Kennison called the meeting to order with the following members present: Baeza, Barnes, Bartels, Bliss, Borland, Chung, Clarke, DeSilva, Doust, Fisher, Holcomb, Holyoak, John, Jones, Lowrance, Luttbeg, Materer, McBee, Paio, Takacs, Walker, Yetter and Young.
Absent: Avakian, Biros, Cornell, Lovern, VanOverbeke, Wansley and Wu.

**HIGHLIGHTS**

Special Reports –
- Ron Beer – Ombudsman
- Pamela Fry – OSU Student Success Collaboration
Remarks and Comments from Gary Clark for the President
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations and other Vice Presidents
Reports of Standing Committees
- Academic Standards and Policies
- Athletics
- Budget
- Campus Facilities, Safety and Security
- Diversity
- Faculty
- Long-Range Planning and Information Technology
- Research
- Retirement and Fringe Benefits
- Student Affairs and Learning Resources
Reports of Liaison Representatives
- Wellness Center
- SAC
- WFC
Rules and Procedures

Kennison called the meeting to order and reminded the councilors to sign the attendance sheet which is circulating the room. Kennison asked for approval of the January 14, 2014 minutes. Bartels moved to accept the minutes and Walker seconded. Motion passed. Kennison stated that the agenda that went out Friday did not reflect that at this meeting we will hold election nominations for the two open positions of Vice Chair and Secretary. Kennison asked for a formal motion to revise the order of the agenda. DeSilva moved to move the Rules and Procedures section to the end of the agenda following new business. Bartels seconded the motion. Motion passed.
Special Reports:

A. Ron Beer - Ombudsman

Beer expressed his appreciation for the time to present to the Council today. Beer stated that technically the position was created in October but didn’t become functional until November and is a part time position. Beer adheres to four fundamental principles. Beer refers to people who come to his office as visitors. These would be people who have a dispute, a concern or a conflict with another person, agency or department. Beer stated that confidentiality is very critical. When an individual comes to the office their information is maintained confidentially unless or until they give permission for other individuals to be contacted. The process in the office is informal. This bypasses the formal policies and procedures of a Dispute Resolution Committee because they are trying to resolve the issue in an amicable way that is mutually agreeable informally. Beer stated that the position is independent. Beer is responsible to the President but he does not convey information about a person or issue. He makes observations over time about policy/conflict. Beer has found that there is no consistency in policies among departments or colleges. Beer is available to faculty, students and staff. The predominant number of visitors to date has been faculty but he has also seen graduate students, technicians, custodial level folks and some support staff. Beer is working to bring these issues to a mutually satisfactory resolution. A number are still under way but they have resolved a number of issues to date. Beer received his first call from Tulsa which is a campus that is included. Beer stated that he is on call and so he doesn’t sit in his office waiting for people to come by. Beer can be contacted by email or phone. Beer tries to respond within a 12-hour period. Beer stated that he would be happy to meet with anyone who has questions. His office is located in 336 Student Union which is directly across from the glass enclosed reception area of the career center. Beer encouraged those attending today’s meeting to share this information with their colleagues and if they have any concerns they are welcome to contact him. Beer stated that if one or the other parties wishes to terminate the conversation or the pursuit of resolution, he closes the book and says sorry an agreement wasn’t reached. The person will then have to pursue other means to resolve the difference.

Bartels stated that the Ombudsman position has been in the Faculty Handbook since the last edition but as Beer just stated, was only recently instituted. This position does report directly to the President. Bartels stated that the confidentiality as well as independence is something that Bartels feels was needed on this campus for a long time. Bartels appreciates what Beer is doing and also wonders how long it will be part-time. Beer said that the statement about the Ombudsman needs to be revised. Beer is working on a set of policies and procedures and will have these out via the website that will restate what an Ombudsman is supposed to do. Beer believes the current reference states that someone can be designated to pursue an Ombudsman role for a temporary period of time and he doesn’t believe this has ever been used.

B. Meredith Hamilton – OSU NCAA Rep:

Hamilton distributed the following information from the NCAA manual:
Faculty Athletics Representative
Oklahoma State University

Definition and Role of the Faculty Athletics Representative is mandated in NCAA Legislation – bylaws 4.02 and 6.1.3:
Definition:
A faculty athletics representative is a member of an institution's faculty or administrative staff who is designated by the institution's president or chancellor or other appropriate entity to represent the institution and its faculty in the institution's relationships with the NCAA and its conference(s).
Role:
a member of the institution's faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletics department. Duties of the faculty athletics representative shall be determined by the member institution.

Big 12 Conference

5.1.2 Council of Faculty Athletics Representatives.
(a) The Council of Faculty Athletics Representatives shall consist of a representative of each Member Institution appointed by the Chief Executive Officer of the Council of Faculty Athletics Representatives or his designee for the duration of his or her term of office. Each Member Institution shall be represented by a member of the institution's faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletics department. Duties of the faculty athletics representative shall be determined by the member institution.

