FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

**3:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 12, 2013**

# Council Room, 412 Student Union

**AGENDA:**

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of the February 12, 2013, Minutes

3. Approval of Agenda

4. The President – Remarks and Comments

5. Special Report:

A. Cheryl Devuyst – LASSO Director

6. Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations:

Provost Sternberg, and/or Vice Presidents

7. Reports of Standing Committees:

a. Academic Standards and Policies: Ed Harris – Up Date

b. Athletics: Robert Cornell – No Report

c. Budget: Rodney Holcomb – Up Date

d. Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security: Robert Emerson – Up Date

Recommendation – Employee Travel Policy Amendment\*

e. Faculty: Matt Lovern – Up Date

f. Long-Range Planning and Information Technology: Nick Materer – No Report

g. Research: Dan Fisher – No Report

h. Retirement & Fringe Benefits: Stephen Clarke – Up Date

Recommendation – Phased Retirement Program (PRP) Incentive Amendment\*

Recommendation – Colvin Access for Emeriti Faculty\*

i. Rules and Procedures: Kemit Grafton – Up Date

Recommendation - Faculty Council By-Law Change to add New Diversity Committee\*

j. Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Bob Miller – No Report

8. Reports of Liaison Representatives –

9. Old Business

10. New Business – New Faculty Council Standing Committee

11. Adjournment

*Refreshments will be served at 2:45 p.m.*

*\*Attached*

**Amended by Passed Failed**

**Recommendation No.**  13-03-01-CFSS  1.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Moved by:**  Campus Facilities, Safety & Security  2.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Seconded by:**  3.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Passed**         **Tabled**         **Failed**  4.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Title:**  Employee Travel Policy Amendment

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Hargis that:**

Section 4.01 Travel by Motor Vehicle should be amended.

Item F – “at least two qualified drivers must be used if traveling farther than 350 miles one way, or if the trip is expected to extend later than 2:00 a.m.”;

should be modified to: “**for a single day trip** at least two qualified drivers must be used if traveling farther than 350 miles one way or if the trip is expected to extend later than 2:00 a.m. **For a multiple day trip at least two qualified drivers must be used if traveling farther than 700 miles one way or if the travel day is expected to extend later than 2:00 a.m.**”

Item G - “the maximum number of hours a driver may drive in any twenty-four (24) hour period is eight (8) hours;”

should be modified to: “the maximum number of hours a driver my travel in any twenty-four (24) hour period is **ten (10) hours including rest stops unless 8 hours or more of sleep separates the travel days.**”

**Rationale:**

The current travel policy does not account for the nature of many employees travel for extension, research, and scholarly activities. Many employees regularly make professional trips that occur over multiple days. This should be reflected in the University Employee Travel Policy. The increased limits on travel times from 8 hours of driving time to 10 hours of travel time are suggested to be similar to other travel policies used by the BSA and USDOT.

Boy Scouts of America:

http://www.scouting.org/scoutsource/HealthandSafety/GSS/gss11.aspx

 Driving time is limited to a maximum of 10 hours and must be interrupted by frequent rest, food, and recreation stops. If there is only one driver, the driving time should be reduced and stops should be made more frequently.

 Travel and rest time is limited to a maximum of 10 hours in one 24-hour period, regardless of the number of drivers available. The intention is to include sleep and thorough rest breaks while traveling long distances.

**Amended by Passed Failed**

**Recommendation No.**   13-03-01-RFB 1.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Moved by:** Retirement & Fringe Benefits    2.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Seconded by:**  3.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Passed**         **Tabled**         **Failed**  4.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Title:** Phased Retirement Program (PRP) Incentive Amendment

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Hargis that:**

The University shall offer a financial incentive of up to but not more than the equivalent to 50% of a one-year compensation to the faculty member who voluntarily enters the Phased Retirement Program.  A one-time lump sum payment to the faculty member equal to 2% of their retirement-base annual compensation multiplied by the number of years of service with a maximum of 50% of the retirement-bas annual compensation shall be awarded. For a faculty member to receive this benefit, they must agree to three years of service during a phased retirement program.

