

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
250 Student Union  
May 13, 2008

Van Delinder called the meeting to order with the following members present: Avakian, Bays, Calhoun, Carter, Dare, DeSilva, Gasem, Goetze, Hirschlein, Hoffer, Jadow, Jordan, Moberly, Moder, Perkins, Russell, Shull, Veenstra, and Yellin. Also present: Basu, R., Bosserman, D., Brown, J. D., Elliott, K., Gates, G., Hickman, K., Klatt, A., Lacy, B., Lehenbauer, E., Lehenbauer, T., McCann, M., Osteen, S., Page, M., Purdie, R., Ramakumar, R., Shaklee, T., Shutt, G., Stadler, S., Strathe, M., Suter, T., Thomas, C., Trennepohl, G., Weaver, J., Weimer, C., York, S., and Zirkle, L. Absent: Bidwell, Brown, G, Brown, T., Casey, Clinkenbeard, Giles, Materer, Miller, B., Miller, R., and Spicer

**HIGHLIGHTS**

---

Overview of Programs and Objectives in the Office of Institutional Diversity .....	2
Recommendations from the Wellness Summit.....	5
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	7
Report of Response to OSU-Tulsa Degree Program Request .....	8
OSU-Tulsa Degree Programs .....	9
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards & Policies.....	11
Athletics .....	12
Budget.....	13
Campus Facilities, Safety and Security .....	14
Faculty.....	16
Long-Range Planning & Information Technology .....	17
Recommendation: Development of an OSU Strategic Planning Process.....	18
Research.....	19
Retirement and Fringe Benefits .....	20
Rules & Procedures.....	22
Student Affairs & Learning Resources.....	22
Old Business	
Conflict of Commitment Ad Hoc Report.....	23
Update on Murray Hall Recommendation.....	24

---

Van Delinder asked for approval of the April 8, 2008, Minutes. Moder moved acceptance of the Minutes. Jordan seconded. The Minutes were approved. Van Delinder asked for approval of the May 13, 2008, Agenda. Moder moved acceptance of the Agenda. Jordan seconded. The Agenda was approved.

Van Delinder welcomed new Councilor's who attended the meeting as guests and had each introduce themselves. They will begin their new terms on June 1.

**SPECIAL REPORT: OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMS AND OBJECTIVES IN THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY – Cornell Thomas**

VP Thomas distributed folders to all in attendance with information regarding Institutional Diversity and then provided an overview of some of the key initiatives the division has been working on recently. The division is broken up into four units as listed below:

**Affirmative Action:**

Diversity Education – There is a coordinator who conducts workshops primarily in the area of sexual harassment and inner diversity. They are hoping to evolve into is to have a series of four seminars per semester focused on particular aspects of diversity so more depth can be provided to those issues – more differences than diversity.

Diversity Self-Study Assessment – This is an on-going process. Most of the colleges and branch campuses have responded. They are in the process of finalizing those assessments. They will then be sent back to those particular units to confirm the findings. They will be placed on their website and then an executive summary will be prepared for the July Board to review.

Woman's Program – Moving slower than Thomas wants it to. He said he will become more involved in the work it is doing. There will be a calendar of events this coming year.

Internal Vita Bank – Internal because of legal issues. They have been targeting certain areas that have many new faculty and Ph.D. candidates and talking with them about OSU, trying to convince them to consider positions they have open and then getting their vitas and sending them out to search committee chairs as the openings are there. They are diversifying the pools of applicants with the hope of identifying key people.

**Diversity Academic Support (DAS):**

RISE Jumpstart Program – A five-week summer residential experience designed to afford incoming first year students to OSU opportunities to achieve a smooth transition to college life. Life skills seminars and familiarity with the existing academic support networks that exist on campus will be intertwined throughout the program's schedule.

Thomas added there will be about 14 students on campus this summer and most of them have expressed an interest in Engineering. They will be on campus taking six hours for four coursework credits. This is being paid for by outside funding.

RISE Program – The Retention Initiative for Student Excellence Program (RISE) is designed to assist students in their transition from high school to OSU during their freshman year and address all of the academic needs they may face. The program provides scheduled study group sessions, tutoring as needed and other services.

Thomas added they are meeting with donors on May 14 and presenting a report. They have a 97 percent retention rate, a 3.01 GPA, and things are progressing well. They had 24 students in the program last year and this year they have 49. The program is growing by word-of-mouth.

Inclusion Leadership Program (ILP) – This program consists of a year long leadership program designed to equip OSU students and students from high schools in Stillwater, Oklahoma City and Tulsa with the skills and knowledge to become effective leaders in a more diversely inclusive society.

Thomas added this program is in its second year. About 30 high school students involved in the program and 30 OSU students. This is also a sponsored program from an outside source.

Fired up about Research, Science and Engineering – This is another summer program in coordination with J.D. Brown in Fire Protection Engineering Technology. This is from a grant received from the State of Oklahoma and is in its second year. This program recruits students interested in the Sciences.

Retired Educators for Youth in Agriculture Programs (REYAP) – This is an outside group also supported by Institutional Diversity as they bring students on campus for three days. They work through AG and go through a number of seminars and workshops that are led by faculty.

Young Women’s Leadership Development Retreat – A new summer program that will be held over a weekend this year. It will consist of high school young ladies who are primarily Native American. They are trying to get them to see the importance of coming to college and preparing for college. There is a company interested in supporting a week-long program for next year.

Inclusion Center for Academic Excellence (ICAE):

The Center is a comprehensive support service that provides educational and personal growth opportunities to enhance the university experience for students enrolled at OSU. Support services are provided through academic skill development programs, group advisement, and outreach programs.

Thomas added this is the new name for the Multicultural Student Center. They will be focusing on the academic aspects of this group. The GPA’s for the students they work with is extremely low in Thomas’ opinion and they are designing different kinds of activities to enhance that. One big change this year is to implement a program called “Project Pass”. The program was piloted this year and they received feedback from students. This coming year it will be a year-long program. Again, this will help them develop study skills and focus on academic issues. Once a month they will have what is called development of an intellectual community where they will look at current kinds of events, pull an article and have a discussion about it and develop some depth of their understanding and helping them to think more and not just react emotionally. Most importantly what is their role in making change so they become more advocates for the kind of society we want to have. Another aspect of this program is Community Outreach. The coordinators are trying to support their efforts for outreach. They want them in the schools and community service areas more. They will hire upper level Work Study students to help assist

with some of the programming aspects. Thomas thinks this will also help in recruiting and in expanding the emotions of what the program is about in the greater community. Targeted areas besides Tulsa and Oklahoma City include Pawnee, Frontier, etc., for this kind of outreach work. A New Seminar to Prepare Student Leaders will be held. Thomas does not feel MSC has been doing a good job of preparing the leaders they work with. Therefore, they are remodeling how they work with their young people to better prepare them to become leaders. This will help them understand what leadership is all about, responsibilities, and how to be an effective leader.