OSU:
In accordance with the language of Proposal 71, as adopted at the 1989 NCAA Convention—"Duties of the Faculty Athletics Representative shall be determined by the member institution"—the following description has been developed:

- The role of the Faculty Athletics Representative at Oklahoma State University will include the general oversight of the Athletics Department on behalf of the President and the faculty to assist the University in operating its athletics programs in compliance with University, Conference, and NCAA legislation, particularly as related to academic requirements, eligibility, and satisfactory progress toward a degree.
The Faculty Athletic Representative shall:

- Act as a liaison between the faculty and general University administration and the Athletics Department regarding athletics matters, especially in regard to issues of academic progress and student-athlete welfare.

- Work directly with the registrar, admissions, financial aid and other offices to ensure that these offices understand NCAA legislation and fulfill their certification obligations as required by NCAA legislation.

- Serve as a University representative to the NCAA and the Big XII Conference with responsibility for working closely with the Athletic Director on issues of athletics policy.

- Assist the Director of Compliance with interpretations of NCAA and Big XII Conference legislation, processing of waivers and coaches certifications.

- Provide oversight and make recommendations for the University’s educational program on rules and regulations.

- Be responsible for the development and implementation of a comprehensive compliance program for the Athletics Department in conjunction with outside consultants.

- Participate in investigations and reporting of violations of rules and regulations of the NCAA, the Big XII Conference and the institution.

- Report regularly to the President on matters of intercollegiate athletics so that the President is afforded independent advice concerning athletics matters.

Reasonable resources for travel and communications will be made available for the performance of these duties. Compensatory time may be granted by the President and Dean for special projects and assignments.
Examples of activities

NCAA level:
Eligible to serve on NCAA councils, cabinets, and committees; help prepare and submit on behalf of OSU requests for waivers or appeals from NCAA legislation; included in official notifications when an official rules violation notification is initiated by NCAA; help prepare written responses to inquiries to determine if rules violations have occurred; attend hearings involving the Committee on Infractions if allegations of a major infraction case are made; help prepare self-study reports for NCAA certification; help administer NCAA Coaches Certification Test.

Conference level:
Serve on the Council of FARS (which meets in person minimally 4 times/year [conference calls as needed]); meet with Athletic Directors and Senior Woman Administrators 3 to 4 times/year; serve on conference standing committees (currently serve on - Administrative, Championships and Awards, Drug Testing Appeals, Finance and Budget, Interpretations); formulate legislative initiatives and positions for consideration by Board of Directors; review requests for waivers of conference rules; assess monitor student athlete welfare issues.

University level:
Validate - usually by signature - documents related to compliance, including reports to the conference on team participation, eligibility, and financial aid; assist in the examination of the factual basis of possible violations of NCAA and Big 12 Conference rules; sign off on reports to the conference and the NCAA on matters of primary and secondary violations of rules; present institution’s case for seeking waivers, exceptions, or appeals of NCAA or conference rules or findings; assist in documenting and presenting the institution’s case for NCAA athletics re-certification; chair the panel hearing appeals of non-renewal of athletics financial aid and transfer exception appeals; promoting policies and procedures to assure academic integrity in work with student athletes; maintain familiarity and regular contact with the personnel, policies, and procedures of athletics-related academic assistance units and activities; promoting student athlete welfare (e.g., meeting with team physician, head trainer, counselors, etc.); serve as ex officio member of Athletic Council and Athletic Committee of Faculty Council; meet periodically with President Harris; attend head coaches meetings; attend rules education sessions for coaching staff and student athletes.
Hamilton became the representative in 2007. She was appointed by David Schmidly during his tenure at OSU. Hamilton was recently appointed to serve three more years. Hamilton stated that there is a lot of individuality in her position within the Big 12 schools. Not all schools do everything the same. Hamilton stated that she does receive compensation for holding this position. She receives a 1/4 time teaching reduction, football and basketball tickets. Other reps get different compensations and they vary across the schools. Hamilton stated that this is a very cyclical position. There are weeks where she does not do anything with athletics and then there are weeks where she only handles athletic issues.

Bartels stated that Hamilton is an ad hoc member of the FC Athletics Committee and asked how she feels this interface is working and how can it be improved. Hamilton stated that the current committee chair is doing a great job of letting her know when the meetings will be held and what the topics will be. Hamilton stated that these meetings are valuable. She also attends the University Athletic Council meetings. Borland asked why there was a separate Women’s Administrators section of the Big 12 Governance structure. Hamilton stated this was due to Title 9. Hamilton stated that the Senior Woman Administrators handle a lot of the individual sports and look out for the sports that women are involved in. C. Pamela Fry – OSU Student Success Collaboration
Dr. Fry distributed the following information to take a more system wide approach to looking at student success.

This is a working draft and this may not be the final version. This is still in the gathering/input stage. This chart does reflect at this point what has been researched as best practice across the country looking at as many research studies about student success and retention as they possibly could. Student success and retention have been used interchangeably but we are really talking about retention and graduation rate as a definition for student success.
Student Success Collaborative at Oklahoma State University – An Overview

Purpose

The purpose of the Education Advisory Board Student Success Collaborative is to create ongoing collaboration among universities nationwide focused on becoming best-in-class at student retention and timely graduation. The SSC will help university advisors proactively work to keep students on track toward graduation and provide academic administrators with insights into systemic and curricular problems impeding student progress using predictive analysis and determining graduation success risk.

