FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

**3:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 13, 2014**

# Council Room, 412 Student Union

**AGENDA:**

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of the April 8, 2014 Minutes

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Special Report:

A. Scott Gelfand/Eric Reitan: The Global Village at OSU

5. The President – Remarks and Comments

6. Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations:

President Hargis, Interim Provost Fry, and/or Vice Presidents

7. Reports of Standing Committees:

a. Academic Standards and Policies: Deb VanOverbeke – Year End Report

Academic Standards & Policies Committee Report

2013-2014 Academic Year

Committee Members: Deb VanOverbeke (Chair), Barney Luttbeg, Carol Jones, Ann Lowrance, Mindy McCann, Karin Schestokat, Beulah Hirschlein, Kathleen Rivers, Evyn Larson

**Recommendations Made:**

* Changes to OSU Policy 2-0128: Requirements for Undergraduate and Graduate Minors
* Changes to OSU Academic Regulation 7.3: Residence Waiver for Certain Premedical Students
* Changes to OSU Policy 2-0216: Final Exam Overload Policy
* Changes to OSU Policy 2-0207: University Academic Format and Final Examination Policy

**Other Activities:**

* Review of Gen-Ed Task Force Report prior to it going to Instruction Council
* Review of changes made to the Academic Integrity Policy prior to it going to Instruction Council
* Chair of AS&P serves on four university committees regarding the committee’s work.

Respectfully Submitted,



Deb VanOverbeke, Chair

b. Athletics: Gary Young –Year End Report/ Update\*

**Faculty Council**

**Athletics Committee**

**End of Year Summary**

**2013 – 2014**

**Submitted by Gary Young, Chair**

**Committee Members**

Gary Young, Chair, Dennis Bertholf, Clint Chelf, Robert Christenson, Robert Cornell, Kevin Fite, Meredith Hamilton, Edward (Ted) Kian, Art Klatt, Marilyn Middlebrook, Nathan Walker

**Summary**

1. The Chair met with the Chair of the Athletic Council to better understand the role and charge of each of our committees. The past Chair of the Faculty Council (FC), Ken Bartels or the Chair of the Athletics Committee attended the Athletic Council meetings acting as a liaison to promote closer relations between these two groups. It has been suggested to the incoming Chair of the FC that the Chair of the Athletics Committee be designated as the liaison to the Athletic Council.

2. The committee was given a tour or the Academic Services for Student-Athletes (ASSA) and attended a presentation by Dr. Marilyn Middlebrook (Associate Athletics Director for Academic Affairs and Director of ASSA) on the topic of the NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR). This was extremely beneficial in helping the committee to understand many of the constraints under which the ASSA operates.

3 Meredith Hamilton (OSU Faculty Athletics Representative and member of this committee) gave a report to the committee after she attended the 2014 NCAA Convention. She discussed the many changes that NCAA is currently experiencing and will experience in the near future and how these will affect OSU.

4. The committee was asked by the Chair of the FC to look into the rental structure of Gallagher-Iba (G-I) Arena and the rationale for funds flowing from the Educational & General (E&G) account to the Athletic Department. The Chair of the Athletics Committee met with Jason Lewis (Associate Athletic Director for Business Affairs). Fees were determined based on the cost of utilities and required personnel to staff special events and clean-up afterwards for events including graduations / convocations, Special Olympics, the College of Engineering Architecture and Technology (CEAT) Career Fair, hosting of outside speakers, and intramural events.

5. The committee recommended to the FC that the Athletics Committee of the Faculty Council review on an annual basis the policies, procedures, and practices implemented in the office of Academic Services for Student-Athletes (ASSA). This process will include the review of procedures for counseling, tutoring, and online courses. It will also assess the communication practices between the coaches and the student-athletes and between the student-athletes and other advising offices across campus. The rationale was that it will provide the ASSA with a documented annual review from a committee of the Faculty Council in the event that individuals or groups make claims which bring under question the integrity or efficacy of the advising services provided to our student-athletes. The recommendation passed, was forwarded to the OSU Administration, and approved.

6. With financial help from the Provost’s office, a member from our committee (Ted Kian) attended the 2014 National Meeting of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). He subsequently presented a detailed report to the committee. A summary of his observations and thoughts on how future changes to the NCAA will affect OSU was provided as an update to the May 13th meeting.

c. Budget: Rodney Holcomb – Year End Report

**Annual Report - Faculty Council Budget Committee for Academic Year 2013-2014**

**May 6, 2014**

Members: Rodney Holcomb –Chair, Andrea Arquitt, David Biros, Jennifer Borland, Tim Bowser, Chanjin Chung, Bill Dare, Nick Materer, and Avdhesh Tyagi

Over the course of the year the Budget Committee reviewed, discussed, and responded to a number of issues/requests related to the university’s current and future budget.

The Committee began the academic year by following up on the dependent tuition waiver survey jointly conducted by this Committee, the Retirement & Fringe Benefits Committee, and the Staff Advisory Council in June/July 2013. The Committee discussed the findings of the survey relative to the projected costs of such a program as determined by University administration. This information was shared with University administration in an effort to provide a more accurate measure of costs and benefits for this proposed employee benefit.

