

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
May 8, 2007

Tom Phillips called the meeting to order with the following members present: Bell, G., Bidwell, Brown, G., Brown, T., Carter, Clinkenbeard, Cruz-Rodz, Darcy, Dare, Gasem, Giles, Goetze, Hirschlein, Jordan, Leavell, Materer, Miller, Moberly, Moomaw, Nolan, Rouch, Russell, Spicer, Van Delinder, Veenstra and Also present: Bird, L., Bosserman, D., Buchanan, D., Bull, K., Calhoun, R., Chang, Y., DeSilva, U., Elliott, K., Gates, G., Goodbary, A., Hightower, D., Hubbard, S., Hunger, B., Miller, R., Perkins, S., Shutt, G., Strathe, M., Weaver, J., Weimer, C., Wieder, L., and Yellin, D. Absent: Bell, P., Martin, Mitchell, Ransom, and Westhaus.

HIGHLIGHTS

Special Recognitions.....	2
Determining Scholarly Activity in All Three Areas of Our University Mission: Teaching, Research/Creative Development, and Outreach/Extension/Service	3
Committee to Review Tenure Clock Extension for Family Medical Leave Act Reasons.....	5
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	9
Smoke-Free Campus Summary	10
Comments from the Interim President.....	11
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	12
Athletics	13
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security	15
Faculty.....	16
Recommendation: Policy and Procedures for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty	17
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	18
Recommendation: Course Management Systems and Extraordinary Use	19
Research.....	20
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	21
Rules and Procedures.....	23
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	23
Budget.....	24
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate Faculty Council	26
New Business	
Recommendation: Merit Raise Salary Program for FY 2007-2008	26
Request Regarding Report on a Tobacco-Free Campus	27

Phillips asked for approval of the April 10, 2007, Minutes. Jordan made the following correction to the Minutes: In the Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security update on page 8, the word “transmission” should be replaced by “transition. He then moved acceptance of the Minutes.

Darcy seconded. The Minutes were approved as corrected. Phillips asked for approval of the May 8, 2007, Agenda. Moomaw moved and Darcy seconded. The Agenda was approved.

Special Recognitions – Tom Phillips

Certificates were presented to out-going Councilors as follows: Patricia Bell, Armando Cruz-Rodz, Earl Mitchell, Linda Leavell, Bob Nolan, and Jim Meinkoth. Bob Darcy was presented a certificate due to the fact he is ending his term as Past Chair. Diane LaFollette was presented roses for her help during the year. Bob Miller presented Tom Phillips, out-going Chair, a plaque for his service to Council. Miller said a great past member of Council was lost last month, Dr. Ted Agnew, and he presented a resolution to Council for their consideration as follows:

Whereas, Professor Theodore Agnew was a Councilor of the Faculty Council representing the College of Arts and Sciences from 1961 to 1963 and from 1967 to 1969,

And

Whereas, Dr. Agnew served as Chair of the Faculty Council from 1963 to 1964,

And

Whereas, he served as the OSU representative to the Oklahoma AAUP,

And

Whereas, he remained an active participant in OSU governance his entire life, serving as an observer of the business of the Faculty Council, an informal advisor, a liaison from other campus groups, and an active participant,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Council of the corporate faculty of the Oklahoma State University recognizes Professor Agnew's continued and exemplary service to OSU and its faculty by placing his portrait in the Faculty Council Offices.

Enacted this 8th Day of May 2007

Phillips asked for a vote. The resolution passed unanimously.

Miller said he had corresponded with Dr. Agnew's daughter regarding the resolution and he read an email received from her. "Thanks, Bob (and everybody on the Faculty Council). That's a really kind way to remember my father. Daddy really enjoyed Faculty Council meetings. He valued his involvement in university affairs. In fact, he and Eric Williams, our neighbor (Vet Med), used to go to "House of Lords" meetings (meetings of the Chairs) together every year. My father felt that all kinds of governance issues, including AAUP issues and the efforts to get a Phi Beta Kappa on campus, were very important for the ongoing welfare of OSU, its students, and faculty/staff. Thanks again for honoring him in this way. Marion". Miller added if anyone would like Marion Agnew's email address to contact him.

A framed portrait of Dr. Agnew along with the resolution will hang in the Faculty Council Conference Room in the Public Information Building.

In additional business Council voted on a replacement for Jim Meinkoth, Center for Veterinary Health Sciences representative. Meinkoth had recently accepted an administrative position and

resigned from Council. Moomaw moved that Ken Clinkenbeard be appointed to fulfill the remaining one year of Meinkoth's term. The motion passed unanimously.

**SPECIAL REPORT: Determining Scholarly Activity in All Three Areas of Our University
Mission: Teaching, Research/Creative Development, and Outreach/Extension/Service –
David Buchanan**

Buchanan said during the Spring of 1999, he was selected to Chair a Task Force to examine scholarship at OSU. The members of the Task Force who helped coordinate forums and develop the report included: Chris Cashel, Renee Daugherty, Gerald Frank, Debra Jordan, Dale Maronek, Ron Moomaw, Marcia Tilley, Alan Tree, Jack Vitek, Margaret White, Nancy Wilkinson, and Joe Williams.

Buchanan said his least favorite academic phrase is "teaching, scholarship, and service". He feels it implies that research and scholarship are the same thing and that teaching and service are not scholarly. The Scholarship Task Force was asked to assess scholarship at OSU, to look at the possibility of expanding the definition of scholarship and to help faculty understand the diversity of scholarly activities. Work of the Task Force included sending out a survey to faculty and there was a good response rate. There was a series of forums where every member of the faculty was invited and approximately one-fourth of the faculty attended. The forums were led by different members of the Task Force. There were many diverse views expressed by faculty and it was discovered that they are passionate about ideas on scholarship. Some concerns expressed were that scholarship should not be "watered down", scholarship should (should not) be restricted to publication of research, to define scholarship would be to limit it and so they ended up not trying to define it. A primary concern was this was just an attempt on the part of administration to alter RPT.

This was and continues to be a part of a national dialogue. There has been a long-time debate on the relative importance of teaching and research. Popular books questioning the role of the professoriate include: Sykes, 1988, "ProfScam", and Solomon and Solomon, 1993, "Up the University". Boyer in 1990 published a document entitled, "Scholarship Reconsidered". Boyer used phrases like: Scholarship of engagement, discovery, integration and synthesis, teaching and learning, and of application. The Kellogg Commission was organized in 1995 by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and they asked for support from the Kellogg Foundation to study the future of Land-Grant and State Universities.

To view "Scholarship" at OSU one first has to look at what kind of institution this is. We are a comprehensive University, a research University, and a Land-Grant University. As a comprehensive University it means we are a "full-service university" in that we have undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, Doctoral granting, professional colleges, we do research, extension, we have a Statewide mission. As a research University we are committed to graduate education through the Doctoral degree. We award at least some specified number of Ph.D. degrees and we receive at least some specified amount of federal research funding. Buchanan said he grew up in the sense of what a Land-Grant University is due to the fact that his father was a professor of one and a graduate of OSU. Land-Grant University's function through the dictates of the Morrill Act (1862), Hatch Act (1887), and Smith-Lever Act (1914).

Categories of faculty effort include teaching, research, and extension. Many faculty members move among these categories. The Task Force found that Service was defined to include activities that promote the well-being of the department, division, university and/or the profession. Categories of Scholarship include Scholarship of Engagement (working with the targets of scholarship and understanding the needs of the users, and developing societal understanding); Scholarship of Discovery (finding new knowledge, ideas, and artistic expression); Scholarship of Integration and Synthesis (placing new concepts into the existing body of scholarship); Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (conveying scholarship to appropriate audiences – articles, presentations at scientific meetings, lectures, and/or extension presentations); Scholarship of Application where you take Scholarship directly to the field through consulting or professional practice.