General Summary of Five Major areas of Service:

- Orientation, Training, and Support
- Development of Academic Milestones
- Web-Based Student Tracking System for Advisors
- Web-Based Dashboard for Academic Administrators
- Best Practice Sharing and Member Networking

SCOPE OF SERVICES

Orientation, Training and Support

An assigned team of EAB employees, including a dedicated consultant and a business analyst, plays a key role in the project planning and leading initial end-user training. This team actively helps:

- Configure system alerts to university specifications
- Develop plan for system roll-out and end-user training
- Load data and validate sensitivity of system flags and alerts
- Lead initial training of authorized users of the web-based tools
- Offer additional support, which may include initial opportunity assessment

Development of Academic Milestones

EAB will help member universities develop academic milestones for all relevant colleges and majors and will play a lead role in project planning, facilitating all meetings, and providing templates and tools including:

- Specific academic milestones for each major
- Plan for rolling out academic milestones to faculty and students

Web-Based Student Tracking System for Advisors

The keystone is a web-based system that improves academic advisor effectiveness by proactively identifying students “off path” for timely degree completion, and helping advisors more efficiently manage their outreach. The tracking systems capabilities will include the following:

- Automatically identifying at-risk students based on key progress indicators
- Assisting advisors with outreach, including use of student alerts
- Displaying academic success risk and suggesting best alternative majors for students seeking change
- Providing 360 degree student view of student record

Web-Based Dashboard for Academic Administrators

In addition to the student tracking system, university administrators will have access to a web-based dashboard including the following:

- Aggregate view of academic risk
- Track degree progress by major or college
- Surface potential systemic roadblocks to successful degree completion

Best Practice Sharing and Member Networking

The SSC will also include access to services fostering networking across the cohort and sharing knowledge of how member institutions are leveraging the membership to drive increased student retention and graduation success, including:

- Case studies profiling practice successes
- Research briefs on best practices
- User group conference calls and annual meetings
Selecting Pilot Programs

Commitments from Successful Pilot Programs
- Serve as early adopters and champions of the SSC Initiative
- Participate in breakout and training sessions throughout the implementation timeline
- Utilize the platform regularly during advising-related activities
- Provide product enhancement suggestions

Typical Attributes of Good Pilot Programs
- Strong leadership known for handling change well
- Advisors who are engaged and receptive to utilizing technology
- Programs with an advising structure that includes the use of Professional Advisors, if possible

Considerations for Selecting Your Institution’s Pilot Program Team
- Create a team of Pilot Programs that is representative of various sectors of the university
- Common types of program structures:
  - Sequential e.g., Engineering, Business
  - Pre-Majors e.g., Nursing, Social Work, Education
  - Less Prescribed e.g., History, English, Political Science
  - Undeclared Students

Typical Time Commitments of Pilot Programs During the Milestone Phases

Kickoff: Attend kickoff overview and respective pilot program breakout session.
Launch Preparation and Analytics: Complete a series of four e-Learning Modules and a short assessment. Access the site to become familiar with various features prior to training.
Pre-Training: Utilize the platform during advisor-related activities and provide feedback to Leadership Team and Dedicated Consultant.
Training: Attend a 90-minute training session facilitated by SSC Dedicated Consultant.
Utilization: Attend a 90-minute training session.
Oklahoma State University Reverse Transfer Initiative:
Collaboration with Oklahoma Community Colleges
Information Sheet – Academic Affairs and Office of the Registrar – Fall 2013

The OSU Reverse Transfer Initiative
To support Oklahoma’s participation in Complete College America, OSU will initiate a statewide reverse transfer collaboration with public community colleges during the Fall 2013 semester.

The Goal
The goal is to enable students to use their OSU courses to complete associate’s degrees at their previous colleges while continuing to complete their bachelor’s degrees at OSU.

What Is Reverse Transfer?
Students who begin their college work at community colleges transfer their coursework from the community college to the university so that it may apply toward their OSU degrees. Reversing this process, and transferring coursework from the university back to the community college, is called reverse transfer. Students who come to OSU before completing an associate’s degree may benefit from reverse transfer.

Benefits to Students
- Students earn an additional and immediate academic credential.
- Students’ OSU academic records are updated to reflect all community college courses that apply to their bachelor’s degrees.
- Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree satisfies general education requirements which may reduce the number of credit hours for bachelor’s degree.

Benefits to Community Colleges and to the State
- Increase the number of associate’s degrees earned.
- Increase completion rates for community colleges.

Potential Impact
Approximately 2,000 OSU students may be eligible to earn associate’s degrees through reverse transfer of their OSU coursework to the community colleges. Fewer than 20% of OSU students with community college credit have associate’s degrees recorded on the OSU student information system.

OSU’s Role in the Reverse Transfer Initiative
- The OSU Office of Academic Affairs and Office of the Registrar contact similar offices at the 14 Oklahoma public community colleges to invite participation.
- OSU provides participating community colleges the names (and other contact directory information) of their previous students who are potential candidates for completion of associate’s degree—OSU juniors and seniors who have earned at least 15 credit hours at the community college and who have no associate's degree on record with OSU.
- OSU provides participating community colleges transcript request forms that are individually tailored for each college. Students may use these forms to direct OSU to send their transcripts to the community colleges.
- OSU provides contact information for the office responsible for administering the reverse transfer initiative.