The Committee also examined trends in OSU undergraduate enrollment and forecasted enrollment for FY 2015. In October 2013, OSU VP Joe Weaver provided information on enrollment, the resulting need for faculty FTEs, the demands on current infrastructure, and the challenges of adding infrastructure (primarily student housing) to address the burgeoning student population. At that meeting, VP Weaver asked the Committee to review and provide comments on the first draft of a block tuition proposal. The Committee’s feedback was incorporated in subsequent drafts of the block tuition proposal, which were discussed in later Committee meetings with VP Weaver and Associate VP Dr. Christie Hawkins. The resulting OSU block tuition plan will be implemented in the forthcoming academic year.

At the request of Chairwoman Kennison, the Committee renewed discussions regarding salary compression/inversion stemming from the Committee’s 2012-2013 efforts. In the last meeting of the current academic year, the Committee reviewed faculty salaries relative to Big XII schools and college-defined peer institutions. In that same meeting, the Committee heard from OSU Transportation Services director Chris Hoffman on the budgetary pros and cons of an initiative to end the practice of OSU purchasing vehicles, and instead contract with a leasing agency for all of OSU’s long-term and daily-reserved motor pool vehicles.

In recent years, the Committee has had representatives at college-level budget meetings with the Provost and VP Finance/Administration. The Committee did so again in early 2014. Committee members shared their experiences with one another and provided feedback to administration on issues of concern to faculty from those college-level meetings. Once again, the Committee strongly encouraged administration follow the approved 2008 recommendation (08-03-01 BUDG), which states that deans will provide public presentations of their proposed budgets and initiatives for the next fiscal year.

One suggestion for next year’s Committee is to review the full budgetary impacts of outsourcing custodial services, which began in February 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney Holcomb – Chair

d. Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security: Nathan Walker – Year End Report

Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security: Nathan Walker – Year End Report

**Committee Members:**

Stacy Takacs, English OSU- Tulsa; Carol Jones, Biosystems & Agricultural Engineering; Tom Jordan, Architecture; Dr. Khaled Mansy, Architecture; Jim Criswell, Emeriti Association; Zhouyang Kang and Aaron Sharp, student representatives.

**The CFSS Committee would like to thank the following individuals for their assistance:** Ron Hill, Manager Emergency Operations & Preparedness; Gary Clark, Vice President and General Counsel; Dr. Lee Bird, Vice President, Office of Student Affairs; Tolga Durak, Director, Environmental, Health & Safety; Joe Weaver, Vice-President, Division of Administration and Finance.

Over the year the Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security Committee reviewed and discussed several diverse issues. One issue that carried over from the previous year was the Employee Travel Policy. The Committee reviewed the Employee Travel Policy Amendmentand supported the proposed changes. Currently the committee is looking into the possible creation of an OSU webpage addressing employee travel. The committee met with Emergency Operations & Preparedness to better understand efforts being taken to prepare for any possible campus emergency. The committee has and continues to review the issue of portable heart defibrillators on campus. Currently, efforts are being taken by EHS to compile an inventory of these devices on campus. The committee also reviewed and discussed the use of on-campus dormitories during summer months, cross-walk issues on Monroe Street, and issues related to ADA.

e. Diversity: Georgette Yetter – Year End Report

f. Faculty: Matt Lovern – Update/Year End Report

Recommendation: 14-05-01-Faculty

Revisions to P&P 2-0112: Annual Faculty Appraisal and Development Policy\*

Faculty Committee End of Year Report

The members of the committee for 2013-14 were Drs. Victor Baeza, Ken Bell, Jack Dillwith, Nurhan Dunford, Reed Holyoak, Sue Jacobs, and Karen McBee. I thank them for their time, effort, and insight on this committee; it was greatly appreciated!

Much of our initial work during the 2013-14 academic year was a continuation of work from the previous academic year. We continued to help with revisions to faculty workload (2-0110, Guidelines to Govern Workload Assignment of Faculty Members) and RPT (2-0902, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Process for Ranked Faculty). Each of these revised policies has been approved. The committee also successfully updated the policy on clinical track faculty (2-0903, Clinical Faculty Track (Non-Tenure Track)), proposed and passed a Faculty Council resolution for creation of a formal policy of academic administrator appraisal, and has under consideration at the May 2014 Faculty Council meeting a recommendation to revise the A&D policy (2-0112, Annual Faculty Appraisal and Development Program). Finally, the committee assisted the Provost with review and evaluation of selected RPT folders under consideration for 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Lovern, Chair

g. Long-Range Planning and Information Technology: Victor Baeza – Year End Report

YEAR-END REPORT: LONG RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

2013 - 2014

**Committee Members:**

Faculty Council Members: Victor Baeza (Chair), Georgette Yetter, and Yanqi Wu

General Faculty Members: Allen Finchum, Nicole Sump-Crethar, Jeanmarie Verchot

Faculty Council Past Chair (Ex-officio): Kenneth Bartels

Faculty Council Vice-Chair: Nick Materer

Emeritus Representative: Russell Wright

Recognizing that effective communication channels between OSU faculty and the departments responsible for University’s information technology are necessary for the advancement of the academy, the committee worked this year to complete activities begun last year and to further develop a working relationship with IT leadership.