A question that was raised was “How do we merge functional areas with categories of scholarship”? The Kellogg Commission said we have Teaching and so let’s call that Learning, we have Research so let’s call that Discovery and we have Extension and so let’s call that Engagement. The Task Force decided that all aspects of scholarship take place in the context of all of the different things done.

There must be evidences of scholarship. Something new must be created. There must be a mechanism for peer validation. Scholarship should make a difference in one or more discipline, department, college or university and a more informed public. It doesn’t matter if it is scholarship unless it is shared with others.

Evidences of scholarship include journal articles, reports, lectures, popular press, outreach activities, public performances and shows, electronic publishing, and the list goes on and on.

Does scholarship cover every task performed by professors? Buchanan said “No”. He added he spent a lot of time working individually with students and “We do many important, critical tasks that are not scholarly but are crucial and we still must pursue excellence”.

Does this multi-dimensional approach have an impact on appraisal and development and/or the reappointment, promotion and tenure process? Not everyone is evaluated by the same specific criteria. Evaluation is based on defined expectations and expectations may and should evolve through the life of the faculty member.

Scholarship across the career of the scholar should not be static because position descriptions may evolve because of changing needs, interests and/or abilities. Does it have an impact on writing position descriptions and hiring faculty? Buchanan said he believed it did. The traditional approach is to hire rugged individualists to develop independent research, teaching or extension programs. There might be a more flexible approach as writing some team oriented positions and hire “team players” who may move around on the “matrix”.

Phillips said, as with the past tradition of recognizing past Faculty Council Chairs when they retire, he presented Buchanan a certificate due to the fact he is retiring from OSU and leaving Oklahoma July 1. This was for his service to the OSU General Faculty throughout all his years

here and also for his service as Chair of Faculty Council in 1997-98. Round of applause followed.

SPECIAL REPORT: Committee to Review Tenure Clock Extension for Family Medical Leave Act Reasons – Kay Bull

Dr. Bull reported for the committee due to the fact Barbara Miller, Chair, was out of town. Bull said the committee was commissioned by the OSU Faculty Council on February 13, 2007 and was composed of the following members. Barbara Miller, Chair, Assoc. Prof., Library; Kay Bull, Professor, Education; Kathleen Kelsey, Assoc. Prof, Ag. Ed., Comm. and Leadership; Greg Wilbur, Assoc. Prof., CEAT, Matt Brosi, Asst. Prof., HES; Frederique Knottnerus, Prof., Dept. of Foreign Languages; Anne Matoy (ex officio), Asst. V.P., Human Resources Dev. Officer; and Carolyn Hernandez, (ex officio) Affirmative Action Program Dir., Inst. Diversity.

The committee charge was to: 1) Investigate the current policies at Oklahoma State University regarding extension of the probationary period (a so-called “tenure clock adjustment”); 2) determine if the current policies are in compliance with Federal law, both in words and in practice; 3) Study what is done at other universities with regard to adjustments to the tenure clock related to family or health leaves of all kinds; and 4) prepare a summary report on findings, and, if warranted, suggest a recommendation that Faculty Council could make to improve and ensure equitable, consistent and streamlined implementation of requests for tenure track adjustments based on family leave and related needs for all OSU faculty.

The committee reviewed documentation and/or policies from over thirty academic institutions, including many in the Big 12. We also checked on any lawsuits resulting from tenure clock extension policies, or lack of such policies, and have looked at background information from the American Council on Education and the University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women. We also studied the OSU Policy and Procedure Letter 3-0708 (as revised June 2004) regarding the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and Faculty Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion..., as approved January 2006, section on Tenure Clock Extension (1.4.8). The substance of these two policies are reprinted here.

P&P Letter 3-0708 (excerpted parts). The Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 provides employees with up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for (1) the birth and care of child or placement of a child for adoption or foster care, (2) an employee’s own serious health condition, and/or (3) for caring for dependents in the immediate family with serious health conditions. To be eligible, the employee must have worked at OSU in a continuous capacity for one year and have worked 1250 hours in the year adjoining the leave. Family Medical Leave runs concurrently with other forms of leave. During this period of unpaid leave, the employee’s appropriate leave accruals will be used to pay the employee; unpaid leave status begins when leave accruals are exhausted. Departments must complete the FMLA forms even when an employee is on workers compensation and should notify the employee in writing in advance of actual leave. Questions regarding the FMLA should be directed to University Personnel Services, 1st floor Whitehurst, 744-5373.

Faculty Policy Statement, section 1.4.8. Extension of Probationary Period. A period of appointment and the probationary period of a faculty member may be extended up to three

years for extenuating circumstances, e.g., a leave of absence without pay, an extended sick leave, significant changes in published criteria for tenure, or significant changes in job description associated with transfer or promotion. Upon written request by the faculty member and recommendation by the unit administrator and dean of the college, such an extension may be granted upon approval by the VPAA.

Recommendation. Based on our review of these materials described above and discussed further below, the committee recommends that the Faculty Committee of Faculty Council utilize this report and related information and consider making the following or a similar Recommendation to the OSU Administration. This recommendation could simply result in an amendment to Faculty Policy Statement section 1.4.8.

Oklahoma State University adopt an across-the-board policy of a one-year extension of the probationary period (the “tenure clock”) for pregnancy, adoption of a child, elder care of family member(s), or other health reasons covered in the Family Medical Leave Act. Faculty should be granted up to two automatic one year extensions during their six year tenure track probationary period. We further recommend that this policy shall be gender-neutral, and that both male and female faculty shall receive an automatic extension of their tenure clock unless they choose to refuse the extension in writing.

It is further noted that the extension of the Probationary Period does not imply that faculty members will take leave of absence from the university under the Family Medical Leave Act during this time. Paid leave is determined by the Family Medical Leave Act and other University policies, and should be considered separately from Probationary Period extension. In addition to adopting such a policy, it is recommended that Oklahoma State University insure in its policy that no discrimination shall apply at the time of tenure consideration to faculty who have been granted such tenure clock extensions. We recommend that funding be established at the University level to support additional temporary personnel to be hired to fill in for any duties, such as teaching or laboratory supervision, that faculty under the tenure clock extension are unable to complete. We further recommend that this new policy not preclude any faculty from requesting additional tenure clock extensions as allowed under section 1.4.8 of the Faculty Policy Statement.

The bases for the Committee’s proposed policy change recommendation, and background information that led to the recommendation, are discussed below.

B. Changing face of the American Academic

The American Council on Education (An Agenda for Excellence, Executive Summary, p. 6) has stated that data show that, since the 1980s the face of the American Academic has changed from the white male-as-wage earner with wife a stay-at-home-caregiver, to the current view of the academic as coming from a two career family where both partners share care giving and parenting responsibilities (An Agenda for Excellence, Executive Summary, p. 5). Thus all faculty have need for family friendly tenure policies.

In addition, American Universities are facing a crisis in attracting good faculty to their institutions (citation). This recruitment crisis, combined with the fact that universities are losing many good faculty to retirement and face declining numbers of foreign faculty since 9/11, shows a need for universities to address the holistic needs of potential faculty members or risk losing them to more family-friendly positions such as lab directors, coordinators, recruiters, student service personnel or other non tenure track positions.

Given the faculty hiring and retention challenges facing higher education, the American Council on Education reports that the National Panel of Presidents and Chancellors advocates creating flexible tenure track faculty career paths, changing the current rigid structure. (An Agenda for Excellence, p. 8) They recommend creating policies that reflect the new academic profile and allow faculty to balance work-life issues, and thus remain productive throughout their career. Such measures will hopefully eliminate preventable causes of talented PhDs opting out of tenure-track faculty positions.