**Rationale:**

The Faculty Council passed a Recommendation in January 2011 to implement a Phased Retirement Program (PRP) at OSU.  The resolution was based principally on the work of the Faculty Council’s Phased Retirement Taskforce (PRT).  The PRT report highlighted the benefits for both the faculty member and the university in developing a PRP and also discussed the potential problems in implementation.  The Administration accepted the recommendation and developed administrative procedures for its implementation.

In principle, the PRP is an effective strategy for the University because it facilitates a smooth transition in faculty staffing upon a faculty member’s retirement.  With transition and planning, instructional commitments and strategic goals for a unit need not be placed on hold in the time interval between the loss of productivity from the retirement of a faculty member and the hiring of replacement. Additionally, there are potential budget savings for OSU. Although the proposed incentive is equivalent to 0.5 FTE annually, the budget savings could be as much as 1.5 FTE.  With proper management, the PRP could save the University Budget approximately 1.0 FTE for each phased retirement. There is significant precedence for a retirement incentive in other states. Indeed, the PRP is a viable option for many of our retirement-eligible faculty. They can transition into retirement while remaining active and engaged with OSU as they continue to be involved in student education through instruction, research, and outreach/extension/engagement.

In addition to the original recommendation passed in January 2011, the Faculty Council unanimously passed an amendment to the PRP recommending to the Administration adoption of a financial incentive similar to the recommendation described herein of approximately 50% of the faculty member’s base pay for faculty members entering the PRP.  However, the Administration did not accept the Faculty Council’s amended recommendation that would have provided the Financial Incentive.

Significant dis-incentives against faculty members entering the PRP already exist through OTRS rules which restrict earning levels following retirement from OSU. The report from the PRT in January 2011 highlighted the effect of the OTRS “clawback” requirements on OSU faculty desiring to enter the PRP. The financial incentives that we recommend would serve to mitigate some of the financial dis-incentive posed by OTRS rules.

In the two years since its implementation, only three eligible faculty members have elected to participate in the PRP. And one of those faculty members left the program after only one year “in phase”. It is the opinion of the Retirement and Fringe Benefits (RFB) Committee that the PRP has been unsuccessful. Further, it is the opinion of the RFB Committee that the lack of a significant financial incentive to join the PRP has limited its value to prospective faculty members and contributes to the underperformance of the PRP.

In summary, in order to enhance the effectiveness and success of the PRP, the RFB Committee believes that the financial incentive described in the recommendation above, or a similar program, would help assure that the PRP works as intended, and that the PRP would provide significant strategic benefits to the University while providing an opportunity for a retiring faculty member to remain engaged in service to the University.

**Amended by Passed Failed**

**Recommendation No.**  13-03-02-RFB  1.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Moved by:** Retirement & Fringe Benefits    2.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Seconded by:**  3.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Passed**         **Tabled**         **Failed**  4.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Title:** Extending Faculty Benefits of Recreational Facilities to Emeriti Faculty

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Hargis that:**

The University shall extend equitable benefits of current faculty members to retired faculty with emeritus status related to the *gratis* access of the Colvin Recreation Center/Seretean Wellness Center.

**Rationale:**

Emeritus faculty members are lifelong representatives of Oklahoma State University (OSU). Based on the work of Sidney Albert (“*Emeriti Bill of Rights*”, Academe 72(4):24-6, 1986), the American Association of University Professors recommended 20 privileges that should be extended to emeriti faculty, including the notion that retired faculty should have the same professional privileges as active faculty. Indeed, as the author stated “…accomplishments of emeriti faculty reflect the excellence of the land-grant mission and the University as much as active faculty at much less cost”. These retired faculty members represent a wealth of institutional memory and are a rich resource that contributes to the success and welfare of the University. In fact, there are numerous examples of emeriti faculty at OSU who continue to publish and disseminate scholarly works well after retirement that positively influence the research status of the institution. In addition to their scholarly activities, many of these retired faculty members volunteer their time to the University, continue to serve as mentors for other faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students, and are otherwise great friends of the University. As OSU continues its efforts to become America’s Healthiest Campus, the University should consider all members of the OSU community regardless of age or status. In agreement with programs directed towards improving the health and well-being of faculty and staff, the benefits of exercise and physical activity for older adults are well documented. Additionally, the intellectual and developmental benefits derived from multiple generations of OSU students, faculty, and staff interacting through their participation in activities at the Colvin Recreational Center/Seretean Wellness Center (CRC/SWC) are immeasurable. In fact, members of our emeriti faculty provide exercise and wellness instruction at the CRC/SWC. The Retirement and Fringe Benefits (RFB) Committee of the Faculty Council strongly supports the notion that health and wellness is a lifelong pursuit and one that does not end at retirement.