#### LS-OKAMP:

With support of the OSU administration they have applied for another bridge to the doctorate program award. Thomas feels OSU has a good chance to secure this program. This program will support 12 students as they start preparing for life as a professor. They are working with this in full partnership with Gordon Emslie and the Graduate College and are working hand-in-hand to make sure the right students are selected and then progress them on. They will know by the end of this month if the grant is secured.

Thomas ended by saying what they have been trying to do is develop a system where they work with young people, a lot of them high school students, and work with them throughout their time here and help them secure internships, jobs, and then convince them to give back. Thomas had read a book called "Letter to America". He, in turn, wrote "A Letter to College Presidents" which was included in the folder distributed and he urged all to read. This letter was about what an office of diversity ought to be about and what components should be in place and how it should be supported by campus presidents.

Hoffer asked about the Internal Vita Bank under Affirmative Bank and if that was for faculty hires. Thomas replied, "Yes". Hoffer asked, "In relation to the RISE Jumpstart Program what do you do to make the students pay attention to you"? Thomas replied, "Hold money over their heads". He added he is a proponent of scholarships or funding ahead of time. He believes in giving students money for what they have done. Their programs are designed to give students money for what they've done. They do not get the money until the work is done. He gave an example that in the RISE Program if they have fulfilled their requirements of attending all of the sessions they were to attend and finish with a 3.0 GPA or better they get \$500. If they do not meet those requirements they do not receive the money.

Russell asked if there was anything unique to Oklahoma State or Oklahoma that makes our Diversity Program different – mainly a Native American approach or outreach. Thomas replied "Two things that are a little different are that we are really stressing the academic side of their lives which most diversity offices across the country do not. Most offices are mostly connected to Student Affairs. The other thing is we don't stress diversity as much as we stress inclusiveness. We have coordinators in our Inclusion Center for Academic Excellence focused on particular groups of students and that's good. But, the primary goal for us is not only to help them maintain their sense of culture and develop a better sense of self, but also how to work and live in the real world so they can experience differences not only among themselves but all kinds of different groups of people. The other thing is to get them to understand that just because I'm whatever 'blank' you want to put in there you're still a different kind of person with that same

kind of label. You might have some foundational links that are similar but you are a unique individual and you need to know that about yourself”.

Van Delinder thanked Thomas for his report followed by a round of applause.

### **SPECIAL REPORT: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WELLNESS SUMMIT – Robin Purdie**

Purdie gave a brief history of wellness at Oklahoma State. The Wellness Center was built in 1990. Prior to that they were housed in the Health and Fitness Center and conducted wellness program through that Center beginning in 1982. In the late 1990s OSU insurance was self-funded which made a big difference in the way wellness programs were delivered. At that time from 1995-98 OSU had a robust program centered around: 1) yearly health screenings which were incentivized by giving employees a \$50 cash bonus for doing; 2) a high-impact educational component including a magazine which went to each person’s home which talked about wellness and wellness initiatives; and 3) on-campus activities – organized walks, challenges, all kinds of different activities on campus. A medical component was also part of the program, which was an employee health clinic and wellness physicals. The cost for this, not including the \$50 bonus, was about \$80 per employee per year. When OSU moved to the State plan in January 2000 we went from being self-insured to the State Medical Indemnity Plan and wellness was not a focus of that plan and they are just now catching up with what is wellness and what are they going to do with those participating in their plan. In December 2006, then President Schmidly appointed a task force to examine the current health insurance plan to see if it could be improved financially, programmatically, and better for the employees. Also, to look at the wellness program and make recommendations for both. Mercer Consultants were hired to help with those processes. They recommended we go out for bid for a health insurance program which resulted in OSU going with BlueCross/Blue Shield and also to increase our wellness offerings both through the new insurance carrier and on campus through the Wellness Center or on branch campuses through their employee services. The wellness plan includes to date: 1) an assessment of where we are so we will know where we want to go; 2) surveyed employees about their concepts of wellness, what they would be participating in; and 3) set goals for the Stillwater campus and system-wide.

Purdie distributed the following OSU & A&M System Wellness Summit Summary prepared with the assistance of Dr. Ken Eastman, February 28, 2008:

#### **Introduction**

On February 28, 2008 wellness representatives from all OSU and A&M System campuses met at the Seretean Wellness Center. The goals for the meeting were to discuss current trends in wellness, set goals for wellness for OSU and A&M System, and receive information from BlueCross BlueShield on their wellness offerings.

A SWOT analysis was performed with the following outcomes:

#### **Strengths**

1. Ability to interact within the System

2. Desire for wellness
3. Focus on healthcare and increases in health care premiums
4. Facilities and resources available
5. Striving to be the “Healthiest Campus”

**Weaknesses**

1. Lack of top-level support (this varies from campus to campus) and with new incoming President uncertainty.
2. Lack of full time personnel (wellness coordinators)
3. Lack of System-wide policies
  - a. Exercise time
  - b. Tobacco free campuses
  - c. Meeting, vending, food service, healthy food options
4. Lack of follow through
  - a. Good ideas not carried out
5. Lack of funding

**Opportunities**

1. Increase awareness of health risk factors (obesity, tobacco use, etc)
2. Educate people about the ways to eat healthy, make healthier choices
3. Encourage infrastructure to promote physical activity (walking and bike routes)
4. Promoting-encouraging tobacco free campuses
5. Wellness as a way of decreasing health care costs
6. Develop system wide health campaign with support of legislators, regents, administration
7. Leading edge in OK for system-wide focus on health
8. Utilize BC/BS to support comprehensive campaign
9. Utilize extension offices for communications across OK
10. Use Healthiest Campus campaign for recruitment and retention of finest faculty, staff, and students

**Threats**

1. Unhealthy lifestyles
2. Lack of awareness
3. Lack of funding
4. Lack of space/facilities
5. Fear of providing personal health information
6. Personnel/expertise
7. Complexity of issue
8. Disregard of quality of life
9. Institutionalization
10. Health care costs

**Overarching Goals**

1. Maximize BCBS partnership by using available tools.
2. Promote benefits of health and wellness to President Hargis and administration on all campuses

3. Work on System-wide policies that are more inclusive for all campuses
4. Leverage all resources, work together

### Specific Goals

1. Policy Recommendations
  - a. All campuses be tobacco free by Fall 2010 or before
    - i. Coordinates with *Healthy People 2010* government recommendations
  - b. Policy for administrative support for alternative scheduling to accommodate physical activity during work hours
  - c. Provide wellness education during workday
  - d. Provide incentives (financial or other) for participation in health/wellness activities.
  - e. Provide annual health assessments on each campus
  - f. Provide low or no cost facilities for employees to use for physical activity, or reimbursement for facilities off campus.
  - g. Policy to require healthy food options for OSU meetings, vending and dining services
  - h. Have quarterly meetings for Wellness Coordinators to share ideas and report on goals

Van Delinder thanked Purdie for her report followed by a round of applause.

### REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS: President Hargis, Provost Strathe, and/or Vice Presidents

08-03-03-RFB

***Recommended Changes to Health Insurance Premiums – March 2008:*** Accepted with modification. The administration will implement a dependent health care premium coverage generated by withdrawal of the \$34.44 excess health care funding provided to employees this year, as recommended by the Faculty Council, as amended by the Staff Advisory Council's (SAC) recommendation. The SAC recommended the \$34.44 not be withdrawn from employees making \$30,000 or less who do not opt for dependent coverage. Should those employees later opt for dependent coverage; there is the possibility the \$34.44 will be withdrawn and applied to the dependent subsidy. Pending Board approval of the FY2009 budget as pertains to an increase in fringe benefits, an additional \$294,000 will be applied to this initiative which should generate funding sufficient to provide approximately 60% of dependent health care premium coverage.

Gasem asked if there was a possibility of phasing in the increase to 70% over a period of time. Bosserman replied that as long as Council members worked toward that goal he was certain administration will be trying next year to find the additional money and they were not opposed to that. They are not accepting the 63% as the maximum but are accepting the concept to get a viable dependent coverage.

Moder said this has been a long-term problem and she believes this is an example of everyone working very well together to make some significant progress on a major problem. She added the FC Benefits committee, the Staff Council and the administration needed to be thanked for coming up with something in a very difficult budget year. Round of applause followed.

08-04-01-ASP

***Adding and Dropping Courses and Withdrawing from the University:*** Accepted. Proposed modifications have been reviewed and approved by the Student Academic Services Directors, Instruction Council and Council of Deans.

08-04-02-COUNCIL

***Creation of an Academic Brand for OSU:*** Accepted. VP Strathe shared with the President multiple samples of OSU logos used in the past. A task force will be formed to develop and recommend alternative academic brands.

08-05-01-LRPIT

***Development of an OSU Strategic Planning Process:***  
To President Hargis

### **REPORT OF RESPONSE TO OSU-TULSA DEGREE PROGRAM REQUEST – Carol Moder**

Moder said at the last Council meeting it was requested that assurance be given from the administration that the procedure that was on-going with respect to some new programs at OSU-Tulsa was not an attempt to violate the general principle that faculty govern the curriculum. She was happy to say they were given that assurance in the form of a letter signed by President Hargis, Provost Strathe and OSU-Tulsa President Gary Trennepohl.

Moder distributed copies and read the following letter to all present:

“We understand that the pending request to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for authorization to offer additional programs at the Oklahoma State University-Tulsa campus has created some concern among faculty that the existing campus procedures for implementation of programs and course offerings would not be followed. We want to assure you that such is not the case.

We recognize and value the central role that faculty fulfill in academia. The request for authorization to offer existing programs at a new location is only for the general authority to do so. Requests for actual implementation will depend on a number of factors, including availability of adequate resources, and will follow our usual and customary processes. There has never been any intent to deviate from them.

Decisions concerning program, curriculum, and course offerings, including when and where to offer courses and programs, are the purview of the faculty. Proposals concerning such matters for any location off the Stillwater campus should follow the established procedures for course and program offerings, including initial consultation of and approval by the relevant departmental or school unit and, where prescribed, the subsequent approval of the Dean and the

Council on Instruction. No degree program will be offered at any location off the Stillwater campus without the approval of the relevant departmental or school faculty.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Faculty Council in a spirit of cooperation as we all work to make Oklahoma State University the very best it can be”.

Moder said she appreciated that response from the administration in reassuring us about an important principle of faculty governance and she also expressed appreciation to President Trennepohl for agreeing to come and answer any remaining questions that anyone has about the OSU-Tulsa degree program initiatives.

### **OSU-TULSA DEGREE PROGRAMS – Gary Trennepohl**

Trennepohl said he served as Dean of the Business School at OSU-Stillwater beginning in 1995 and moved to Tulsa in 1999 when Legislation created OSU-Tulsa. When created in 1999 it basically gave OSU the opportunity to offer undergraduate degrees in Tulsa (before a few graduate degrees were offered). He wanted everyone to understand that all the students who graduate from OSU in either Tulsa or Stillwater get the same degree with the same set of requirements as well as many of the same faculty (two-thirds of the classes taught in Tulsa are taught by faculty from Stillwater) even though there are approximately 65 faculty in Tulsa considered resident faculty. There is no database that has just Tulsa students or just Stillwater students. They are all the same. That is why it is importance regarding the faculty governance issue because they need to make sure they do exactly the same as they would for any students and deliver what is promised. He stressed they do not have faculty on the OSU-Tulsa budget. All faculty are budgeted in Stillwater, are part of their departments in Stillwater, and are tenured through their Stillwater department with those faculty making the tenure decision. It is purposely set up that way to insure that accreditation standards are met.

Trennepohl said about \$10M per year is spent in transfer payments from Tulsa out of their budget to the Stillwater budgets and that goes to the colleges. Included is a \$2,000 commuting stipend which is the typical; however, there are variations depending on credit hours, etc.

There has been no consistent State Regents policy about offering new degrees in Tulsa since 1999. Some degree programs were inherited and some were started in the 2000s, e.g., American Studies, English, Sociology, supporting the American Studies Program, other Business programs. Trennepohl said he felt it was important for everyone to understand the competitive and political situation that exists in Tulsa. You have OU and OSU; Northeastern in Broken Arrow has expanded plus they have a campus in Tahlequah; Rogers State was created with the legislation and they are only approximately 16 to 18 miles from Tulsa and are now a four-year school and are offering degrees; Langston University on our campus; plus the private schools. There is a lot of competition in Tulsa. His main reason for getting these degree programs approved is to protect OSU interests in Tulsa. He wanted to be able to create the option to be able to offer these degrees when it is possible.