C. Diversity Issues at OSU

Oklahoma State University Administration has also indicated a desire to recruit a more diverse faculty to reflect the increasing diversity of the student population. In order to be competitive in this area there is a need to create a climate of family-friendly policies such as tenure-clock extension, campus day care, better insurance coverage and spousal hiring. Many of these policies will attract faculty who fall into the current demographic of the two-career family. The National Panel of Presidents and chancellors has suggested that institutions make it a priority to redefine the ideal faculty member, in terms of characteristics appropriate for faculty in the pluralistic society of the 21st century.

D. Lack of consistent policy across the board at OSU governing tenure extension.

The current OSU policy regarding extension of the Probationary Period is a short statement (Faculty Policy Statement, section 1.4.8) indicating individual departments may decide to issue extensions for up to three years. This present practice allows for inequality in departments, discrimination against many faculty members with legitimate requests, and the feeling of many faculty members that, if they request an extension, they will pay for it at tenure decision time. An across the board policy would alleviate many of these problems, and present the University as a more desirable place to work.

E. Decision to make extension automatic rather than discretionary

This decision is based on documentation from several universities which indicated that optional policies led to faculty failing to avail themselves of the option because of fear of recrimination at tenure time. When universities such as Princeton chose to make the policy mandatory, with option to refuse (or to “go up early”) the fear factor went away and RPT Committees had a more balanced view of the extension process. The Committee found two law suits dealing with tenure clock extension issues. One concerned a faculty member who was given an extension and did not want it, and the other a faculty member denied an extension. The above plan would alleviate these problems.

F. Additional issues to be addressed by the new or revised policy

1. Many articles have indicated that faculty cannot stop research during this period, so may have to be relieved of teaching duties during this period. Who will teach classes, and who will pay for classes, for faculty who cannot teach because of FMLA issues involved in the tenure clock extension? Such a policy should not put an undue onus of extra teaching on other faculty in the department. Such decisions may depend upon whether or not a faculty member is taking the three months leave allowed under the Family Medical Leave Act. A University-level fund should be established to take care of these issues.
2. The extension be automatically awarded, but who needs to be notified? Does notification go to the Dept. Head and Dean in addition to the faculty member? The Committee recommends notification should go to all three.
3. Who determines whether an extension is legitimate under the FMLA? Must documentation be supplied? The Committee recommends that university FMLA procedures should be followed.
4. Should the automatic extension be awarded only for pregnancy and adoption, or also for other health issues, or should the latter issues be approved only if requested? As noted in the policy recommendation above, the Committee recommends all FMLA issues be covered.
5. How should the policy be marketed to new faculty and to the RPT committees (so they know any extension is a non issue when deciding tenure)? The Committee recommends that language addressing automatic tenure clock extension should be added to the University Faculty Handbook and to all college and department RPT handbooks and documents.
6. Should there be a time limit after which the extension policy does not apply? The Committee recommends that if the documentation has already been submitted for a faculty member's tenure consideration, then no extension should be granted for that year.
7. Should leave be extended to domestic partners? The Oklahoma Constitution recognizes common law marriage, and these partners would qualify for automatic FMLA coverage. University Legal Counsel will have to be consulted for language involving other partnerships.

This report and proposed policy change has been endorsed by the following campus organizations as of April 30, 2007: OSU Women's Faculty Council, Barbara Miller, Chair; Institutional Diversity, Cornell Thomas, Vice Pres.

G. Documents Cited and Consulted

1. American Council on Education. 2005. An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers. Washington, D.C. number of pages

2. American Council on Education. 2005. *An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers, Executive Summary*. Washington, D.C.
3. Smith, Gilia C. and Jean A. Waltman. 2006. *Designing and Implementing Family-Friendly Policies in Higher Education*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan, The Center for the Education of Women.
4. West, Martha S. and John W. Curtis. 2006. *AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006*. Washington, D.C., American Association of University Professors.

The Committee has placed documentation from other universities, and copies of other university policies on tenure clock extension in the Faculty Council Office, 314 Public Information Building.

Phillips entertained a motion that this report be accepted and referred to the Faculty Council Faculty Committee for review. Darcy moved and Jordan seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Phillips said the Faculty Committee will make any needed revisions they see necessary and then bring to Council with a recommendation to administration.

**REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:
Interim President Strathe, Provost, and Vice Presidents**

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 06-11-03-SALR | <i>Study Abroad Initiative:</i> Participation goals accepted; implementation plan due Fall 2007. Dr. J. Hromas and Ms. Gerry Auel have met several times with the Study Abroad Committee to discuss issues raised in the FC recommendation. |
| 06-12-03-COUNCIL | <i>Smoke-Free Campus:</i> Report received and under review. The Task Force, led by Vice President Lee Bird, continues to review strategies, legality, and timeliness. NOTE: See summary below from Dr. Bird. |
| 07-03-01-RFB | <i>Employee Tuition Benefit Recommendation:</i> Pending. Recommendation will be considered, along with other budget priorities, as the FY 2008 budget is finalized. |
| 07-03-02-RFB | <i>Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Recommendation:</i> Pending. Recommendation will be considered, along with other budget priorities, as the FY 2008 budget is finalized. |
| 07-04-01-ASP | <i>Recommended Policy on Academic Integrity:</i> Accepted. Proposed modifications will be discussed with Instruction Council and with the Council of Deans. |
| 07-05-01-LRPIT | <i>Course Management Systems and Extraordinary Use:</i> To Interim President Strathe |
| 07-05-02-FAC | <i>Policy and Procedures for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty:</i> To Interim President Strathe |
| 07-05-03-EXEC | <i>Merit Raise Salary Program for FY 2007-2008:</i> To Interim President Strathe |

Tobacco-Free Campus Summary – Vice President Lee Bird

Dr. Bird reported that in December 2006, a Tobacco Free Task Force was appointed. Members of the Task Force included: Robin Purdie, Director, Seretean Wellness Center, John Fernandez, President, CHS-Tulsa, Steve Rogers, Director, University Health Services, Bob Huss, Director, Residential Life, Rachel Shreffler, Health Education Coordinator, David Christy, Tobacco Health Educator, Carey Pullins, SAC, Kari Alldredge, Enrollment Management, and Samir Ahmed, Engineering.

The “Charge” of the Task Force was to review the current and pending tobacco policy recommendations from the Student Government Association, Staff Advisory Council, and Faculty Council, to investigate other higher education institutions that have instituted tobacco policies, and to compile a summary and recommendations.

Each of the campus governance groups recommended “phased in” policies making the campus smoke free or tobacco free within a four-year period. The Task Force recommended cutting the time-frame for going tobacco free by half. Support for those that wish to quit will be provided through University Health Services for students and by the Seretean Wellness Center for faculty and staff. Examples include free cessation programs (provided by a Tobacco Settlement Endowment Trust [TSET] grant) for students beginning July 2007 and to work with health insurance providers, the American Cancer Society, TSET, and others to provide assistance with behavior modification and cessation. The committees’ ultimate goal is to change the culture of smoking on campus and use enforcement and formal disciplinary policy only when necessary. Effective immediately, the current state law prohibiting tobacco use within 25 feet of building entrances and exits should be enforced. OSU policy prohibiting tobacco use in university owned and operated vehicles should be enforced. Public education in the form of email, the Human Resources newsletter, and newsprint should be used to raise awareness about current law and campus policies. Beginning July 2008, a policy should be implemented prohibiting use of all tobacco products on any university owned, leased or operated property and university owned vehicle. Immediate adoption of a policy prohibiting sponsorship of any university activity by tobacco companies. Emphasis should be placed on creating a positive and healthy culture free of tobacco and alcohol. Enforcement should be a cooperative effort and encouraged by all faculty, staff, students, and alumni to promote a healthy environment to live, work, and learn. Unresolved issues include Game Day enforcement is still a question regarding the donor areas and parking areas. This issue has been discussed with Mike Holder. He agreed to state in the policy that this would include all areas on campus since it would be accomplished through persuasion rather than law enforcement.