One of the activities begun last year was the effort to bring OSU into compliance with requirements within the T.E.A.C.H. Act in order to make the provisions for online instruction available to the University. A task force identified deficiencies and two recommendations were brought before and passed by Faculty Council: (1) the creation of a copyright information website and (2) a set of copyright usage warnings for students and faculty. The creation of a copyright information website was begun by the Edmon Low Library and a completed suite of pages should be ready for the Fall of 2014. Instead of a set of copyright usage warning for students and faculty, one statement was created and is now included in D2L and a version will be mailed to faculty and students at the beginning of the fall.

OSU Copyright Statement

Course materials may not be published, leased, sold to others, or used for any purpose other than appropriate OSU-related individual or group study without the written permission of the faculty member in charge of the course and other copyright holders. This paragraph grants students a limited license, giving you access to course materials posted on this site for appropriate OSU-related educational use only. When posting information, instructors should ensure these materials are not a direct replacement for a required textbook, coursepack or e-reserves, or digital library resource. Instructors must also ensure that any converted analog materials (either audio or video) are not available in a digital format and that the conversion is authorized and in compliance with copyright law.”

In 2014, there were several questions brought to the committee from faculty through the Council Chair Shelia Kennison concerning various issues such as e-mail security, data management and access, and technology infrastructure. The concerns were brought to the attention of IT administration who, upon review of current policy statements, decided to update policies dealing with e-mail and technology usage and access. The new and updated policies, dealing with issues such as the e-distribution of classroom materials, data storage and protection, and procedures for faculty to request assistance from IT, as well as providing clearer communication channels between faculty and IT, are planned to be completed and brought to Faculty Council through the Committee in the Fall.

Respectfully Submitted,

Victor D Baeza

h. Research: Gilbert John – Year End Report

**Research Committee Year End Reports (submitted May 9, 2014)**

Research Committee members: (Chair) Gilbert H. John, Andrew Doust, Lin Liu, Suzanne Reiman, Robert Larzelere, Dan Fisher, and (Emeritus) David Lewis.

The research committee met every month. The research committee addressed a number of issue this past year. The following issues are summarized below.

1. Animal Care Facility- the facility has some serious compliance requirement issues, as the facility was receiving notices to address needs as well as negative press on the care of animals at OSU. The issue was brought to the attention of the committee by Dr. Ken Bartels, who is on the animal care compliance committee. Issues included under staffing, particularly the lack of a dedicated compliance veterinary. In addition, update of policies, and protocol and practices were addressed. The Interim Vice President for Research and Technology & Transfer (VPRTT), Dr. Sheryl Tucker, created a task force to address the issues. The task force and VPRTT were able to agree on providing initial funding to support the hiring of an additional veterinary as well as updating the policy and procedures related to the Animal Care Facility. These efforts are short-term and more long term efforts are needed.
2. Research Infrastructure- the issue of infrastructural needs was brought to the attention of the committee by the Associate Deans for Research (ADR) from the different Colleges at OSU. The ADRs requested support from the faculty council and research committee to meet with President Hargis, Vice Presidents (VP Research, Technology & Transfer, VP Administration & Finance), and the Interim Provost to discuss research needs at OSU. The initial meeting provided a basis for identifying research needs at OSU. In addition, the ADRs stated they wanted to be more involved in planning the future direction of research at OSU and to work with upper administration. The ADRs reported that they are pleased with upper administration’s commitment to work with them regarding research at OSU. The ADRs will report in the fall 2014 on a proposed plan to improve the infrastructural needs at OSU. The ADRs and the research committee also look forward to working with the new VPRTT this fall.
3. Research policy reviews- the research committee was given the opportunity to review the policy changes made by the Laser committee and Biosafety committee (see policies at the VPRTT web site). The committee supported the changes. The two compliance committees are in the VPRTT office.
4. Overload pay for Faculty policy- the committee met with Interim Provost (Dr. Pam Fry), Interim VPRTT (Dr. Sheryl Tucker), and the Director of Grants and Contracts Financial Administration (Dr. Robert Dixon) to discuss changes to the policy, particularly as it related to research. It was decided that language regarding “13 months” will be replaced. A possible replacement include “percent”. The goal is to have a clearer definition of overload pay for faculty.
5. Student Employment Job Listing- the research committee was given the opportunity to review the policy changes (see policy at the VP Student Affairs web site). The committee supported the changes.
6. Invited guests to the research committee meetings- Dr. Joshua Ward (Director of the Scholar Development & Undergraduate office), Dr. Ken Bartels (Laser Compliance committee member), Dr. Ed Shaw (Biosafety committee member), and Dr. Charlotte Ownby (Chair, Animal Care Facility committee).