The Role of the Community College in the Reverse Transfer Initiative
- The participating community college uses contact information obtained from OSU to:
  o Provide an opportunity for students to apply for their associate’s degrees;
  o Provide a form students can use to request reverse transfer (send their OSU transcripts to the community colleges);
  o Award associate’s degrees to those who qualify;
  o Secure students’ consent to send transcripts verifying the degrees back to OSU.
- Communicate the results to OSU—which students completed degrees as a result of the reverse transfer.
- The participating community college provides contact information for the office responsible for administering the reverse transfer initiative.

According to Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education policy (3.4.2), “Reverse Transfer” is a process in which credit hours earned by students after transfer to another institution may be applied to certificate or degree requirements at a previously attended institution or institutions. State Regents’ policies regarding requirements and standards for awarding an undergraduate certificate or degree shall apply.”

Miller has noticed, in the Library, those students who take classes at OSU as high school seniors
they enroll at OSU as continuing students and do not take orientation classes. Miller also stated they also test out of English and do not take English 1213. Miller feels these are areas that would get these students back in the Library for training. She feels this puts them at a disadvantage and would like to find a way to identify and help them. Devuyst stated that incoming freshman take orientation classes. They could be testing out of the English class but should all be enrolled in orientation, unless they are a transfer student. Fry stated that some of the students have tested out of the introductory English classes. Materer stated that some of his chemistry students come from schools with advanced labs while others do not. Materer asked how politically we can get funding for those schools that do not have the best opportunities for their students. Fry stated if we could get at least one person who would be a liaison who could help make connections then start forming a partnership. Fry said there is so much potential in this area that maybe grants would be written with schools. Fry also stated that we can have MOOCS to high schools which is also not explored by most universities. They don’t necessarily have to be free; there is professional development money in the school districts that could be used, say a calculus course for teachers who teach calculus in the high school. This is something the OState.TV could be used or other forms of delivery that are at our disposal. Fry stated that having a point person or an office for these types of questions will be very helpful. Doust asked if the teachers need to be trained as well. This example was not teaching calculus to the students but working with teachers on how to improve the teaching of calculus. Fry stated there are a tremendous amount of opportunities available. This is what Fry means by teacher development, some teachers may be in an area (smaller school) where they do not have a good grasp of the concept. They are trained in physics but have to teach xyz and they are not comfortable with this. Kennison stated that there is an increasing number of high school psychology courses being taught and our College of Education trains our teachers and the way psychology is handled at the state level means they are trained in social sciences and as undergraduates they may take only one class within the college. When they go to the high school, they are the social studies teacher and now they also need to teach psychology. They could use resources and professional development to help them. Fry stated teachers really want this professional development and would love to have this opportunity.

The Educational Advisory Board will play a major part of this effort. Three pilot advisement programs will be rolling out this semester. There will be additional sessions that demonstrate these. This will be a much more comprehensive advisement tool. Dashboards will be available to review on a daily basis. There will also be a best practices networking site. Faculty can log onto the EAB website and have access to a tremendous amount of data about student success in all different areas.

Fry wanted to thank everyone who is participating in the academic alert system. 40% of OSU instructors in 1,000 and 2,000 level classes do use this system.

DeSilva asked that with the new reorganization has LASSO tutoring mission changed. Fry stated that there will be piloted supplemental instruction for certain classes. These will be high freshman enrollment classes with a high D/F/W rate. The initial results from this were exceptionally good for most classes. Supplement instruction is one piece and the training for supplemental instructors will continue to go through LASSO as they look at expanding this program. Fry stated they are looking at what can be moved to supplemental instruction and how
much tutoring will be needed. Fry stated that we need to focus on-at least with LASSO-more of a freshman focus for their success. DeSilva asked if supplemental instruction is one-on-one or more small group. Fry stated small group with a trained SI instructor. This is part of the national movement, by the way, for high freshman enrollment and high D/F/W classes. Fry stated that supplemental instruction is more effective than taking a remedial course and then jumping into the more challenging class. John stated that with the high number of tutor appointments being made there will be an issue with students not getting the tutoring help they need. How will this back log be handled? In his mind, right now LASSO is not the place to go to get help. How will LASSO handle this large number of students who need help? Fry stated that it is not sustainable for LASSO to continue to offer tutoring for every single course. LASSO needs to partner more with the colleges. There are currently tutoring centers around campus that students can go to for help.

DeSilva asked if the reverse transfer option is only offered by OSU or is OU and other four year schools offering it. Fry stated that the University of Central Oklahoma also has an organized reverse transfer policy but it is a different model than what OSU uses. Campbell stated that UCO works with three primary feeder schools and have devoted a lot of resources to it. DeSilva stated this could be a recruitment tool for some of the transfer students. Devuyst stated that faculty could talk to students about taking an entire track (transfer earlier) at OSU while taking other courses at a two year school. If the courses are taken in a series here at OSU the student is better prepared and will be more successful. These would hopefully help OSU students to be the most successful.