Darcy asked what was meant by “prohibiting sponsorship of any university activity by tobacco companies” since many sell other products besides tobacco, i.e., Kraft Foods. Bird replied only tobacco advertising.

Gasem thought the plan was a little harsh as people affected with a tobacco habit might have trouble quitting by July 2008 and that help should be offered to faculty and staff and not just students. Bird replied they would be open to another proposal but in July 2006 the Seretean Wellness Center was awarded a five year \$500,000 grant to decrease tobacco use among college students. She added classes are offered at the hospital, community classes, and they are willing

to help create more. CHS is willing to provide more classes. Gasem said he thought it was important for the faculty and staff to know what services were available to them. Bird agreed but said she could not see it would be any better for the community's health to delay what she thinks will be the inevitable. She added part of the role of this committee was to see if OSU could be a leader instead of a follower for this movement. There is now one public university in Indiana (IUPUI) that has a tobacco-free campus and Indiana University will go tobacco free next year. Rouch asked if it was known what the impact is from this university on the health-care costs from each individual and has it come down significantly. Bird said she thought it was a matter of public health and the right thing to do. It might not change the cost of health insurance overall but changes the culture and the health of students and the climate we work in.

Glenn Brown asked what the consequences would be for a student leaving class, walking 25 feet from a building and then lighting a cigarette. Bird replied that was a "code of conduct" issue and would be up to the Student Conduct Officer. Brown said, "You're expecting us to attach the approval to a recommendation of an acceleration to which none of the recommendations had, as all were in favor of four to five years, and you're not even telling us how it's going to impact our students". Bird replied, "How it's going to impact our students is that they are going to be healthier if they choose to quit. We're going to have cessation programs provided by the grant".

Bruce Russell said he was concerned about the disciplinary action in regard to faculty and staff and could termination be a result. Bird said that was certainly not the intent of the committee.

Moomaw said he thought it was appropriate to say that the Task Force Committee has rejected Faculty Council's recommendation because it is very clear in regard to the timing. Bird replied she thought it was "tagged on" to the language of the SGA recommendation and that language used is "up to four years". Moomaw quoted from the Faculty Council recommendation as follows: "At the end of the four year period the University Administration will enter negotiations with students, faculty and staff about whether or not to make the rest of the Academic Core of the campus Smoke-Free by removing all designated smoking areas." Bird replied she would take that back to the committee.

Comments from Interim President Strathe

The budget status between the leadership in the House, Senate and Governor continues. The one bright spot is there is more spillover money available than had been anticipated but what that means is there are a lot of players after one-time money. There is not much sense about what, if any, additional dollars might go to higher education out of that spillover money. Conversations are still being held about some additional Capital Project money some of which might come to OSU, some of which might go to OU, and some to the other colleges and universities. This is still very unclear. There is some conversation about funding for endowed chairs but this is uncertain. There was also a recommendation to see if part of the 2005 Bond issue money could be restored. Over time, the projects on all campuses regarding inflation costs, etc., have had to be value-engineered down. This would be one-time money. A Bill in some form of guaranteed tuition as well as some modifications in the OLAP program is in conference committee. How both of these items come out and in what form is unknown at this time. Groundbreaking will occur in the next few months on the multimodal facility, the Architecture Building, the new

Classroom Building, the renovation of Murray Hall, the beginning of the restoration of Old Central and the Interdisciplinary Science Building.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Jean Van Delinder

Committee Year-end Report follows:

Committee members: Jean Van Delinder, Chair & Faculty Council Members Chuck Ransom, Brian Carter, and Bob Nolan; General Faculty Members Carl Latino and Amilcar Shabazz; Margaret Scott, Emeritus Faculty Member; Amanda Nichols, Graduate Student Member; and Matt Beier, Undergraduate Student Member. Nine (9) Committee meetings were held during the Faculty Council meeting year.

Committee Recommendations: The following recommendations were made to the Faculty Council during the 2006-07 academic year: 1) Add/Drop policy changes (09-12-06); 2) Incomplete Grades Policy modification (11-06-06); 3) Wellness Class Recommendation (12 13-06); and 4) Policy on Academic Integrity to include procedures for revocation of degree (4-11-07).

Faculty Council Action on Recommendations

All recommendations were approved by the Faculty Council with the exception of the Incomplete Grades Policy which was tabled at the November 14, 2006 meeting.

Administration Action on Recommendations

All recommendations were approved by the Administration with the exception of the Incomplete Grades policy which was tabled at the November 14, 2006 meeting.

Additional Committee Activities

The following issues were reviewed and discussed by the Committee without a recommendation to Faculty Council: 1) Guidelines for Initiating, Modifying and Discontinuing Academic Options or Degree Programs; and 2) Review of Course Action Requests.

Pending Committee Actions

Proposed changes to the following policies and procedures to reflect changes in OSRHE policy wording and OSU procedures: 1) Summer School Policies & Procedures; 2) Semester credit hour Policies & Procedures; 3) Academic Program Review Policies & Procedures; 4) A recommendation from Student Government Association regarding a Middle Eastern Studies Minor; 5) a recommendation from SGA regarding grading policies in required classes with multiple sections; and 6) Pandemic attendance policy.

Van Delinder distributed copies of the policy revisions the Faculty Council Academic Standards and Policy Committee recently reviewed in regard to Policy and Procedures letters “Course Action Requests 2-0202” and “Guidelines for Initiating, Modifying and Discontinuing Academic Options or Degree Programs 2-0211”. These are changes to reflect current OSU practice and changes in OSRHE policy. These do not require a formal recommendation but the committee thought it was important to keep Faculty Council informed of these updated policies and procedures.

2-0211 Guidelines for Initiating, Modifying and Discontinuing Academic Options or Degree Programs – revised to reflect changes in OSRHE policy wording and OSU procedures

2-0201 Review of Requests for Changes in Educational Programs and Course Offerings by OSRHE – program modifications were incorporated into 2-0211 and course offering section was deleted (courses no longer require OSRHE approval)

2-0202 Course Action Requests – revised to reflect current OSU practice and changes in OSRHE policy (courses no longer require OSRHE approval)

ATHLETICS — Kris Giles

Committee Year-end Report follows:

Committee Members: Kristopher Giles, Patricia Bell, Bob Darcy, Sandee Goetze, David Moll, Tim Ireland, Glade Presnal, Scott Williams, Marilyn Middlebrook, Gerald Lage, and Niccole Grimaldi.

The committee met approximately every month and discussed three major items. First, with the help of the POSSE and the ticket office at OSU, the committee assembled financial data and documented that faculty and staff provide significant support to the Athletic Department (See report below). Second, the committee developed a resolution commending Athletics Director Mike Holder for his efforts to (1) address the fiscal solvency of the athletics department, (2) return unused appropriated money to back to the general university, and (3) improve academic achievement of student athletes (See resolution below). The third topic, which is still in progress, involves documenting the accessibility of academic programs and degrees for student athletes and other non-traditional students. We are working with the Registrar's office to evaluate departments and programs; this topic will continue next year.

OSU Faculty and Staff Support Athletics

OSU faculty and staff supported their student athletes in 2005-6 with \$1,391,409 in season ticket sales and donations.

Football was most popular with faculty and staff; 103 club seats and 1,251 season tickets were purchased, with a total of \$285,694. Men's Basketball's 756 season tickets brought in an additional \$275,940. Wrestling had 160 faculty and staff season tickets (\$9,600); and baseball 79 (\$9,322). Women's basketball had 157 faculty and staff season tickets (\$10,205). Softball and soccer had only eight faculty and staff season tickets for \$336 and \$312. An additional \$800,000 was donated through the Posse.