i. Retirement & Fringe Benefits: Stephen Clarke – Update/Year End Report

**OSU FACULTY COUNCIL**

Year--‐‑end Report from the

**RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS COMMITTEE**

May 9, 2014

**Committee Members:**

Stephen Clarke, Nutritional Sciences; Ken Clinkenbeard, Veterinary Pathobiology; Barbara Miller, Government Documents Department, OSU

Libraries; Bob Miller, Microbiology; Rita Miller, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Bob Terry, Emeriti Association; Richard Wansley, OSU Center for Health Sciences; Gary Young, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

**The RFB Committee would once again like to thank the following individuals for their assistance and input over the past year:** Rodney Holcomb, OSU Faculty Council Budget Committee**;** Jamie Payne, Assistant Vice--‐‑President, Chief Human Resources Officer**;** Anne Matoy, Division of Administration and Finance**;** Joe Weaver, Vice--‐‑President, Division of Administration and Finance.

During the academic year the committee examined key issues including domestic partner benefits and tuition waiver benefits for faculty and staff spouses or dependents. According to a recent survey of faculty and staff on the OSU campus, domestic partner benefits ranked second only to childcare options (or lack thereof) as major concerns. Over the last year, we have collected information on domestic partner benefits available to employees at other state and private universities in Oklahoma or at peer/aspirational institutions in higher education. The committee will continue to examine the data collected and have decided to table any further action until a decision is made on the appeal of U.S. District Court Judge Terence C. Kern’s ruling that Oklahoma’s ban on same--‐‑sex marriage is unconstitutional.

In cooperation with the Budget Committee, we continued to examine possibilities for establishing a tuition waiver program for faculty/staff spouses and/or dependents. Given the financial constraints resulting from decreasing state appropriations, it seems unlikely that developing and implementing a program in the current budget climate is feasible. In general, the committee and the majority of faculty believe that a tuition waiver program could be an excellent recruiting and retention tool, but understand the financial realities that prohibit a program from being available at this time. We continue to examine other possibilities for providing a tuition--‐related benefit that might be more financially feasible.

Respectfully Submitted,



Stephen L. Clarke, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

Department of Nutritional Sciences

j. Rules and Procedures: Chanjin Chung – Year End Report

This academic year the Rules and Procedures Committee conducted the Faculty Council election for 2014-2015 and elected a new Vice Chair, Secretary and council members.

Members are: Chanjin Chung, Chair, Udaya DeSilva, Kenneth Bartels and Deb VanOverbeke

k. Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Barney Luttbeg – Year End Report

Activities of the Student Affairs and Learning Resources committee 2013-14

* The committee was composed Reed Holyoak, Laura Barnes, Timm Bliss, Robert Avakian, Patricia Jordan, Misty Smith, Sean Baser (undergraduate), and Barney Luttbeg (chair)
* Met with Dr. Lee Bird to discuss student affairs on campus
* Commented on and approved revisions to policy on Student Employment Job Listings
* Voted to reject Instruction Council changes to the wording of the Attendance Policy
* Provided comments on an early draft of the university Block Tuition program
* Met with Dr. Christie Hawkins to discuss the Block Tuition and provided written comments on the proposed policy

8. Reports of Liaison Representatives –

9. Old Business

10. New Business

11. Adjournment

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

*Attached\**

**\*Athletics Committee**

**Ted Kian Report on COIA Speakers, Workshops, and Plans**

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA; the Coalition) is an alliance of faculty senates from NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools. COIA’s mission is to provide a national faculty voice on intercollegiate sports issues.

COIA reps from more than 40 BCS universities attended the 2014 annual gatherings in Tampa, along with guest speakers and other invitees, such as FARS from a few universities and a large contingent of NCAA officials.

Below is a synopsis of each guest speaker(s) and the topic they addressed/workshop/meeting, along with my take on each situation and how it affects Oklahoma State University.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

**Dr. Bob Malekoff**, co-author of the Rawlings Report by the external task force commissioned to investigate academic fraud at UNC involving college athletes, reflected on the lessons to draw from the case. Lack of clear accountability, or “ownership,” in college sports, failure of faculties to take responsibility for monitoring faculty conduct, and lack of financial transparency in athletics are key problems that must be addressed. The lack of a clear hierarchy and poor supervision is how the UNC scandal occurred.

Another problem at UNC was athletes being accepted who otherwise would not have been considered for admission, coupled with economic demands that now place athletics administrators and football/men’s basketball coaches under sharply increased pressure to win, with the expectation that winning will enhance revenue. Therefore, Malekoff called for more transparency from college athletics programs to their universities.

**COIA’s Position**: COIA wants more transparency from major college athletics programs and more frequent interactions with the faculty governing bodies of those institutions.

**Ted’s Take:** Further reports came out later showing more than 200 phony lecture classes were offered at UNC specifically for athletes (a clear violation of NCAA rules), with student athletes never attending those classes and required to write only one short paper (e.g., a one-paragraph paper was published on the Web) for the course, which was often completed by a tutor. It’s hard to imagine more people didn’t know about this transpiring than UNC admitted or the report found, particularly since UNC has continuously tried to discredit the whistle-blower. More transparency from major college athletics programs on their internal affairs would be ideal, but those procedures would have to be implemented from university presidents.