Trennepohl said this all came about when they advertised they were going to offer Elementary Education in fall 2006 and Northeastern said “you can’t do that”. Many letters were exchanged

with the State Regents for Higher Education. They finally approved the degree in June 2007 but indicated any further new programs at OSU-Tulsa would have to be approved by the State Regents. With the set of degrees proposed this year Dr. Strathe sent the letter listing the 16 degrees and nothing happened. Trennepohl called the Regent's staff and were told the new degree form needed to be sent that is normally filled out in the department at OSU-Stillwater requesting the new degree; however, these were not new degrees. They were told they did not have a form for that and to just use that new degree form. Trennepohl complimented Gail Gates and her staff for getting the necessary paperwork done in a timely manner. The forms for five degree programs were sent to the State Regents and are now in process. He stressed both campuses need to work together to make this work successfully.

Yellin asked about the Elementary Education program and the timing of the request. His understanding was that this program would be implemented in the Fall and in December they heard it would be offered in the Spring and their faculty felt unprepared. Trennepohl replied politics were involved and it was not as they would have liked.

Gasem asked about the long term vision for OSU-Tulsa both for the undergraduate and graduate program and to elaborate on the funding for such an endeavor. Trennepohl replied Tulsa Community College was started in 1971 and turned out to be very successful; therefore OSU-Tulsa still does not provide the first two years, only junior, senior and graduate. The vision that the Tulsa community leaders had when they lobbied the Legislature in 1998 was that they needed a comprehensive public university available in the Tulsa market. They wanted degree programs offered so as the city tried to promote economic development, recruit firms, expand, etc., a comprehensive public university was available. Most of the companies wanted to know what the educational opportunities were for their employees and what opportunities were there to hire people out of degree programs. Trennepohl added they have to work with Stillwater to be complimentary rather than contradictory or competitive. One key thing to remember is that if OSU-Tulsa is not there then it will be OU-Tulsa or Northeastern that is there taking up that market. And that would be his concern for Stillwater as about 20% of the OSU-Tulsa students take classes at OSU-Stillwater as well. He looks at this as an opportunity to create a demand for both campuses. In regard to funding for growth Trennepohl said there is a struggle every year as no one knows what the budget will be. Gasem asked for the issue to be forced on the Board of Regents and request that funding will be clear in its amounts and is reconciled in what we want to do. Trennepohl replied there is a budget in Tulsa and one in Stillwater. They have requested to get into the formula funding which would give Tulsa the stream to support growth. What they get is what the State decides to give all of us.

Moder asked if there was some kind of long-term task force looking at where OSU-Tulsa is going that has significant faculty involvement of the department administration or representatives of the departments that might be involved. She added one of the difficulties she sees with the complementarity issue is that there is someone in Finance trying to figure out what in English would work in this situation, or vice versa. It is quite possible there are some degrees offered by the English Department that could be offered in Tulsa that would be beneficial but it is probably not the general English degree. Trennepohl said he liked that idea a lot and had been thinking about that for the last six months. The problem is that as they get more programs they need more involvement. This suggestion will certainly be considered.

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

Year-End Reports from all Committee Chairs are below.

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Brad Bays**

Brad Bays, ASP Chair, Geography; Matthew Beier, Student Government Association; Brian Carter, Plant and Soil Sciences; Rhonda Casey, Pediatrics, OSU Center for Health Sciences; Carolyn Henry, Human Development and Family Science; Carl Latino, School of Electrical and Computer Engineering; Margaret Scott, Professional Education; Chris Wright, Graduate and Professional Student Organization.

The ASP Committee met on the last Wednesdays of the month at 12:00 noon in room 313 of the Public Information Office Building. During the academic year the committee made three recommendations that were approved by the Faculty Council. Below are summaries of these recommendations:

1. On November 13, 2007 the Council approved a recommendation amending the university grade change policy. This change prohibits instructors from allowing students to perform additional coursework in order to raise a final course grade after the end of the course term.
2. On February 12, 2008 the Council approved a recommendation that instituted major changes to the university policy on Incomplete (I) grades. The change replaces the traditional "I" with a new "Composite Incomplete" (IB, IC, ID, or IF), which has a one-year time limit, after which a permanent letter grade (second letter in the Composite Incomplete) is assigned if the instructor does not submit a grade change assigning a higher grade (A, B, C, or D). The policy ends the ability of a student to receive a GPA-neutral "permanent I" that functions as a de facto drop. The new one-year time limit may be extended if a student petitions his/her College Dean for special consideration.
3. On April 8, 2008 the Council approved a recommendation documenting and clarifying the Registrar's policy on adding, dropping, and withdrawing from courses after respective deadlines. It establishes a new committee to make final decisions, usually in special circumstances, regarding refunding of tuition and fees to individuals who successfully petition for late drops and withdrawals. The policy also outlines the necessary conditions for late drops and withdrawals and consolidates the hearing of these cases into one committee, which includes a representative from the Faculty Council ASP Committee. These changes will reduce student confusion and the workload of the Late Drop/Withdrawal Committee.

A number of other items were considered and remain under investigation by the ASP Committee, including:

- A) an investigation into the benefits and costs of changing to a “plus/minus” grading system
- B) an initiative by the Provost’s Office to recommend the reporting of six-week grades from instructors of upper-division courses
- C) an SGA recommendation regarding university grading procedures
- D) an initiative by Undergraduate Admissions to include “translated” grades from foreign institutions into the GPA calculations of international undergraduate transfer students
- E) working with the Student Health Center to develop a university class attendance policy during a pandemic disease outbreak

The committee plans to begin an investigation into the level of success of OSU/NOC Gateway Program during the fall 2008 semester. We are interested in learning about the level of success of OSU students who have participated in the program.

#### **ATHLETICS – Kris Giles**

Due to Giles’ absence, the Committee Year-End Report was sent to the Secretary in and is below.

**Committee Members:** Kristopher Giles; Patricia Bell; Marilyn Middlebrook; Tim Ireland; Glade Presnal; Scott Williams; Bruce Russell; Mona Lane; Tucker Weems; Meredith Hamilton; Niccole Grimaldi

The committee met approximately every month and discussed three major items.

First, the committee discussed the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics report (<http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>) that addressed intercollegiate sports reform. We examined several of the recommendations as they relate to Oklahoma State University athletics particularly proposals related to the availability of courses/majors for student athletes and the current competitive climate for donor funds between athletics and academics. We recommend that Faculty Council utilize this document as a reference during future interactions with the Department of Athletics.

Second, with input from John Mowen (Marketing), the committee evaluated access to Karsten Creek by OSU faculty and staff and the potential for reduced green fees for the OSU community. Athletics Director Mike Holder met with the committee to discuss this topic. Mike stated that the course does not utilize OSU money to subsidize costs like other universities. Green fees are set to maintain the facilities at Karsten Creek, and these fees are paid for all rounds played on the course; the golf program at OSU pays green fees for rounds played by student athletes.