Faculty and staff purchase a significant number of game-day tickets and make donations to the athletic department as well. The \$1,391,409 represents only dollars received from season tickets and associated donations, and does not include the significant contributions associated with individual game-day ticket purchases or donations independent of season tickets. These additional contributions would significantly increase the total annual contributions by faculty and staff at OSU.

Employees at the OSU ticket office and the POSSE summarized 2005-2006 data on season ticket purchases and donations to Athletics at the request of the Athletics Committee of the Faculty Council.

Contributions to OSU sports during the 05/06 year by faculty and staff

	2005-06			Total \$
	<u># of Accts</u>	<u>Ticket Price</u>	<u># of Season Tix</u>	
Baseball	42	\$118	79	\$9,322
Football	562	\$211	1,251	\$263,961
Football Club Seats	36	\$211	103	\$21,733
Softball	6	\$42	8	\$336
Men's Basketball	380	\$365	756	\$275,940
Soccer	6	\$39	8	\$312
Wrestling	81	\$60	160	\$9,600
Women's Basketball	83	\$65	157	\$10,205
			2,522	\$591,409
Donations made to the posse associated with tickets				\$800,000
Minimum annual contributions				\$1,391,409

*These figure do not include non-season ticket purchases: ex. individual game-day tickets.

*These figures do not include donations to the posse independent of season tickets.

While faculty and staff also spend their money on interests other than OSU athletics, it is clear by the number of tickets sold and annual donations that many faculty and staff consider athletics an important component of their OSU experience.

Resolution by the Athletics Committee of the Faculty Council

WHEREAS, Mike Holder, Vice President for Athletic Programs and Director of Intercollegiate Athletics at Oklahoma State University has initiated comprehensive and innovative fund-raising and revenue programs that are designed to permanently address athletic department expenditures,

And,

WHEREAS, the Athletic Director has initiated cost-saving procedures in the athletic department that have resulted in \$1,937,265 returned to the University,

And,

WHEREAS, the Athletic Director has expressed his dedication to the academic integrity and achievement of student athletes,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Council at Oklahoma State University extends its sincere appreciation to the Athletic Director for his commitment to: (1) the fiscal responsibility of the Athletic Department, (2) allocation of financial resources to OSU academic programs, and (3) the scholarly accomplishments of athletes who represent Oklahoma State University.

Phillips called for a vote. The Resolution was approved unanimously by Council.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Khaled Gasem

Committee Year-end Report follows:

Committee Members: Khaled Gasem, Chair, Faculty Council Members, Tom Jordan, Jim Meinkoth, and Heather Moberly; General Faculty Members, Katherine Bost and Charles Leider; Ex-Officio members, Jeffery Stewart and Sarah Kimball; Bob Swaim, Emeritus Faculty Member; and Blaine Law, Student Member.

Summary of Activities

The activities of the CFSS Committee have focused mainly on reviewing the 2025 OSU-Stillwater Campus Master Plan. The deliberations and findings of the Committee are captured in the (1) the charge for the formation of the “*Ad Hoc Multidisciplinary Committee for Reviewing the 2025 OSU-Stillwater Master Plan*”, and (2) the Ad Hoc Committee “*Review of the Planning Process and the Preliminary Campus Master Plan*”.

Plans for Year 2007-2008

In the next academic year, the CFSS Committee plans to:

1. Review the progress of the OSU Master Plan and its implementation
2. Review the progress of the on-going construction projects
3. Review policies relating to campus security
4. Finalize its findings on “Tobacco-free campus”

FACULTY — Tony Brown

Committee Year-end Report follows:

The members of the Faculty Committee who served during the 2006-07 academic year were: Faculty Council Members: Tony Brown, Chair (Political Science); Linda Leavell (English); Bob Miller (Microbiology & Molecular Genetics); and Bruce Russell (Civil & Environmental Engineering). General Faculty Members: Martin Wallen, Secretary (English); Barbara Miller (Library Documents); and David Yellin (Teaching & Curriculum Leadership). Emeritus Faculty Member: John Thornton.

The Faculty Committee met twice monthly during the 2006-07 academic year. Actions taken by the Committee included the following:

Fall Semester 2006

1. The Faculty Committee revised the Policies and Procedures Letter for the Annual Appraisal and Development Process. Revisions were made based on the revised policy adopted by the Faculty Council and the A&M Board in June 2006. A revised document was taken to the Faculty Council as a recommendation and approved at its December 12, 2006, meeting. The revised document was approved by Administration.
2. The Committee reviewed applications for the Big 12 Fellowship Program. Advisory recommendations were made to Dr. Marlene Strathe, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Spring Semester 2007

1. The Faculty Committee developed a new Policies and Procedures Letter for implementation of a new policy on cumulative review of tenured faculty. The new policy was adopted by the A&M Board of Regents in June 2006. The new document was presented to the General Faculty at the April 17, 2007, General Faculty Meeting. It was then presented to the Faculty Council and approved at its May 8, 2007 meeting. The recommendation was being reviewed by the administration at the end of the 2006-07 academic year.
2. The Faculty Committee reviewed three cases of disputed reappointment, promotion, and tenure actions. Advisory recommendations were made to Dr. Marlene Strathe, Interim President.

Listed below are proposed agenda items for the 2007-08 Faculty Committee:

1. Revise the Dispute Resolution Policy to accommodate the new policy on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty.
2. Revise the Appraisal and Development Form to accommodate the revised policy on Annual Appraisal and Development of Faculty.
3. Review recommendations in the Report of the Special Committee on Tenure Track Adjustment Related to Faculty Leave that was presented at the May 8, 2007, meeting of the Faculty Council.

Brown presented a recommendation from the committee entitled “Policy and Procedures for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty” as follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to Interim President Strathe that: the policy and procedures letter entitled “Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures—Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty” be approved.

Rationale:

The A&M Board of Regents approved a new policy on cumulative review of tenured faculty in June 2006 (Section 1.1.5.2 of the “Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University”). The Faculty Committee was charged with the responsibility of developing a policy and procedures letter for implementing the new policy. A draft of the policies and procedures letter was presented to the Faculty Council Executive Committee on April 3, 2007; President Strathe on April 6, 2007; the Faculty Council on April 10, 2007; and the General Faculty on April 17, 2007 with a request to review and comment on the proposed document. Comments received from faculty and administration were reviewed by the Faculty Committee and a final revised document approved by the Committee on May 3, 2007.

Contact diane.lafollette@okstate.edu in the Faculty Council Office if you would like a copy of the proposed document.

Nolan said he had been asked by his College (Education), and especially by the Leadership Team, about the criteria for Department Heads which seems ambiguous. In 2.04 Review Criteria it states: “The faculty of each academic unit shall develop and formally approve written performance standards and expectations for each tenured faculty rank within the unit”.... He said there was some unease about the wording in that it might provide a completely different set of criteria in evaluations of heads then for the teaching faculty. Brown said there was a great deal of discussion in regard to the status of unit heads, unit administrators, or department heads in terms of their inclusion in the cumulative review process. The committee took the position that they should be included. The language leaves to the unit or department the responsibility of specifying the review criteria. Section 2.01 specifies the faculty subject to review and in section 2.04 he continued the quote (partially listed above) where it states “...In those cases in which work assignments for tenured faculty members vary greatly within a given unit or are spilt between units, it will be necessary to specify performance standards and expectations for individual positions”.... Brown said it was the intention of the committee to include unit heads, unit administrators and department heads, since they are tenured faculty with a percentage of administrative appointment to the unit. The faculty in those departments will have to deal with that situation in terms of establishing review criteria. He added most departments already have criteria within their promotion and tenure documents.