Remarks and Comments: Gary Clark for President Hargis

Clark stated that OSU is in the last year of the Branding Success campaign and President Hargis is out in California working on bringing some money back to Oklahoma. So far, OSU has had 91,000 people who have donated to the campaign. He is hoping that by the end of the campaign this number is over 100,000.
Clark stated that applications and admissions are up over last year at this point.
Clark said the Postal Plaza Gallery is open.
The framework of the new Library Annex is going up. This will allow for more study space in the Library.
The Atherton Hotel will be closing this May after graduation for renovations and should be closed for approximately one year. Hopefully it will reopen in the fall of 2015.
Clark stated that OSU again this year received the Higher Education Excellence in Diversity Award. In the past 5 years, OSU has doubled the enrollment of minority students so that today about 1 in 4 of OSU students is a minority. Clark stated this was mentioned in the recent accreditation visit.
OSU was ranked as the 15th happiest campus in America. Clark said this relates primarily to students. This tells us that our students feel like they are getting the value for their money.
Clark announced that OSU received a grant – OSU Teach Award. This is a significant grant that only five universities in the United States received this year.
Clark stated on a more somber note there was a recent article about the UML and the problems it encountered. Litigation is underway and an FBI investigation is also underway. The FBI does not share the progress of their investigation but OSU does have periodic contacts from them and ask
for information. This is still ongoing so there are a lot of things Clark cannot discuss. Clark thought it was important for Faculty Council to know that as a result of the inappropriate activities and miss management of funds in October/November of 2012 that OSU began the current litigation. Clark said it will probably go to trial this fall unless it’s settled before hand. Clark does not know what the chances of settling before trial are but it is a possibility. Clark stated that OSU has invested additional amounts in the UML because of the litigation expenses and some other things not related to the normal operational expenses. The UML is currently operating profitably now. Clark stated that a lot of the actions that were taken were necessary in order for OSU to continue to be able to receive Federal research funds. The good news is that the Board has been re-organized, new management is in place and OSU just recently entered into an agreement with the Cherokee Nation Business which will provide business services to UML. The prospects for the UML in the future really look very good. A $40 million contract was recently discussed with part of the money going to OSU to be used for research. While disappointed about the past, OSU is excited about the future.

Bartels asked who from OSU provides the oversight, like some of the other national labs might have DOD or different groups. Clark stated that the primary oversight will be provided by the Board of Directors for UML. This includes two Regents and President Hargis. In addition to this the management is retained by UML employees.

Chung asked how minority students are defined and does this include international students. Clark said that minority students self-identify. OSU cannot ask this question. Dr. Bird stated that they are not counted together, international students are counted separately. Clark stated that OSU has a large number of Native American students. The President recently ok’d an effort with some of the Native American Tribes to help these students be more successful.

**Report of Status of Council Recommendations:**

Interim Provost Pam Fry gave the status of the following recommendations:

13-03-01-CTSS: **Employee Travel Policy Amendment:**

   Faculty Council’s recommendation has been accepted, but the policy will be re-submitted following additional changes requested by the Office of Risk Management.

Nathan Walker will update the council during his committee report.

Kennison stated that the RPT policy which was supposed to go before the Board of Regents at their last meeting but it will go forward at their next meeting. Fry stated she hopes so. She stated that Legal Counsel wanted to take a final look at the language and so she just received some suggested changes from them. Kennison and Fry will be meeting next week to review these suggested changes. Hopefully these changes can be ironed out and have it before the Board at the March meeting. Kennison stated that since it did not go before the Board and officially approved it’s still pending. The policy will go back to the Faculty Committee for review.

Fry updated the council on ongoing dean searches. The Honors College will be inviting candidates to campus in the next few weeks. AG/Business are meeting and just now assembling their pools and will be moving forward with Skype interviews in the near future.

Fry stated that the online education steering committee continues to meet and she hopes to have
Joe Weaver:

Weaver stated that the block tuition proposal has been discussed with the Budget committee and will be discussed with the Student Affairs. Good discussion and some revisions have been made to the original concept. Weaver stated if discussions continue to go as positively as they have been, he hopes to have the proposal before the Board at their March 6th meeting. This will give OSU plenty of time to train advisors so they can advise the students and have a successful fall enrollment. Weaver stated that the point of the block tuition is about retention and graduating students in four years.

Weaver stated that OSU was disappointed in the Governors State of the State Address. Higher Ed was slated for a 5% cut in her budget. The legislature has a lot to say about what the budget is going to be but she always has to present a budget to them for consideration. Weaver said it’s worth noting that the governor proposed common ed receive additional and no cut to career tech. Weaver is hopeful that the cut won’t be that high. One of the reasons it is that high is the governor is proposing lower income tax which will cause a cut to education. Materer asked if the OSU faculty member who is currently advising the governor on science issues have the authority to address the issue of higher ed. Weaver said he’s been involved with the state capitol since 1987 and we have never been as well positioned with a particular governor or the legislature than we are right now with Burns Hargis. Weaver said he is a patriarch of local politics. Materer said it’s disturbing how they can make this break.