Third, the committee evaluated the distribution of majors among scholarship student athletes. The committee identified several over-represented and under-represented majors (compared to all other full-time undergraduates) among student athletes. After an examination of schedules for core requirements, and consultation with Associate Athletic Director Marilyn Middlebrook, the committee determined that a significant number of student athletes chose majors based on flexibility in core requirements, rather than interest in the particular discipline. Because of fixed athletic practice schedules, majors with core courses that were primarily offered during afternoon hours, and/or offered infrequently were under-represented by student athletes.

Marilyn Middlebrook further stated that NCAA requirements for student athlete progress further restricted the choice of majors to those with the greatest flexibility in core course schedules. During this evaluation, the committee received several testimonials from non-athlete OSU students who worked significant hours within or outside of OSU to pay for educational expenses. Each stated that their work schedule (as determined by the employer) conflicted with course offerings and eventually influenced the choice of major that could be completed in a reasonable time frame. The committee concluded that students who choose a major at OSU because of core course schedule conflicts are primarily restricted to student athletes, students who work significant hours to pay for education expenses, and other non-traditional students; i.e., students whose daily schedules are restricted.

During our evaluation, it became clear that the schedules of core-courses for majors that were under-represented by student athletes continue to target only traditional full-time students. Additionally, it became clear that the schedules of core-courses for majors that were over-represented by student athletes have highly flexible core-course offerings that allow all students enrolled at OSU to complete their degree in a reasonable time frame.

It is the opinion of the committee that all departments at OSU should examine their core course requirements and consider adjusting schedules to accommodate all students at OSU including student athletes. We believe that all students enrolled at OSU should be able to pursue a degree of their choice, and that scheduling of core courses cannot be a primary reason why any group of students at a land grant institution chose majors.

#### **BUDGET — John Veenstra**

Members of the Committee: John Veenstra, Chair, Andrea Arquitt, Pat Jordan, Ron Miller, Carol Moder, Peter Shull, and Jean Van Delinder (Ex Officio)

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 October a letter was sent to Mr. Mike Holder, Vice President for Athletics and Athletic Director. 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.

In the Fall Semester an inquiry was made to Interim President Strathe regarding the OSU President's Office appearing as #29 out of the top 150 Athletic Department Donors. A timely response was received from Interim President Strathe explaining this was for the President's Box at athletic events.

Also in the Fall Semester Mr. Joe Weaver talked to the Committee about tuition and mandatory and academic service fees. This discussion was held in the context of the Employee Tuition Benefit Recommendation and Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Recommendation made by Faculty Council.

Speakers at other Budget Committee meetings included a representation from the OSU Alumni Association and OSU Foundation to discuss issues related to scholarships.

Mr. Albert Colom spoke at the February 27, 2008 meeting and discussed tuition waivers and scholarship programs. The Committee was interested in how the scholarship and tuition waiver programs operated.

In March 2008 the Budget Committee and the Faculty Committee jointly sent a letter to Dr. Strathe concerning funding sources for actions, both compensation for those with outstanding performance and proposed development plans, related to new Cumulative Review Policy. A response was received in the form a memo from Dr. Strathe dated April 4, 2008 and was reported on at the May University Faculty Council Meeting. The memo stated that "a distinct centralized resource pool has not been established to 'compensate for those with outstanding performance' although outstanding performance has always served as the criterion for merit-based salary programs". Additionally, the memo noted that a number of resources exist within the university setting to support proposed development plans, however, in the case where a development plan identifies resources not currently available the plan would need to be considered on an individual basis by the respective academic department/college. A copy of the response memo was incorporated into the minutes of that meeting.

At the March meeting of the University Faculty Council the Budget Committee put forth a recommendation for the reinstatement of an annual public presentation by College Deans and University Vice-Presidents of their unit's proposed budget. The administration is working with the Committee on this recommendation. No formal response to the recommendation has occurred and this issue may be taken up by next year's Budget Committee.

### **CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY – Ken Clinkenbeard**

Due to Clinkenbeard's absence, the Committee Year-End Report was sent to the Secretary and is below.

#### **Committee members:**

From Faculty Council: Heather Moberly (Chair, 6-07 to 3-08), Ken Clinkenbeard (Chair 3-08 to 5-08), Tom Jordan

From the Faculty: Katherine Bost, Charles Leider

From the Emeriti: Alan Brunken  
From the student body: Joshua Ward  
Ex Officio: Rick Krysiak (Director, Physical Plant Services)

### **Business Considered:**

#### Un-naming of Murray Hall

A request was made to the chair to consider forwarding a recommendation to the Faculty Council (FC) to un-name Murray Hall. The background on this issue was that Murray Hall is scheduled to be occupied by some departments from the College of Arts and Sciences whose faculty believe the name sake Murray to be an antithesis to what they teach. The CFSS discussed this issue, but did not form a consensus on the merits of proposing a recommendation to the FC to un-name Murray Hall. However, the CFSS did support the right of the affected faculty through their representative College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Council to partition and make the argument to the OSU administration to un-name Murray Hall. Such a recommendation was drafted and carried by Chair Moberly to the Faculty Council.

#### Representation and liaison between CFSS and OSU administration appointed committees

Chair Moberly served on the search committee for the new director of Parking and Transit representing CFSS at the invitation of Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance Joe Weaver and met with Weaver and Vice President for Student Affairs Lee Bird to discuss CFSS issues and whether or not/ when they could meet with committee. The committee believes that it is important for it function to have direct contact with other committees that have campus facilities, safety and security as their purview. In particular, there are OSU administrative committees that deal with campus and facilities planning, transit, parking and bicycle use, and student and facilities safety and security that the CFSS has no representation on or liaison with. It is deemed important that representation and liaison of the CFSS with these committees be established.

#### Parking and transit

The committee met with newly hired Steve Spradling, Director of Parking and Transit, to hear his views of parking and transit issues and to discuss various issue on such. There are no plans to close additional parking lots for the next academic year, and the opening of the new multimodal parking and transit facility will help ease parking and transit problems. Maintenance of existing parking lots is an issue for planning and funding. The use of parking permit/parking meter income is not transparent, and its relationship to parking maintenance is likely not 1 to 1. Some units such as athletics to not pay sufficient rental for parking space even to cover post-event clean-up costs. The bus system routes and schedules will be modified with opening of the multimodal parking and transit facility, but bus routes will still run through campus prior to terminating at the multimodal parking and transit facility. Issues to be addressed in future are initiatives to increase ridership and conversion of buses to greener fuels such as liquefied natural gas.