Glenn Brown proposed an amendment as he expressed concern about this turning into an additional burden for both faculty and department heads. He recommended guidance be provided under Section 2.05 “Documents and Information Used in the Review”, last paragraph, stating, “The vast majority of tenured faculty meet and exceed the requirements of their positions and annual appraisals provide an adequate instrument for their direction. Thus, academic units

should structure the cumulative review process to minimize the time and effort demanded of the faculty. In no case shall the cumulative review process be considered equal to or made as demanding as the tenure process itself". Moomaw seconded. Phillips reminded all that they are developing a procedure. The policy has been completed. He had sat in on many of the committee meetings and much was left open to the unit and he felt what Brown was proposing as an amendment could be decided by any unit. Glenn Brown added he felt if it was not in the policy some new administrator that has not been involved in the discussions might decide that this is like conducting a new tenure. The vote to amend failed with a vote of 17 "against", 6 "for" and 3 "abstentions".

Moomaw said since the majority of the faculty had not been involved in the committee discussions he felt it would be helpful for the committee to develop an independent document (guidelines) that explained some of the items in more detail.

Bob Miller said he thought one important thing implied by this statement is that a department cannot simply take their RPT document and say "here is the document for cumulative review". They must develop a document that describes their unit's procedures for cumulative review. He added they could refer to their RPT document when it comes to the exact criteria for performance of an Associate Professor, for example, if they want.

Phillips called for a vote on the original recommendation. The recommendation passed with 22 "for", 1 "against", and 1 "abstention".

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Nick Materer

Committee Year-end Report follows:

I would like to thank the other members of the Long Range Planning and Information Technology Committee, Mark Weiser, Patricia Bell, Mark A Wolfgram, Robin Leech, Bob Darcy and Bob Miller. I would also thank Darlene Hightower (Chief Information Officer) and her directors (Jerry Kidd, Data Center, Preston Carrier, Software Services, Tina Meier, Server Administration, Charles McCann, Technology Support, Michael White, Telecommunications, and Eric Maynard, IT Security) for their help and frankness concerning information technology issues.

A concern about privacy related to the email destination option under O-Key was discussed with Information Technology (IT). IT added a warning on the web page utilized to setup the email destination option under O-Key. IT has also implemented a new directory service to prevent the email destination or personal email address from being exposed. Please note that your personal email address can also be exposed by responding to an email using your personal account. If you are concerned about this information being compromised, you should use the web outlook interface to send email from your OSU account when you are at home.

IT has requested input from our committee on possible solutions to the growing spam problem. After consultation with faculty and staff, we recommended the least invasive solution. We believe that this issue should be periodically revisited by our committee.

Due to a system failure, it was discovered that the Library Catalog does not have redundancy built-in in case of failure due to the software license. Currently, the Library is looking at a solution in which the catalog will be backed-up to a secondary system allowing a “current” version to be browsed in case the main system fails. Faculty and staff need to consider the effects of failures when they plan the infrastructure and pro-actively address possible failures in critical systems they utilize.

We have made two motions. The first is a resolution addressing the posting of the Regents Board Books. The other is a recommendation addressing copyright and the use of university-provided systems for course materials management and delivery.

Going forward, we see two main issues facing this committee. One is rollout of the Device Subscription Project, which simplifies network management, helps optimize bandwidth and allows better planning for future upgrades. However this project can potentially hinder legitimate network use by faculty and must be implemented carefully. The other issue is copyright and file-sharing. Software and entertainment companies are becoming sensitive to copyright violations on University Campuses. The US Congress has indicted that they will take action if something is not done at Universities. We have supported IT efforts to block peer-to-peer file sharing on the wireless network. The blocking will be for all peer-to-peer traffic on wireless and is expected to be implemented in June 2007. Before we implement it for the wired portion of the network, IT will have an exception process for those with legitimate uses. I recommend that the next committee continues to get updates on the wireless rollout being supported by student technology fees, evaluate faculty satisfaction with the existing course management tools, examine redundancy in critical system and ensure that the academic freedom is preserved as network security is increased.

Materer then presented a recommendation to Council entitled “Course Management Systems and Extraordinary Use” as follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to Interim President Strathe that the use of university-provided systems for course materials management and delivery (e.g., Desire2Learn, VBrick, etc.) does not, in itself, constitute “extraordinary use of university resources” that may jeopardize ownership and/or copyright of the intellectual property that a faculty member may post on those systems.

Rationale:

Since classroom technology is becoming increasingly expensive, the utilization of these systems may be considered extraordinary use of university facilities. The Copyrightable Educational Material and Other Intellectual Property policy (1-0201 section 1.02) states that the ownership of works created without direct assignment or supervision by the University for teaching purposes remain with the employee who created them except when the creation utilizes “extraordinary use of university facilities.”

Faculty should be encouraged to utilize new technologies without the fear of losing copyright control over their materials.

Online materials created by Faculty for teaching purposes should not be treated differently than those created in traditional ways, for example handouts and overheads.

Phillips called for a vote and the recommendation unanimously.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

Committee Year-end Report follows:

Committee Members: Dr Al Rouch, Chair; Faculty Council Members, Dr. Joe Bidwell, Dr Glenn Brown, and Dr. Leon Spicer; General Faculty Members, Dr. Darrell Berlin, Dr. Denver Marlow, and Dr. Ramesh Rao; and Dr. George Waller, Emeritus Faculty Member.

Items in the annual report include:

- Human Subjects Research
- Eminent Faculty Committee
- EFFF
- Communicating Science Conference
- Distinguished Faculty Award
- Conflict of Commitment Policy

Human Subject Research: The Research Committee worked with Dr. Steven O’Geary, Director of Compliance, and the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) from the Stillwater campus and the Center for Health Sciences in Tulsa in developing a new university policy titled: “*Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research*”. The policy was reviewed and revised in the summer months and a final draft was completed in the fall. Dr. Rouch presented the draft policy to the Faculty Council which approved it in the fall. The policy replaces an outdated and inadequate document (4-0115) written in 1977. The new policy brings the university in full compliance with its obligation to protect human subjects in research and to confirm the University’s commitment to its IRBs.

Eminent Faculty Nominating Committee: The Office of the Provost requested a member of the Research Committee serve a two-year term on the screening committee for the 2007 Eminent Faculty Award. The award honors one faculty member who has made sustained contributions to scholarly-creative activity, teaching, and service, bringing honor and recognition to the University. Dr. Ramesh Rao accepted the position.

EFFF: The Research Committee worked on the proposed guidelines and application for the Entrepreneurial Faculty Fellows Program (EFFF). This was approved at the end of last year, and specific guidelines and requirements were developed in the summer. The program is designed to provide qualified faculty the time to create start-up companies using OSU-licensed intellectual property. The program is designed to provide faculty time by reducing departmental/university responsibilities. Options include a one-half or full year sabbatical-like leave, or leave without pay (with OSU benefits). The application procedure is quite extensive and involves two tracks: business and academic. A business plan must be submitted to the Office of Intellectual Property

and an academic plan to the department Chair and appropriate Dean. The Provost and Senior Vice President, Vice President for Research, and Assistant Vice President for Technology Development will make the final review and decision. The Guidelines provide specific items to be addressed for both plans. The program is now open for all interested faculty.

Communicating Science Conference: Dr. John Mowen, Regents Professor and Noble Foundation Chair of Marketing Strategy, chaired a day-long conference titled: “*Communicating Science Knowledge: Implications for Oklahoma and the Nation*”. This was held at OSU during OSU Research Week in February. The conference attracted distinguished speakers from around the country. In December, Dr. Mowen briefed the Research Committee about the conference and asked for ideas and support. Dr. Rouch facilitated a session at the conference.