Miller wondered if there were any updates on the custodial transfers to the new agency. Weaver stated that most people chose to go with the agency. Some have chosen not to however. Weaver stated there have been some bumps in the road but as a whole it’s transitioning. The GCA knows what OSU’s expectations are. The contract just started yesterday.

Below is the draft block tuition proposal. Please note modifications may be made after presenting this to the SGA:

**OSU Block Tuition/Mandatory Fee Proposal**  
*January 2014*

**Plan:**
- Beginning in Fall 2014 undergraduates taking 12 to 16 hours will all pay the same block rate for tuition and mandatory fees. This rate will be equivalent to the current per-credit-cost for 15 hours. Academic Service Fees will not be included in the block.

- Undergraduates taking 17 or more hours will pay the block rate for the first 16 hours, but will receive a 50% discount on tuition (not mandatory fees) for hours over 16. Based on current 2013-2014 tuition rates, a 50% discount for hours over 16 is:
  - $74 per-credit-hour for resident undergraduates
  - $284 per-credit-hour for nonresident undergraduates
- Specific populations of students would continue to be charged under the current per-credit-hour model. These would include:
  - Graduate students
  - Undergraduate students enrolled in less than 12 hours (1 to 11 hours)
Undergraduate students receiving Oklahoma’s Promise
• Undergraduate students taking remedial courses at NOC
• Undergraduate students taking sections that are not charged regular tuition/mandatory fee rates
• Students who need less than 15 hours in a semester or less then 30 hours in a year to graduate.
• Students who select the guaranteed tuition option.

Benefits of Block Model:
• The proposed block tuition/mandatory fee model will provide undergraduate students a 2nd consecutive year with no increases in tuition and/or mandatory fees.

• Encourage students currently taking less than 15 hours to enroll in more hours.
• Taking 15 hours per semester puts students on target to graduate in 4 years.
• Assuming tuition, fees, books and supplies are the same, whether a student graduates in 4, 5 or 6 years, a student still incurs approximately $13,350 per year for room, board, transportation and miscellaneous expenses.
• $13,350 is saved if a student graduates in 4 years rather than 5, and
• $26,700 is saved if a student graduates in 4 years rather than 6.
• Students who graduate in 4 years rather than 5 or 6 would be able to enter the workforce 1 to 2 years earlier.
• Improve 4 and 5 year graduation rates.
• University of Texas and Texas A&M converted to a block model approximately 10 years ago and have experienced 4 to 5% increases in their 4-year graduation rates.
• Incentivize students to take 17+ hours by offering a 50% tuition discount for any hours over 16.

• Supports the Complete College America Oklahoma Plan. How to Mitigate Impact On Students Currently Taking Less Than 15 Hours:

  • Use a portion of the increased tuition/fee revenue to establish a short-term waiver program targeted at current students to aid in transitioning from the current per-credit-hour model to the block model.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICIES – Deb VanOverbeke – No Report

ATHLECTICS – Gary Young – No Report

BUDGET – Rodney Holcomb – Update

Holcomb stated that the Budget committee met with Joe Weaver and Christie Hawkins this month to discuss the second round of proposal for block tuition. Holcomb stated that the committee reviewed it and agreed it’s definitely improved over the first proposal that they saw. It’s much more in-tune with our peer institutions in the region. Probably more so than the one from OU from which the original proposal was based on. The committee agreed it’s a vast improvement and something that should be considered especially since our peer institutions are moving that direction. Kennison said that the block tuition will also be discussed by the Student Affairs and Learning Resources committee. This meeting will happen before the next Faculty Council meeting so we’ll have to communicate the SALR committee’s views about the proposal. Kennison said that is sounds like the Budget committee thinks it looks feasible. Holcomb stated
that it’s much improved over the original draft. The original draft was very closely tied to the OU plan that was hastily introduced last summer. This one is much more similar to what you would see at Texas A&M, University of Texas and it does not consider banking hours that can be used in the summer intersession. Holcomb said this quite honestly was a vast improvement and one of the things the Budget committee really worried about because it’s so hard to determine what the impacts would be on the financial situation for the summer sessions because they are almost their own little entities separate from the fall and spring semesters. Holcomb said the new proposal is much more consistent with what we see at peer institutions. If the other institutions are moving this way then this second proposal is much closer to this. Kennison asked whether or not a draft of the proposal should be sent out with the minutes of this meeting. If Holcomb feels the version the Budget committee reviewed is close to what the final version will be the information can get out to people because if it’s approved by the Board of Regents students will start enrolling for the fall in April. The block tuition will be happening on campus very quickly. Weaver would be happy to send a copy to attach to the minutes. Holcomb added that members of the committee are sitting in right now on the ongoing college level budget meetings between the Provost, Vice President Weaver and the college deans. There are representatives at each of these meetings. Kennison appreciates the invitations to attend these meetings and thanks the committee members for attending.

**CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY – Nathan Walker - Update**

Nathan commented that the committee has reviewed the changes to the Employee Travel Policy and they support the changes. Kennison stated it looks like we are moving forward with this recommendation. Kennison said that the Travel Policy will most likely be taken to the Board of Regents at the March meeting.