#### Surface and subsurface drainage

The committee met with Adrian Self, Physical Plant, to discuss surface and subsurface drainage, particular as these relate to campus safety and mitigation of damage to campus

infrastructure. The most recent storm drainage plan was done in 1974 and was only partially constructed. There is no current storm drain plan for the campus. Limited materials are available on topography and surface and subsurface water flow for the campus. In general, drainage issues are handled reactively and not proactively with no coherent planning and execution strategy in place or planned for addressing surface and subsurface drainage. The CFSS believes proactive planning for infrastructure that addresses surface and subsurface drainage is needed and recommends to the 2008-09 CFSS that they continue study of this issue with the goal of making a recommendation to the Faculty Council.

#### Campus emergency response plans

The committee will meet with OSU Police chief Michael Robinson during our final meeting of the term to gain a better understanding of the planning effort and the plans that these produced, particularly with respect to human initiated campus incidents involving casualties.

#### **Summary of issues for 2007-08 CFSS term:**

- Recommended to the FC to support the right of College of Arts and Sciences faculty to make an argument to the OSU administration that Murray Hall be un-named
- Recommended to the FC leadership that CFSS have representation to and liaison with OSU administration appointed committees dealing with issues of campus facilities, safety and security
- Support OSU Office of Parking and Transit in their development and management of emerging issues and opportunities to improve such
- Recommend to the incoming CFSS committee that they further study and make recommendations to the FC on planning and executing surface and subsurface drainage plans for campus that are proactive and that are part of a larger infrastructural plan for the campus

#### **FACULTY – David Yellin**

The Faculty Committee met once a month during the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters. During that time we discussed, proposed and eventually recommended the following:

1. Tenure Clock Extension: This recommendation would extend the tenure clock period under certain circumstances for a faculty member requesting such an extension. This Recommendation was approved by the Faculty Council.
2. Partner Spouse Hire: This recommendation asked the University to provide support services for partners/spouses of new OSU hires seeking employment on campus and in the Stillwater community. This Recommendation was approved by the Faculty Council.
3. Big 12 Scholarships: The Faculty Committee participated in the review of the Big 12 Scholarship Awards in conjunction with the Provost's Office.
4. Tenure Decision Challenges: The Provost's Office informed the Chair of the Faculty Committee that this year there had been no challenges or disputes to tenure decisions and therefore the Committee did not meet.

**LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Khaled Gasem**

Gasem gave an update before the year-end report. The committee reviewed Information Technology IT operations on campus and were assured things are moving along fine. They discussed investments required for mission-critical functions and the group recommended that at least four investments are needed to be assured of continued excellence in the IT operations. Gasem reminded administration they should give IT the money they need, especially for training.

**Committee Members:** Khaled Gasem, Chair; Russ Calhoun; Robin Leech; Carol Moder; Nick Materer; Mark Weiser

**Summary of Activities**

The activities of the LRP&IT Committee have focused mainly on reviewing (a) the OSU IT operations, and (b) the OSU strategic planning processes.

The LRP&IT Committee received briefings from the IT Directors at OSU on system reliability. In general, the Committee was assured that the OSU IT systems enjoy a good level of reliability. This includes servers, web functions, and mainframe. However some actions and investments are required to avoid difficulties with mission-critical functions. These include the following:

1. Professional development for the staff (\$100k to \$125k)
2. Additional storage memory (\$23k)
3. Fiber optic replacements (\$4 million)
4. Mainframe software purchase (>\$40 million)

The deliberations and findings of the Committee regarding the OSU strategic planning processes are captured in the attached recommendation.

**Plans for Year 2008-2009**

In the next academic year, the LRP&IT Committee plans to address:

1. IT structure mapping
2. Infrastructure planning, including computer replacement, reliability and redundancy Issues
3. Fund raising activities for scholarships, infrastructure, etc.

Another issue discussed was how to develop a better process for strategic planning. They reviewed the current strategic planning processes and developed a set of guidelines. As a result of the review the committee formulated the following recommendation:

**Title:** Development of an OSU Strategic Planning Process

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Hargis that:** OSU develop a strategic planning process that:

1. Articulates broad institutional goals that are formulated collectively by all the stakeholders -- **(themes)**
2. Requires the colleges in consultation with their respective units to develop goals and priorities to actualize the articulated goals of OSU -- **(implementation plans)**
3. Reconciles (realistically balances) OSU resources with the strategic planning priorities -- **(resources)**
4. Maintains an academic ledger that reflects the strategic planning deliverables -- **(monitoring)**
5. Informs the stakeholders and the public through the OSU Annual Report on strategic planning milestones and accomplishments -- **(accountability)**
6. Enhances the visibility of our institution -- **(visibility)**

### **Rationale**

Discussions with faculty and members of the OSU administration lead us to conclude that the current strategic planning process is ineffective. Following are some of the contributing factors:

1. The external facilitator for the planning process did not fully appreciate the academic environment at OSU.
2. Although some time was allotted for plans to be developed at the unit and college level, the final product was a narrative developed by the President's office to be adopted at all levels. As such, the strategic plan lacked sense of ownership by the faculty. Their input was perceived by many as token participation for a set agenda.
3. The planning process did not specify the planning period nor did it provide any projections for the resources that would be available for that period.
4. The academic ledger, which was developed to monitor progress, has poor connectivity with the mission and goals of the units and the strategic planning deliverables. Further, many of the metrics used in the ledger are in need of some revision. Nevertheless, the academic ledger was used by the Provost and the Vice Presidents to monitor trends and in some aspects of budget planning.
5. Lacking an effective strategic plan and implementation plans across all levels, OSU activities and budget allocation beyond routine operations were guided by the President's directives. Specifically, the strategic plans had little, if any, influence on decision making on the unit level.

The call for strategic planning was a wise decision to fulfill a pressing need. As an institution, OSU cannot afford random-walk type processes for achieving its mission as a land-grant

university. However, the approach undertaken and the structure adopted for the OSU strategic plans were both lacking.

Effective strategic planning demands strategic thinking that leads to strategic management. We have had some elements of strategic thinking; however, we still need to develop the processes for strategic management.

Therefore, the LRP&IT Committee decided to offer its recommendations on how best to evolve our current planning process to one that meets the following general guidelines:

1. Strategic planning should be viewed as a continuous institutional process.
2. Strategic planning is a collective process based on honest and open dialog among all the stakeholders.
3. Strategic planning should be conducted for a definite time period and a projected resource amount.
4. Implementation plans should evolve *upwardly* from the unit, to the college, then to the institution.
5. Clear procedures for accountability should be in place. Performance metrics for evaluating progress toward specific unit goals should be proposed by the relevant units, in consultation with the appropriate college and university officers.
6. The strategic plans and the outcomes should be evaluated systematically to assure continuous improvement.