To provide evidence of their continued contribution to the University, the Emeriti Association collected information from members regarding their service to the University. Several emeriti members are actively involved as members of a wide range of OSU Faculty Council Committees. Further, many of the emeriti faculty continue to serve as members of thesis and dissertation committees. A large number of members assist as Ushers or Greeters at OSU Convocation and Graduation Ceremonies. Many of the members also assist the OSU Alumni Association in preparing high-volume mailings to Alumni membership several times a month in addition to serving as hosts and greeters of fans visiting the Alumni Center during home football weekends.

Members of the emeriti faculty continue to provide instruction and leadership development for both undergraduate and graduate students. At one of the age spectrum, emeriti faculty provide input related to best practices in Early Childhood Education and at the other end of the age spectrum, some emeriti faculty members are involved in providing continuing education through their involvement in the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute. Emeriti faculty members also donate their time and expertise by serving as tutors for students in a wide variety of disciplines.

These distinguished retired faculty members also provide valuable instruction to new faculty and staff regarding the rich history of Oklahoma A&M College/OSU. Members are also involved in international education through their work with Chiang Mai University and Maejo University in Thailand. In addition to their contribution to meeting the global aspect of the land-grant mission, emeriti faculty work closely with the OSU Foundation to assist in the development of potential donors to contribute to student scholarships. Clearly, despite being ‘retired’, emeriti faculty members remain actively engaged in the University community and provide significant contributions to the success of OSU.

As of November 2012, there were approximately 53 emeriti faculty members currently utilizing the CRC/SWC facilities. Based on current rates and the number of faculty and staff using their CRC/SWC benefits, the expected financial costs are predicted to relatively modest and it is the opinion of the RFB Committee that the potential benefits far outweigh the expenses. By providing this additional benefit to faculty members with emeritus status, the Administration recognizes the significant contributions of these individuals and demonstrates their appreciation for their valued service to fulfilling the mission of OSU.

**Amended by Passed Failed**

**Recommendation No.**   13-03-01-R&P 1.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Moved by:**    Rules and Procedures Committee 2.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Seconded by:**  3.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Passed**         **Tabled**         **Failed**  4.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Title:**        Faculty Council By-Law Change to add New Diversity Committee

**The Rules and Procedures Committee Recommends to Faculty Council that:**

The by-laws of the Faculty Council are amended to add a new standing Diversity Committee. The committee will have two members from the Faculty Council, three members from the General Faculty, one emeritus member, one undergraduate student and one graduate student; one of the two student members shall be male and one, female. This Committee shall formulate and recommend policies to administration regarding the diversity issues on campus.  The committee shall particularly monitor and report on the sources and expenditure of funds related to the recruitment and retention of diverse students, faculty, and staff, the climate on campus for members of underrepresented groups, and the inclusion of diversity issues in curricular and non-curricular programs on campus.

**Rationale:**

Creating a Faculty Council Diversity Committee provides additional study and input as well as a balanced vision of diversity issues. Implementation of administrative and potential task force recommendations regarding diversity issues could also be advanced more effectively. In recent years, the University has experienced an increase in the number of students, faculty, and staff on campus from diverse backgrounds.  Research in higher education predicts that in the coming decades, diversity on college campuses will continue to increase; some projections suggest that the increase will be dramatic.  The committee can play a role in assisting the university as this transition occurs.