**How This Affects OkState:** The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is one of the top comprehensive public institutions of higher education in the U.S. It has an undergraduate acceptance rate of 27.6%. Roughly 80-90% of all student-athletes admitted each year at UNC would not have gained admissions without a “special-admit” status offered only for athletes and (to a much lesser extent) for those in the fine arts. Oklahoma State, in contrast, admits 77.6% of all undergraduate applicants, meaning far fewer athletes would need special-admit status or struggle to remain eligible. Oklahoma State athletics also appears to have a clearer reporting structure/hierarchy to handle these types of situations.

**NCAA RESTRUCTURING**

**Jean Frankel**, who helped facilitate the NCAA restructuring process, provided an update on the push for the big 5 BCS conferences (i.e., ACC, Big Ten, Big 12, PAC 12, SEC) to have more autonomy in their governance and actions. She spoke on opportunities for faculty involvement in the governance and policies of the NCAA going forward. The NCAA recognizes the need for input from faculty. Frankel suggested faculty athletics representatives (FAR) and COIA work more jointly together to better serve faculty at BCS-member institutions.

**Kevin Lennon**, vice-president for membership affairs at the NCAA, called for more faculty involvement in the governance of college athletics, but indicated that would need to come more at the institutional level than from the NCAA, which is under increasing pressure to deregulate.

**COIA’s Position**: COIA has long advocated for more faculty involvement throughout the NCAA governance process, ideally for both FAR and COIA reps, but at least for FAR representatives. COIA reps, along with the BCS-member FARS and athletics directors and presidents from BCS schools, all support more autonomy for the Big 5 conferences, so that they can use available funds that smaller schools do not have to better provide for the welfare and well-being of their student-athletes.

**Ted’s Take:** Some preliminary reports of NCAA Division I restructuring came out in media after the COIA meetings, although details will be discussed further this week at the NCAA Board of Directors meetings. The Big 5 conferences will undoubtedly have more autonomy, but how much remains to be seen. Over the weekend, Dennis Dodd of CBS Sports reported:

“*The 65 member institutions of five conferences (ACC, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-12, SEC), along with all other Division I members, envision an effective intercollegiate athletics system that fully meets the needs and expectations of student-athletes in the 21st century.*

*The 65 member institutions are committed to meeting the needs of student-athletes based on increased resources, and they desire to provide student-athletes with enhanced benefits such as full cost of attendance, lifelong learning and additional health and nutritional benefits. In addition, they desire to support student-athletes who are considering careers as professional athletes by providing more opportunities for that decision-making process to occur in a fair and fully informed manner” (Dodd, April 19, 2014)*

**How This Affects OkState:** Oklahoma State will be much better served if the Big 5 conferences have more autonomy. We have the financial means to better provide for our student-athletes, and the likelihood of NCAA violations or scandals occurring will decline if we are able to do so. However, this would not mean paying athletes’ salaries, but rather providing a higher stipend, likely for all scholarship athletes (or at least female athletes, in addition to football and men’s basketball) due to Title IX.

**CONCUSSIONS IN COLLEGE SPORTS**

**Dr. Brian Hainline**, chief medical officer for the NCAA, spoke about NCAA policies and research on sport concussions, focusing on how they affect student-athlete health. Hainline said the NCAA is still studying concussions, adding that there is a lack of longitudinal or definitive research on their long-term effects. His preliminary research shows that football has more total concussions than any other collegiate sport, but that is due to roster size. Women’s field hockey and ice hockey actually have the highest rates of concussions per participant. He also addressed results from the COIA survey of BCS athletics program policies on concussions (completed by the head of sports medicine and/or the head of athletic training), conveying that results indicated testing procedures were mostly appropriate and followed proper protocols recommended by the NCAA.

**COIA’s Position**: COIA believes that student-athlete health is an important issue, which is why this study was undertaken.

**Ted’s Take:** This survey was poorly constructed and veered away from COIA’s mission to monitor academics and college sports. I got a couple of more experienced COIA reps to privately admit this survey was designed to get media attention on a hot topic. During breakout sessions, I – along with several other COIA delegates – expressed concern with the focus of this study. COIA seemingly will return to issues better undertaken by faculty members from a variety of disciplines in the future. The most interesting findings of Hainline’s preliminary NCAA research were that most football concussions occur in practice and that football players are 14 times more likely to suffer a concussion in full-pads practices than shells. Thus, expect more NCAA restrictions on the number of full-contact days in-season, pre-season, and during spring drills in the future.

**How This Affects OkState:** One COIA recommendation makes a lot of sense for Oklahoma State and other universities to implement: ASSA should notify faculty when an athlete suffers a concussion, noting that reoccurring symptoms may occur and how concussions effect athletes’ ability to complete cognitive functions.