Some examples for the broad institutional themes may include:

1. A land-grant university mission that promotes access to a high-quality, empowering education.
2. A scholarly mission that permeates all disciplines across all levels of academe: undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate.
3. A service mission of a land-grant university in all pertinent fields, including agriculture, engineering, human development, education, information technology.
4. A diversity mission encompassing all aspects of the enterprise: people, ideas, methods, etc.
5. A mission that calls for OSU to be a catalyst for economic growth in Oklahoma.

The recommendation was voted on and passed unanimously.

### **RESEARCH — Joe Bidwell**

Due to Bidwell's absence, the Committee Year-End Report was sent to the Secretary and is below.

The Faculty Council Research Committee began the 2007-2008 academic year with a review of the University's *Guidelines to Govern Overload Assignments, Outside Professional Activities, and Other Outside Activities of Faculty Members*. It was determined that this policy should be further reviewed by an ad hoc committee comprised of representatives from all Colleges. This

committee was appointed by the Faculty Council Chair, conducted a review of the policy, and gave their report to Council during the May 2008 meeting. The Research Committee spent the remainder of the year discussing/reviewing information relevant to two additional issues- the costs associated with upgrades and maintenance of University research facilities, and the issue of an incentive program to stimulate extramurally-funded research by faculty. On the issue of facilities upgrades, the Research Committee Chair met twice with the Director of Physical Plant Services and the Chair of the Faculty Council Campus Facilities, Safety & Security Committee. During these sessions our concern regarding the high cost of facilities upgrades and time lag often associated with these upgrades was expressed to the Director of Physical Plant Services. The fact that researchers must rely solely on the Physical Plant for upgrades and other general maintenance on laboratories was also discussed. It was suggested that revisions to the University policy for alterations to buildings should include an approach that would allow faculty to use off-campus contractors for some types of work on campus facilities. A specific amendment this effect was provided to the Director of Physical Plant Services for consideration. This proposed addition to the policy for building alterations was ultimately rejected by the University's Facility Planning and Space Committee. It is the opinion of the Faculty Council Research Committee that the proposed amendment to the policy for building alterations should be developed as a formal recommendation (either by the Faculty Council Research or Facilities Committee) and reconsidered for inclusion in the University Policy. On the issue of faculty research incentives, the Research Committee Chair met with Drs. Steve McKeever and Gordon Emslie to discuss a specific research incentive policy they had developed. The Research Committee also received input on research incentives from faculty and college administrators. The information compiled through this process will be provided to the new Chair of the Research Committee with the hope that a formal recommendation regarding research incentives can be submitted for consideration by Faculty Council during the 2008-2009 session.

#### **RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS – Bruce Russell**

Bruce Russell, RFB Chair, Civil and Environmental Engineering. Members: Bill Dare – Finance (Tulsa); Susan Bono – Librarian (Architecture); Ken Clinkenbeard – Pathobiology, Vet Med; Robert Emerson – Civil and Environment Engineering; Louisa Payne – Edmon Low Library; John Sauer – Entomology and Plant Pathology – Emeriti Member; Sheila Harp – Emeriti Association Ex-Officio

#### **Health Care Insurance Premiums for Employees with Dependents**

Our primary activities of the year surrounded our efforts to reduce the financial burden that our health insurance benefits place on employees with dependents. During our investigative phase we discovered the following facts:

1. Our employee costs to provide health insurance for dependents is the most expensive of the Big XII schools. Furthermore, our health insurance premiums for employees with dependents are most expensive of the 23 schools in the Big 10 and Big XII.
2. Many of our employees with dependents – that can afford it – are buying private insurance outside of the OSU system.
3. We received many anecdotal testimonies from faculty that were part of search committees and from academic department heads regarding the costs of health

- insurance for employees with dependents and how that harmed their efforts to recruit faculty to OSU.
4. Our insurance costs to an employee who also insures a spouse (without children) are \$461.64 per month compared to the Big XII median of only \$274.00 per month. The difference means that OSU employees that insure a SPOUSE pay \$2,251.68 MORE per year out of pocket than our peers at the median Big XII school.
  5. Our insurance costs to an employee who also insures a spouse and children are \$722.00 per month compared to the Big XII median of only \$344.00 per month. The difference means that OSU employees that insure a FAMILY pay \$4,536.00 MORE per year out of pocket than our peers at the median Big XII school.
  6. We also note that OSU is one of only three schools in the Big XII that pays at least 100% of the health insurance premiums for employees that do not insure dependents. OSU currently pays 110% of the health insurance premium for employees that do not insure dependents.
  7. In the current year (2008) OSU pays annually approximately \$29,500,000 in subsidies for health insurance premiums.

#### **Health Care Insurance Premiums Recommendation**

In order to reduce the financial burden placed on employees with dependents, the RFB committee authored a recommendation to increase university subsidies for health insurance premiums for employees with dependents to that of our peers in the Big XII. The recommendation specifically recommended that 70 percent of the health insurance premiums for employees with dependents would be paid by the university. The recommendation also recommended that employees only would continue to receive subsidies to cover 100% of their health insurance. In order to help pay for the additional insurance subsidy, the recommendation also reallocated the \$34.44 new benefit given to employees only in 2008. Action on the recommendation is pending. The overall cost of the recommendation would be about \$900,000 annually. We note that our recommendation would equally benefit staff families, and the lowest paid staff may be able to insure their dependents under the plan recommended by Faculty Council whereas the lowest paid staff employees almost assuredly are unable to insure spouses and children under the current system. And perhaps most important of all, it is imperative that OSU enable our employees to enroll their HEALTHY DEPENDENTS into the OSU insurance medical plan, so that our overall claims rate can be reduced.

#### **Employee Tuition Benefits and Employee Dependent Tuition Benefits**

RFB discussed again 2007's recommendation to increase tuition benefits for employees (to a 100% subsidy) and also the employee dependent tuition benefits (to a 50% subsidy). However, further action was not taken in deference to the importance of our findings and recommendation regarding health insurance benefits.

#### **"Fairness" in OTRS retirement benefits across all classes, and with respect to common education participants.**

It is perceived that OSU and OU pay disproportionate amounts toward the OTRS, and yet receive less benefit after retirement when compared to common education and employee groups from other four year colleges that are state supported. Additionally, because of periodic changes in law made to the OTRS system, there appear to be disparities in actuarial returns for employees

that were hired at different times. For instance there was a law change in 1992 from Rule of 80 to Rule of 90. Also there was a law change that removed the cap on salaries in 1995, with graduated contributions and graduated benefits. There is need for the RFB committee(s) of the future to investigate the OTRS retirement benefits, report on possible disparities and take action if necessary.