Distinguished Research Award: Dr. Darrell Berlin, member of the Research Committee, participated in reviewing the applications from the various colleges and selecting the awardees.

Conflict of Commitment Policy: This policy titled: “*Guidelines to Govern Overload Assignments, Outside Professional Activities, and Other Outside Activities of Faculty Members*” (2-0111) was written in July 1984. The policy needs updating. Dr. Rouch in consultation with the Council Executive Committee will form a special task force charged with updating the policy. A final draft will be presented to the Council next year.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Greg Bell

Committee Year-end Report follows:

Committee Members: Greg Bell (Chair); Faculty Council Members, Armando Cruz-Rodz, Paul Westhaus, and William Dare; General Faculty Members, Carol Moder, Robert Emerson, and Susan Bobo; and Emeriti representatives John Sauer and Sheila Harp (ex officio).

The RFB committee determined that two issues were of particular importance to the faculty during the 2006-07 fiscal year: 1) The high cost of health insurance for dependents of OSU employees and 2) Tuition benefit plans for employees and employee dependents.

Health Insurance

The cost of health insurance for OSU employee dependents in our most popular plan, Health Choice High, offered by the Oklahoma State Employee and Education Insurance Board (OSEEGIB), increased by more than 20% on January 1, 2007. We are currently paying twice as much to insure a spouse as the university pays to insure us. The reason for that discrepancy is that most employees are not willing to pay the high cost of dependent coverage unless their dependents are in poor health or have pre-existing conditions. That makes our dependent group a high risk endeavor for a provider and increases the cost of dependent premiums. We could ask the university to cover all or a portion of dependent premiums but that would be a major expense and would result in a need to reduce expenses elsewhere, probably our pay checks. In addition, personnel who did not require dependent care would have to help carry the burden of those who did.

The RFB committee researched the possibility of incorporating a high deductible health care plan and health savings account (HDHP/HSA) into our benefit programs. Using premium costs provided by a major health care provider for individuals (these would not be the same premiums charged for a group plan but should be close), we found that compared with health choice, out of pocket expenses for single employees under a wide range of health care requirements, would cost from \$220 to \$1,582 less annually than Health Choice High in spite of the increase in deductible. A family of four could save from \$10,300 to \$12,351 per year.

In February 2007 the committee recommended that the university issue an immediate request for proposals from health care providers and that a high deductible health care plan be included as an option in the solicitation. At this writing, the request for proposals has been issued, the bids are in, and a decision should be made by July 2007.

Tuition Benefits

Oklahoma State University is clearly behind its competitors in providing tuition benefits for its employees and employee dependents. The RFB committee randomly selected and surveyed 24 land grant institutions. Of those 24 institutions, 19 provided a tuition benefit program for employee dependents. Of those 19 institutions, five provided 100% of tuition and 18 provided a benefit of 50% tuition or more. In addition, five of the institutions waived all or a portion of student fees for employee dependents. A survey of Big 12 institutions revealed that only four had an employee tuition benefit program and only three of eight state universities in Oklahoma provided an employee dependent plan. Clearly our region is less progressive than most of the country in this area and Oklahoma State University has the opportunity to take a leadership role. As the second largest employer in Oklahoma and one of the two premier higher education institutions in the state, we need to keep pace with the three smaller institutions providing an employee dependent tuition benefit plan. Only 27.2% of Oklahoma residents are college graduates and Oklahoma ranked 41 out of 50 states in 2005. We felt that we could help increase that number by providing affordable tuition rates for the dependents of our employees and influencing other institutions to provide similar plans.

In March 2007, the committee made two recommendations to the interim president. We recommended that the employee tuition benefit be increased from 50% to 100% and that an employee dependent tuition benefit amounting to a 50% tuition reduction be initiated in Fall 2007. Each recommendation was accompanied by an in-depth cost/benefit analysis using cost estimates provided by the office of institutional research and public information from a variety of sources. In summary, the employee program requires a one-time increase in tuition of 0.31% (if tuition were used to fund it) and provides a \$1.1 to \$5.0 million (current value) return on investment in 20 years that continues to grow in perpetuity. The employee dependent program would require a one-time increase in tuition of 0.7% and provides a \$2.5 to \$7.3 million (current value) return on investment in 20 years that continues to grow in perpetuity.

At this writing, both recommendations are pending a presidential decision once the 2007-08 university budget estimates are known.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Ron Moomaw

Moomaw announced results of the April Faculty Council run-off elections. David Yellin was elected to a three-year term representing the College of Education and Ron Moomaw was elected to the Vice Chair position.

The Committee Preference Nominating Committee met on May 2 to compile names to present to Council for their approval of FC Standing Committees for the 2007-08 meeting year. A list of the nominations was distributed to Council members for their review. Moomaw then moved the names be approved. Phillips called for a vote and the list was approved unanimously.

Moomaw said another Past Chair of Faculty Council, Gerry Lage, will be retiring from OSU as of June 30 and recommended a certificate be sent to him. The staff secretary said one would be prepared.

R&P Committee Year-end Report follows:

Members: Ron Moomaw, Chair; Beulah Hirschlein; Bob Miller; and Earl Mitchell

Earl Mitchell chaired the Rules and Procedures (R&P) Committee through January. Ron Moomaw became chair at that time. The R&P Committee with the excellent assistance of Diane LaFollette organized the FC elections.

Earl Mitchell initiated a study of the Faculty Council rules and reminded us that we attempt to follow Robert's Rules of Order. We obtained the "Rules" and provided the Chair of the R&P committee and new FC members with a summary sheet detailing some of the more relevant rules regarding motions and obtaining recognition.

In addition to attempting to follow FC rules, the R&P may want to consider two general issues next year. One relates to the status of Research and Clinical Faculty with regard to voting status in FC elections, and the other relates to the consideration of motions brought under New Business.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Beulah Hirschlein

Committee Year-end Report follows:

Members of the Committee: OSU Faculty Council Members: Glenn Brown; Danna Martin; and Beulah Hirschlein, Chair. OSU General Faculty Members: Jao-Ming Huang and Dan Chaney; Emeritus Faculty Member Raymond Habiby. Undergraduate Students: Jeff Clark (Fall 06); Brad Scarborough (Spring 07); Christy Milliken (Spring 07). Graduate Students: Samantha Ephgrave (Fall 06), Mauricio Moreno (Late Fall 06), and Amy Mollet (Spring 07).

Issues selected for study for 2006-2007 were: Study abroad; Academic fees and tuition at OSU; Textbook costs; Library accommodations

Liaison relationships maintained: Student Union Planning and University Library Council

Recommendations:

Study Abroad Initiative (06-11-03-SALR)

Recommendation summary: Implementation of a four-point plan to increase study abroad participation: 100% participation (long-term goal); 25% participation in five years; formation of advisory committee to develop action plan; and present action plan to Faculty Council in Fall 2007. **Administration's Response** – 4-10-07. Participation goals accepted; implementation plan due Fall 2007. **Status:** Dr. J. Hromas and Ms. Gerry Auel have met several times with the Study Abroad Committee to discuss issues raised in the Faculty Council Recommendation.

BUDGET — John Veenstra

Committee Year-end Report follows:

Members of the Committee: John Veenstra, Chair, Andrea Arquitt, Sandee Goetze, Bob Miller, Carol Moder, and Peter Shull. Veenstra also extended thanks to Joe Weaver and his office. Every time the committee requested information they were graciously supplied with it.

Over the course of the Academic Year the Budget Committee considered and acted on a wide array of issues. These issues included carry-over business from the previous year's Committee, items generated internally within the Committee, and business referred to the Committee by the both the University Faculty Council and the Executive Committee of University Faculty Council.