**COLLEGE ATHLETICS FINANCES**

**Amy Perko**, executive director of the Knight Commission, presented data showing that athletics budgets were growing much faster than academic spending, on a per student/student-athlete basis. While enhanced media contracts allow a few programs to operate athletics programs in the black, the vast majority of college athletics programs rely on subsidies from general funds and student fees. For a few conferences, media contracts will generate enormous new revenues in coming years, but schools seem already to have designated this money for enlarged athletics expenditures.

**COIA’s Position**: COIA is concerned about significant increases in spending of athletics compared to other ventures at universities. However, many COIA members represent self-sustaining, affluent athletics programs, and thus COIA has not taken any official positions on spending reforms or restrictions.

**Ted’s Take:** Perko presented data that showed television contract revenue for the Big 5 conferences and Notre Dame increased or is projected to increase as follows: 2004=$290M, 2012=$696M, 2015=$1.099B, 2020=(projected) $1.633B. That does not include the BCS/4-team CFB playoff that will increase from $160M in 2012 to $512M in 2015.

The March Madness package for the NCAA Division I men’s basketball tournament was already renegotiated for $10.8B in 2010, providing a huge influx of revenues.

**How This Affects OkState:** We will benefit greatly from the enhanced TV deals for college football and men’s college basketball. The most recent Big 12 TV contract with ESPN and Fox is worth $2.6 billion, and should provide all conference members a minimum of $20 million per year. Many have philosophical problems with the money of these TV contracts, but it enables our athletic department to be self-sufficient and compete at the highest level in all sports.

**NCAA REFORMS?**

**Dr. Allen Sack and Dr. Gerald Gurney**, representing the Drake Group, presented details of an exhaustive list of reforms to be presented to Congress that included an antitrust exemption for the NCAA, limits on coaches’ salaries to $500,000, and a halt to any new athletics facility construction.

**COIA’s Position**: COIA members were highly critical of these reforms, many of which would negatively affect their big-time football and basketball programs. Even more criticism was directed at trying to go through this Congress (which has passed less legislation than any Congress in U.S. history) or trying to include so many reforms in one piece of legislations. COIA is also unsure if the NCAA would try to or even be able to scale back individual athletics programs’ spending if granted an antitrust exemption by Congress. COIA opposes the professionalization of college athletes.

**Ted’s Take:** Coaches like Nick Saban, Bob Stoops, and Mike Gundy would have to take substantial paycuts and OSU’s athletic expansion would be halted immediately. This will never happen. Many of these reforms would be great for small, struggling athletics program, but not the big-time money-makers like Oklahoma State. The Drake Group did present some good reforms (e.g., making all scholarships multi-year instead of 1-year and renewable at the discretion of the institution), but is not cognizant of capitalistic and political realities in proposing radical reform.

**How This Affects OkState:** This type of comprehensive legislation will never pass, especially after the Big 5 receives more autonomy in the NCAA governance restructuring. The Drake Group brings up some good points, but is dis-respected and ineffective when it proposes impractical solutions.

**GOING FORWARD? COIA PLANS FOR 2014-15**

**COIA** approved a new, more-focused, less-critical mission statement at the meetings in Tampa. It now reads:

**Revised Mission Statement Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics**

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is an organization representing elected faculty governance bodies of FBS universities in activities related to the administration and governance of intercollegiate athletics.

**COIA’s mission is to promote the academic integrity of our universities, and to represent the interests of our faculties, non-athlete students and student-athletes in matters related to college sports that can significantly affect the health, sustainability and educational missions of our institutions.**

COIA aims to accomplish these goals by assisting the governance of intercollegiate athletics on our campuses through data collection, information sharing, and the development of best practices, partnering with peer-faculty and other organizations in areas of common interest, and also by providing a constructive, responsible and informed representative faculty voice at the conference and national (NCAA) levels.

**COIA Immediate Foci:** Push for more university senates/faculty councils to appoint an official, continuing SAR (senate athletics representative), who will work jointly with FARs to enhance faculty involvement with athletics, with SARs reporting directly to senates. COIA is also forming a social-media presence to respond quickly to actions after consulting internally with a private email list for COIA representatives.

**Current Research Project:** With the support of Michael Miranda (associate director of NCAA research, who attended the COIA meetings in Tampa), COIA will partner with the NCAA in a project to determine the ways campus athletics governance is practiced among FBS schools: for example, the ways that senates, FARs, campus athletics boards, and athletics departments communicate and divide responsibilities. University of Tulsa’s COIA rep, Dr. Adrien Bouchet, an endowed chair of sports administration, will lead this research effort and work closely with University of Tulsa faculty athletics representative Dr. Christopher Anderson, who was among the FARs to attend the COIA meeting. I told Adrian and COIA co-chair Mike Bowen that I would contribute to the final report.

**Amended by Passed Failed**

**Recommendation No.** 14-05-01-Facutly   1.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Moved by:**  Faculty Committee   2.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

**Title:**  Revisions to P&P 2-0112: Annual Faculty Appraisal and Development Policy

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

Revisions to Policy & Procedure 2-0112 as proposed below be accepted:

**Background and Rationale:**

The changes we propose to 2-0112 mainly reinforce that A&Ds are to be conducted for every faculty member annually based on written standards within each unit, specify that the written standards must align with those established for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and clarify the relationship of 2-0112 with other, established policies.

**Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ANNUAL FACULTY APPRAISAL AND DEVELOPMENT**  **PROGRAM** | **2-0112**  **ACADEMIC**  **AFFAIRS**  **November 2008** |

# POLICY

1.01 A review of faculty activities and accomplishments for the preceding calendar year shall be conducted by the unit administrator every spring for every faculty member, regardless of rank or tenure status. A written report of activities and accomplishments shall be submitted by the faculty member. This report shall include a work and professional development plan. Unit administrators are expected to encourage the professional development of each faculty member.

1.02 Unit administrators shall familiarize each faculty member with the written performance standards established by the faculty members of the unit. The unit administrator shall endeavor to provide an environment conducive to the achievement of expected performance. The unit administrator shall submit a written evaluation that gives detailed descriptions of the faculty member’s accomplishments or deficiencies specifically as they relate to the written performance standards. The faculty member’s written report, together with the unit administrator’s evaluation, shall serve as the supporting documentation for any merit pay raise or other salary adjustment. The completed annual review documentation shall be placed into the permanent record of the faculty member and shall be added to an accumulation of performance documents that shall be used in any further review. A complete set of annual review documents shall be available for any peer committee evaluation, particularly evaluations at the times of reappointment, tenure and promotion. If a major element of performance is judged to be unsatisfactory by the unit administrator, the following steps shall be taken:

1. A detailed written plan for corrective action shall be specified by the unit administrator.

1. If requested by the faculty member, the unit administrator shall obtain appropriate faculty counsel to determine whether the appraisal is justified, and if so, what measures to improve performance are warranted. If the judgment of unsatisfactory performance is not supported by the faculty group, the matter shall be forwarded to the dean for resolution.

# PROCEDURE

2.01 The faculty of each academic unit shall develop and formally approve written performance standards that shall be used as the basis for the annual faculty appraisal and development. These standards must be consistent with those used by the department for establishing the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Changes to the written performance standards require formal approval of the faculty of the academic unit.

2.02 Each spring semester, unit administrators shall initiate the appraisal and development process by distributing the Annual Faculty Appraisal and Development Program Form (attached) and clearly communicate to each faculty member the procedures, guidelines, timetable, and performance standards to be used.

2.03 Upon receipt of the form and information listed in Section 2.02, each faculty member shall provide to the appropriate administrator(s) a written report of his/her activities and accomplishments for the preceding calendar year, and future objectives.Faculty members with split appointments shall submit their report to the unit administrators of all the units in which they have assigned responsibilities. In preparing this report, the faculty member shall adhere to the following:

1. All significant activities and accomplishments for the current appraisal period shall be listed as specified in the Annual Faculty Appraisal and Development Program Form.

1. Outside professional activities listed should follow OSU Policy and Procedure 2-0111, “Procedures to Govern Overload Assignments, Outside Professional Activities, and Other Outside Activities of Faculty Members.”

1. Documentation of activities in each assigned area should be provided.

1. An updated curriculum vitae shall be included to provide an historical context for activities in the current appraisal period.

1. A listing of objectives and planned professional development activities for the coming year shall be included.

2.04 After receiving the written report described in Section 2.03, the unit administrator shall evaluate the professional performance of the faculty member and develop an initial draft of a written statement which describes and supports his/her appraisal. In preparing this draft statement, the unit administrator shall be guided by the following:

1. Each academic unit must have written standards, consistent with those used for establishing the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, against which performance is to be measured. The standards shall reflect the goals of the unit and the professional standards of excellence common to the unit’s academic discipline. The standards also shall be related to the detailed academic qualification standards for each rank, function or specialty within the unit. The unit administrator must base his/her evaluation on these standards and the faculty member’s assigned role in the unit.

1. The appraisal must be a definitive statement of the faculty member’s progress, accomplishments, and/or deficiencies related to objectives and activities during the appraisal period. A restatement of the faculty member’s activities is not adequate. As appropriate, the draft appraisal should include comments on the quality and quantity of performance in the faculty member’s assigned areas of responsibility with respect to the unit standards. This appraisal is not to be used to document or evaluate potential disciplinary actions. Such actions are to be addressed as prescribed in the *Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University* (1.13. Disciplinary Actions).

1. The unit administrator shall ensure that each faculty member has recommended major objectives for the next appraisal period. The unit administrator may recommend additional objectives and planned development activities to be discussed during the appraisal interview.

1. For tenure-track faculty who are not tenured, the unit administrator shall make a specific statement regarding the faculty member’s progress toward tenure based on the written performance standards. Furthermore, the unit administrator should recommend specific modifications in activities, when necessary, that will contribute to a positive tenure decision.

1. If a major element of performance is judged to be unsatisfactory by the unit administrator, a detailed written plan for corrective action shall be provided by the unit administrator.