### **Recommended Future Activities**

1. Follow up on Health Care Recommendation from March 2008.
2. Consider tuition benefits for employees and employee dependents.
3. Consider the Fairness issues in retirement benefits.
4. The addition of a Health Care Flex Account to the Healthcare Savings Account (HSA) currently offered.
5. Health insurance premiums for retirees under the age of 65.

### **RULES AND PROCEDURES — Brian Carter**

Two elections were held during the year to fill vacant faculty council positions. The first, a Special Election was held in the fall 2007 and filled the Vice Chair position for the remainder of the year. The second, the General Spring 2008 Election filled the Vice Chair, Secretary, and all remaining open council positions for the upcoming 2008-2009 session.

### **STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Beulah Hirschlein**

The committee members included: Glenn Brown, Dan Chaney, Tanya Finchum, Beulah Hirschlein, Joseph Jadlow, Danna Martin, Stephen Perkins, Allen Reding, Alex Shadid, and Chris Wright.

We focused on the implementation of the Study Abroad initiative. We wish to thank Provost Marlene Strathe for her interest and resources applied to moving the study abroad focus forward. We appreciated the work of the Study Abroad Task Force. Their full report was shared with you in PDF form last month.

We presented a recommendation regarding OSU's adoption of a holistic admissions policy. The recommendation was approved by the Council and forwarded to administration where it was studied, modified, then sent to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The OSRHE reviewed it and approved an admissions policy more friendly to the broad spectrum of students we want at OSU.

We have begun a study regarding inclusion at OSU. We have learned from Cornell Thomas about several programs that have great promise for developing leadership skills and performance records that position students, who might have otherwise been left out, for outstanding opportunities in business and community life.

Our recommendations for the year ahead will include funding for student scholarships, inclusion, technological enhancements, student union renovation, and supporting new initiatives in Student Affairs.

**Old Business:****Conflict of Commitment Ad Hoc Report – Heidi Hoffer**

Hoffer, as a member of the Conflict of Commitment Ad Hoc Committee presented the following report:

Faculty members owe their primary professional responsibility to Oklahoma State University (OSU). Their principle commitment of time, energy, and intellectual effort should be to their teaching, research, extension/outreach, service, and/or administrative responsibilities. OSU, however, recognizes the value of faculty interaction with business, industry, private foundations, and government agencies that foster the university's mission, facilitates professional development, and/or promotes expansion of knowledge. Therefore, faculty members are encouraged to engage in outside professional activities, whether paid or unpaid, that further the interests of the university and/or the individual's professional development.

The time and energy spent on outside professional activities, however, must not result in a conflict of commitment with OSU. A conflict of commitment occurs when activities unrelated to OSU responsibilities exceed reasonable time limits and/or impede a faculty member from carrying out his/her assigned university responsibilities. It is important to recognize, however, that the specific responsibilities, position requirements, employment obligations, and professional activities constituting an appropriate and primary commitment of time may differ across colleges and departments.

If professional activities unrelated to OSU responsibilities exceed 20 percent of a faculty member's full time equivalent (FTE), prior written approval from his/her unit administrator is required. As a component of their annual evaluation, faculty members engaged in professional work unrelated to OSU will provide an annual written report to their Unit Administrator describing these activities.

**Rationale for Proposed Conflict of Commitment Policy****Committee Membership**

- Rhonda Casey OSU Center for Health Sciences
- Ken Clinkenbeard Center for Veterinary Health Sciences
- Sandra Goetze Education
- Heidi Hoffer Arts & Sciences
- Ricki Ingalls CEAT
- John Mowen Business
- Toni Shaklee VPR Representative
- Dan Storm, Chair DASNR (Research) and CEAT (teaching)
- Charlotte Wright Business

**Additional Outside Assistance**

- Paula Johnson Office of Legal Council

### **Rationale and Comments**

1. Succinct is better. The proposed conflict of commitment (COC) is intentionally short and concise. Given the diverse professional activities in which faculty may engage, we believe that it would be a mistake, as well as very difficult, to attempt to develop rules that cover every possible outside activity. The document would be extremely long, incomplete and ultimately unsuccessful.
2. The proposed approach will minimize bureaucracy by not requiring written permission for less than 20% of the Faculty member's FTE.
3. The proposed policy will improve Faculty retention and recruitment; we need to encourage outside activities that enhance the performance of the Faculty's duties and that may provide additional compensation.
4. The proposed policy extends to include activities beyond consulting, such as providing free services to the public, nonprofits and governmental agencies.
5. Annual reports will provide information and documentation for faculty engaged in professional work unrelated to OSU.
6. The proposed policy will treat faculty as professional academicians, not as hourly workers.
7. We propose to remove the travel clause. Paula Johnson with the Office of Legal Council could not find any documentation or justification for the following provision:  
*5.05 All out-of-state travel, whether for regular professional responsibilities **or for outside professional activities for extra compensation**, must be covered by an authorized travel request submitted in advance and documented and approved according to existing University travel policies and procedures unless approval has been given for conducting them entirely on annual leave.*
8. The proposed policy requires only one approval for an activity that spans over one or more years.
9. Note that other related issues are already covered under the Conflict of Interest Policy.
10. The proposed policy was developed after reviewing Big 12 COC policies.

Bosserman cautioned against removing item #7 above regarding travel. He said, "If you conduct work without having the travel approved and you die then what is your status?" He recalled the plane crash where there was an individual in that status. Bosserman said, "He was off on his own time doing something and then the state benefits don't kick in and you leave the spouse with a huge mess." He added you do not have to file for travel but you want somewhere in the University a recognition that you have asked for permission to do this and your boss said yes.

There was much discussion regarding this issue and Van Delinder stated this was only an Ad Hoc report and not a formal recommendation. She referred it to the Faculty Council Research Committee and when/if they decide to bring it to Council as a formal recommendation discussion will be included in the Minutes at that time.

### **Update on Murray Hall Recommendation**

Perkins asked what the status was of the recommendation to remove the name "Murray" from Murray Hall. Chris Weimer, A&S Faculty Council Liaison, said they had heard nothing. Bosserman replied the Facilities & Space Committee had met and asked the same faculty

members who spoke about this issue in the Student Union Little Theatre to speak to the committee. They also received a letter submitted by the State Historical Society. The committee voted 8-3 to retain the name at the current time but to form a committee of constituencies of the campus to look at this issue should an action be taken and, if so or not, then what should be done to educate on the history of Gov. Murray and the building. Van Delinder asked if there would be faculty input. Bosserman replied, "Most definitely". Strathe said to remember that the first action in this process is the removal of the name and not the naming of it. Perkins asked when the committee would be formed and Bosserman replied this summer but they will probably not meet until after faculty return to campus this fall. He added they will work with the State Historical Society on this matter.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is June 10, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Tom Jordan".

Tom Jordan, Secretary