**DIVERSITY – Georgette Yetter – No Report**

**FACULTY – Matt Lovern – No Report**

**LONG-RANGE PLANNING and INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY – Victor Baeza – No Report**

**RESEARCH – Gilbert John – Update**

John stated that the Laser Safety committee requested the Research committee review some changes that have been made to the Laser Safety Policy. The committee reviewed the changes. The Research committee also had a visit from a member of the Laser Safety committee. The Laser Safety committee is out of the office of the University Research Compliance office which is in-turn is under the Vice President for Research, Technology and Transfer office. This committee is chaired by Al Rosenberg and Ken Bartels serves on this committee. Bartels attended the meeting and provided some details about the policy and changes that were made. John stated some of the changes were considered justified and positive were to provide more authorization and approval to the Laser Safety officer. This takes a little bit of the responsibility out of the hands of the Safety committee but they still oversee the officer’s duties. Secondly was
the medical surveillance program which is essentially anyone on campus using class 34 lasers will now have a base line eye exam paid for by the university. This is to support safety associated with this type of equipment. These are a few of the major changes that were on the list so for the record John wanted to state that the Research committee did look at the changes and had no objections to them and are supportive of them. Kennison stated that the policy can be circulated in the minutes. See below:

ONE-PAGE SUMMARY OF CHANGES FOR POLICY#:

Name of Policy: Institutional Laser Safety Policy  
Submitted by: Name: Steven O’Geary, Ph.D. Phone #: 744-0405  
Department: Office of University Research Compliance  
Date: November 6, 2013  

Significant Changes Made:
- We removed the year of publication and inserted the phrase “the latest versions of” so the policy does not need to be updated each time one of the American National Standards Institute’s (ANSI) laser safety guidelines is updated.
- We modified the definition of Class 3B lasers.
- We defined who may serve as a laser principal investigator (PI).
- We modified PI responsibilities.
- We inserted text about the new medical surveillance program, which consists of a baseline eye exam.
- Laser Safety Committee (LSC) members believed the laser safety officer (LSO) should be charged with authorizing the use of Class 3B and Class 4 lasers on the OSU-Stillwater and OSU-Tulsa campuses with input from the LSC as appropriate. In addition, the LSO will be responsible for approving standard operating procedures that are specific to each laser laboratory. Previously, these duties were assigned to the LSC.
- LSC members believed the policy needed to include information about deposing of Class 3B and Class 4 lasers. As a result, Item 5.05 was added.

Justification:
- We removed the year of publication and inserted the phrase “the latest versions of” so the policy does not need to be updated each time one of the American National Standards Institute’s (ANSI) laser safety guidelines is updated.
- We modified the definition of Class 3B lasers in order to be more specific.
- We defined who may serve as a laser principal investigator (PI) since there had been some confusion about this.
- We modified PI responsibilities in an effort to assist laser PIs in recognizing their individual responsibilities.
- We inserted text about the new medical surveillance program, which consists of a baseline eye exam, given that this is a new important safety aspect of the university’s laser safety program.
- Laser Safety Committee (LSC) members believed the laser safety officer (LSO) should be responsible for authorizing the use of Class 3B and Class 4 lasers on the OSU-Stillwater and OSU-Tulsa campuses with input from the LSC as appropriate. In addition, LSC members felt the LSO should also be responsible for approving standard operating procedures specific to each laser laboratory. Previously, these duties were assigned to the LSC. The LSO’s hands-on familiarity with the equipment in campus laser labs and knowledge of each PI’s operations led to the LSC’s decision to make these changes.
- Laser Safety Committee (LSC) members felt the policy needed to include information about deposing of Class 3B and Class 4 lasers. As a result, Item 5.05 was added.

Policy 4-0303: Institutional Laser Safety Policy
Those Involved in These Changes:
- Members of the OSU Laser Safety Committee
  - Al Rosenberger, Ph.D., Chairperson, Professor - Physics
  - Ken Bartels, D.V.M., Vice Chairperson, Professor - Veterinary Clinical Sciences
  - Greg Fox, Interim EHS Assistant Director
  - Steven O’Geary, Ph.D., Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance
  - Brandi Simmons, Laser Safety Officer
  - Weili Zhang, Ph.D.; Professor - Electrical & Computer Engineering

Has this policy been revised to include the OSU--System?
No.

Does this policy need Board approval? If there is any question about this, please check with Legal Counsel.
No, Board approval is not needed. Still, Mr. John Price, Assistant University Counsel, reviewed the revised policy and raised no concerns.

Do any other policies need to be updated to reference this policy?
I do not believe so, no.

Plans to communicate this policy or changes when policy is approved:
We will notify OSU-Stillwater and OSU-Tulsa faculty whose work falls within the purview of the Laser Safety Committee (LSC) via email. We will notify campus administrative support staff, most particularly college research office staff members, via the Sponsored Programs Review Committee (SPRC) listserv. We will also update the Office of University Research Compliance website.

Kennison also stated that this committee will be reviewing the Overload Pay Policy. Some folks are to meet with the committee to talk about how it’s been working since it was implemented last year and hopefully we will hear about this in the future.