1. If the faculty member has a split appointment, the draft appraisal statement shall be prepared by the unit administrator of the faculty member’s home department after consulting with unit administrators of other units in which the faculty member has assigned responsibilities. All unit administrators involved shall sign the draft appraisal document. If the involved unit administrators disagree significantly on the evaluation, the matter shall be brought to the attention of the dean of the home department for resolution before the draft is finalized and sent to the faculty member.

2.05 After completion of the initial draft of the written appraisal statement, the unit administrator is to schedule an individual conference to be held in person with each faculty member appraised. The purpose of the conference is to discuss the appraisal and to attempt to resolve any differences between the faculty member and the unit administrator regarding the content and meaning of the written appraisal statement. In scheduling and conducting the conference, the unit administrator and faculty member are to be guided by the following:

1. The unit administrator should provide the faculty member with a copy of the draft of the written appraisal statement at least three (3) working days before the conference is scheduled.

1. If the faculty member wishes to clarify or change any part of the draft statement, he/she should provide the unit administrator with a written statement specifying the requested clarifications or changes at least one (1) working day before the conference is scheduled.

1. During the conference, the unit administrator and faculty member should attempt to make changes in the draft appraisal statement that will make it satisfactory to both parties.

1. Unit administrators shall make special provisions for faculty on leave or otherwise unable to meet in person.

* 1. Following the conference, both the faculty member and unit administrator are to sign the final written appraisal statement including any changes they agreed to make. The faculty member’s signature simply acknowledges that he/she has seen the written statement and has participated in the conference.
  2. If there is a disagreement between the faculty member and the unit administrator over the appraisal statement that is not resolved during the individual conference described in Section 2.05, the faculty member has ten (10) working days after the conference in which to present a written response. The written response shall be included as part of the permanent record of the annual review.

If requested by the faculty member, the unit administrator shall obtain appropriate faculty counsel, as defined in footnote 4 of the *Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University*; to determine whether the appraisal is justified, and if so, what measures to improve performance are warranted. The opinion of that faculty counsel shall be delivered in writing to the unit administrator and faculty member within 10 working days of the initial request from the faculty member.

If a disagreement between the faculty member and the unit administrator is not resolved subsequent to the faculty member’s written response and/or faculty counsel, the unit administrator must alert the dean within five (5) working days. The dean must resolve the matter and respond in writing within 20 working days to the unit administrator with a copy to the faculty member.

* 1. The faculty member’s written report of activities and accomplishments together with the final written evaluation shall serve as the supporting documentation for any merit pay raise or other salary adjustment.
  2. All documents and records relating to each faculty member’s annual review are to be placed in that faculty member’s personnel file. These records shall be available to faculty charged with the responsibility of providing appropriate faculty counsel related to reappointment of untenured faculty, promotion of untenured and tenured faculty, granting of tenure, and cumulative review of tenured faculty.

Approved:

Faculty Council, December 12, 2006

Council of Deans, January 11, 2007

Executive Team, December 2007

Form Modified, November 2008

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**ANNUAL FACULTY APPRAISAL AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FORM**

**Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Period covered by evaluation \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Faculty rank \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Percent effort for: Teaching \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Research/Scholarship \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Outreach \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Clinical \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Administrative \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Please provide on separate sheets an accurate and complete profile of your activities and accomplishments during the appraisal period. Long-term activities should include an indication of progress made during the period for which this appraisal is intended. List objectives for teaching, research, and/or outreach, as well as professional development activities for the next appraisal period. For each major area of responsibility that applies, provide the requested information and add additional comments that are relevant. A current vita should be attached to this document.

**TEACHING ACTIVITIES:**

Describe any of the following in which you were involved; do not list courses taught, since they are listed on another sheet:

1. Course revisions or new course offerings.
2. Instructional materials, textbook, laboratory manual, other publications.
3. Advising students or supervision of laboratory assistants.
4. Involvement in Honors, interdisciplinary academic programs and/or Scholar Development.
5. Participation in assessment of student learning outcomes

**RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:**

List the following in which you were involved:

1. Funded research projects (source, amounts, duration).
2. Proposals submitted (source, amount requested, duration) and status.
3. Publications (give citations for journal articles, books, abstracts).
4. Presentations at professional meetings (title, location, date).
5. Graduate theses for which you were advisor.
6. Technology transfer activities (disclosures, patents, licenses, other entrepreneurial activities).
7. Other creative activities.

**OUTREACH ACTIVITIES:**

Outline your primary duties as assigned for your position, and describe any of the following in which you were involved:

1. Programs developed or revised.
2. Extension grants received.
3. Publications authored (e.g., fact sheets, manuals, AV materials).
4. Courses or conferences organized.
5. Cooperative and other extension activities.
6. International activities.

**CLINICAL ACTIVITIES:**

Outline primary duties as assigned for your position.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES:**

Outline primary duties as assigned for your position.

**PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:**

List the following in which you were involved:

1. Committees (departmental, college, and university levels).
2. Service in professional organizations (e.g., offices held, committee assignments, papers reviewed).
3. Consulting services.
4. Professional development activities.

**AWARDS AND HONORS:**

**SIGNATURES:**

Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unit Administrator \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Dean \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_