In September a letter was sent to Mr. Mike Holder, Vice President for Athletics and Athletic Director, in follow-up to his presentation to University Faculty Council on March 14, 2006. The letter inquired whether a timetable had been developed as part of the business plan for Athletics for reducing and eliminating the subsidy of approximately \$944,000 the Department receives from the general university. No timetable was offered in Mr. Holder's response to the letter.

The Committee started investigating how the cost of OSU's administration has changed over the last 10 years. The focus of this effort was on the level of Assistant VP and above. Data concerning University organizational charts and salary information, grouped into \$10,000 increments, over this 10 year period were requested and mostly received from Joe Weaver's office. Analysis of this information was begun, but events such as President Schmidly's resignation and additional business items with more critical timetables being referred to the Committee delayed the completion of this task.

The issue of promotional pay increases was addressed. The Committee working in conjunction with Joe Weaver's office investigated promotional pay increases given last year by 20 universities who are members of the Southern University Group. A proposal was made to Interim President Strathe to increase the OSU promotional pay raises from assistant to associate professor to \$5,000 and from associate to full professor to \$7,500. This proposal was accepted by Interim President Strathe who directed that these promotional pay raises for newly promoted faculty become effective at the beginning of the new fiscal year, July 1, 2007.

The proposed recommendation concerning “Funding Priority for Endowed Chairs and Professorships” was also handled/evaluated by the Committee. Members of the Committee met with representatives of the OSU Foundation and Interim President Strathe to discuss the Foundation’s role in seek funding for chairs and professorships, the current backlog of these positions that have not received matching money from the state, and what current state budget held in terms of new money for state matching money. The Committee learned that there are a significant number of these positions in queue awaiting state matching money and that the current proposed state budget for the next fiscal year contained no new money for this program. The Committee also concluded that some education of the OSU faculty should be encouraged to let them know about the role of the OSU Foundation in raising funds for the academic mission of the University.

The issue of additional compensation for Regents Professors was taken on by the Committee. Dr. Ranga Komanduri presented information concerning what other Big 12 universities do in terms of extra financial compensation for their equivalent to a Regents Professor to the Committee at their April meeting. The Committee is reviewing the information provided by Dr. Komanduri and working on supplementing in with information from other universities. The completion of this task will fall upon next year’s Budget Committee.

An *ad hoc* committee began looking into ways to lessen the cost of textbooks. Members of this committee included faculty, representatives of the Student Government Association, and representatives from the Student Union Bookstore. The Budget Committee was charged with investigating this issue and reviewed all the concerns raised and progress made by the *ad hoc* committee. Some of the members of the Budget Committee meet with the *ad hoc* committee on May 7, 2007. A preliminary working document that contains recommendations concerning the cost of textbooks was developed and mentioned briefly in the Faculty Council Meeting on May 8, 2007. The Budget Committee will meet in late May to review this work-in-progress document. It is likely this issue will not be resolved this year, but will require action to be taken by next year’s Budget Committee.

Bob Darcy reported the cost of textbooks to students is a national issue. An *ad hoc* committee was formed to look into textbook prices at Oklahoma State University. They have spent much time talking to the bookstore, with students and faculty. Faculty involved include Darcy, Tom Phillips, Tom Jordan, Bob Miller, Ron Moomaw, Nick Materer, Peter Shull, John Veenstra, Jean Van Delinder and Carol Moder. What they have decided is that there is not a “silver bullet” in regard to this issue. They have suggested that OSU commit itself to the lowest possible textbook costs to students consistent with instructor’s educational objectives. Low textbook costs are achieved through allowing students to purchase and use older editions, by facilitating and selling textbooks back at half the new book price, by making available used books, use of electronic text and by maximizing market competition. With that in mind they suggest that 1) the bookstore get the book orders from the faculty and post them on-line; 2) the bookstore work with cooperating departments which teach courses each semester so that the books can be ordered two semesters at a time and thereby guaranteeing the student a purchase back at half the new book cost, 3) that the library work with faculty, who are interested, to develop readers and anthologies based on free use for subscription material that is already received electronically, 4) when the book orders are made the faculty member indicates whether bundled information is

required for the students. If it is, usually the textbooks cannot be bought back. If it is not, the textbooks usually can be bought back and if the bookstore knows that ahead of time they can buy the book back at half the new book cost. If they don't they won't. They are also recommending that at the time of the textbook orders the faculty member be asked if previous editions can be used. If so, which ones. The students are very enthusiastic about the recommendations and they will be circulated to through the Student Senate process. The Faculty Council Budget Committee will then formulate a recommendation that will be brought to Faculty Council.

After each committee report Phillips presented each Committee Chair a certificate and thanked them for their service to Faculty Council.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Graduate Faculty Council — Bob Hunger

At its April 2007 meeting, Graduate Council, approved the deletion of the Aviation and Space Sciences Option in the Natural & Applied Sciences Masters degree, and approved a Masters in Aerospace Administration and Operation with a single option in Aerospace Leadership that will be housed in the College of Education.

Hunger thanked Al Rouch, graduate faculty member from CHS-Tulsa, for serving on Graduate Council the last three years as a very diligent member with excellent attendance.

Phillips presented Hunger with a certificate for service as Vice Chair of Graduate Faculty Council and liaison to the Faculty Council for the past four years.

New A&S Liaison Representative

Chris Weimer, Foreign Languages, introduced himself as the new Vice Chair of the Arts and Sciences Faculty Council and will be their liaison representative. Bob Miller added Rolf Prada would be the new Chair.

New Business:

Ron Moomaw presented a recommendation entitled "Merit Raise Salary Program for FY 2007-2008" as follows:

The Faculty Council recommends to Interim President Strathe that there be a merit raise salary program for FY 2007-2008 for both faculty and staff, and that the program be announced promptly after state appropriations for the OSU FY-2008 budget are known.

Rationale

1. OSU salaries are dramatically lower than their Big-12 and local industry peers.
2. The Board of Regents and the President have publicly committed to the "Restore, Reward and Grow" program for OSU.

3. Faculty and Staff morale, recruitment, retention and productivity depend on an Administration that is committed to a salary program.

Bob Darcy seconded.

Bill Dare said everyone was underpaid and if there was any increase it would be a very small amount and he thought an across-the-board percentage increase would be fairer. Greg Bell said he thought whether or not there were raises should be controlled by the administration and they need to make that decision because they are the only ones that know where the money is.

Phillips called for a vote. The recommendation passed with 20 “for”, 2 “against” and 1 “abstention”.

Request Regarding Report on a Tobacco-Free Campus

Bob Darcy requested Lee Bird and the Interim President circulate the report of the Tobacco Free Task Force not only to administration but also to the faculty, staff and students and that the acceptance of the report be held until there can be time for faculty, staff and students to react to the report. He added he is very much in favor of a tobacco-free campus but feels the constitute groups on this campus initiated this issue after much thought and deliberation and they have not had a chance to look at key elements of the report and discuss it. He gave an example of one recommendation for a shelter for tobacco users and the implementation process now being suggested in the report would eliminate the use of shelters, etc. Bird responded that the purpose of this is not to set artificial shelters that will need to be torn down a year from now if the campus is completely tobacco free.

Bird said there was representation of students, staff and faculty on the Task Force. She added she would be glad to reconvene the committee and ask for a representative from Faculty Council to join them for dialogue. She stated they want to move in the direction of a healthier campus and to provide a lot of support and help. Bird had copies of the report and distributed to all in attendance.

Rouch commented on the concern that a tobacco-free campus would “destroy the campus”. He said has faith in the men and women that work at Oklahoma State University and that if this policy is enacted they would comply with it.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is June 12, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas Jordan, Secretary