RETIREMENT and FRINGE BENEFITS – Stephen Clarke – No Report

STUDENT AFFAIRS and LEARNING RESOURCES – Barney Luttbeg – No Report

Report of Liaison Representatives:

Wellness Center – Mary Tally

Tally distributed the following flyer and gave her remark time to Suzy Harrington.
Harrington wants to look at fitness as an active lifestyle for the month of April. She wants everyone to look at fitness as a lifestyle not just a class you attend or something that needs to be done. She wants everyone to really be active. Harrington wanted to let everyone know that the new walking path is opening April 15th. President and Ann Hargis will be there for the ribbon cutting and walk around the new path. Harrington hopes everyone has seen the medallions around campus. The walk will end at the Student Union with oranges, food and all the student groups. Harrington stated that OSU has 163 fitness classes that faculty, staff and students can go to. She feels this is pretty remarkable. This is larger than most university centers. There are 43 student clubs just based on activity. So students are out there. Students are actually at 17% obesity rate which is lower than the national average of 33%. Faculty and staff are at 36%. Harrington’s challenge to the council members is to think about getting active. Take the stairs instead of the elevator, parking further out or adding 2,000 steps to your day. Harrington asked everyone to think about things like flying a kite, hula hooping, jump roping and other activities.
How can you encourage your students to do one thing to get more active this spring?

Staff Advisory Council – Emily Snow

Snow reminded the council that Staff Development Day is Friday, February 28th. There will be a motivational speaker. There are close to 300 people signed up already. At the conclusion of the morning session the staff distinguished service awards will be given out. If you receive an email stating one of your staff members will be receiving an award please try to attend and show your support. Snow stated that years of service pins and padfolios went out within the last two weeks to the people who were eligible to receive them. The SAC is in the planning stages of the staff appreciation picnic. The date has been set for May 22nd. More information will be coming about this event. Snow thanked the council for always supporting the SAC and allowing them to have a place in the Faculty Council process.

Women’s Faculty Council – Barbara Miller

Miller mentioned the following Research Week activities: the speaker on Thursday is Deborah Ortloff. She will be talking about developing global citizenship and how there is little or no interaction between K12 goals and college goals in preparing the lower level students for what they will see as far as global citizenship at the college level. She will be speaking Thursday at 3:30 in the Browsing Room at the Library. On Friday at 3:00 in the Browsing Room at the Library will be the Women’s Faculty Council Research awardees. They will give short description of their research. Miller stated that faculty should be really pleased. These research projects were incredible. It was very hard to pick the 11 winners. Kennison stated that on Monday, February 17th the Library will be having the OSU Authors Reception from 11:30 to 1:00.

Old Business – Kennison stated that she met with Mitch Kilcrease and Lance about the bookstore issues. They had a very productive meeting and discussed faculty members desire to use older editions and some of the difficulty there is when the bookstore cannot find copies from the publishers. Kennison was told that faculty should really feel welcome to give the bookstore a call if there is an older edition that they want to use; Starla in the bookstore has contacts with wholesalers. If she can verify that there are enough copies it may be possible to get the older edition. Planning ahead is the biggest issue. Kennison asked faculty to get the word out that other faculty members can call the bookstore but the bookstore probably won’t be calling the departments. There is a policy that they do not want to do any advocacy for any particular kinds of learning materials so that they don’t look like they are in the job of convincing someone to use a particular book. Faculty can call the bookstore.

New Business – Kennison wanted to let everyone know that the Spring General Faculty meeting will be Tuesday, April 15th from 3:00 to 5:00 in the Student Union Theater. Kennison is hoping to be able to present some data from a survey that will be going out in the next few weeks. The survey will have a few questions about faculty members understanding views of shared governance but most importantly working conditions (having your workloads increased, where do things stand in your department and just climate issues). The survey will be able to identify
issues that maybe next years Faculty Council chair may want to address.

Seeing no more new business, Kennison moved on to the Rules and Procedures committee report which is essentially generating nominees for the Vice Chair and Secretary positions. If those attending are not Council members feel free to adjourn.

**RULES and PROCEDURES – Chanjin Chung – Update**

Chung stated that two nominees for Vice Chair and Secretary need to be identified at this meeting. Chung took nominations from the floor for Vice Chair – these nominees are Stephen Clarke and Jeanmarie Verchot. Bartels moved to accept Stephen Clarke and Jeanmarie Verchot as nominees for Vice Chair. Materer seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Chung took nominations from the floor for Secretary – these nominees are Deb VanOverbeke and Daqing Piao. Bartels moved to accept Deb VanOverbeke and Daqing Piao as nominees for Secretary. DeSilva seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Kennison mentioned that everyone will be receiving a memo regarding additional nominations for Vice Chair and Secretary as well as College representatives. The final ballots will go out March sometime around spring break. The voting will be completed by the first of April so the new councilors will be announced at the April Faculty Council meeting. Council members received a list of representatives needed from each college. DeSilva asked about the Okmulgee representative. Does this person need to be elected for just one year? Okmulgee has one person does it matter if they are elected for one or three years? It’s hard enough to get someone to run from Okmulgee. Kennison said we could check into this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, March 11, 2014 in **412 Student Union, Council Room**.

Respectfully submitted,

Udaya DeSilva, Secretary