Krehbiel called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ahrberg, Avakian, Barnes, Bartels, Chung, Clarke, Cornell, Dare, DeSilva, Emerson, Fisher, Grafton, Harris, Holcomb, Holyoak, Kennison, Materer, Meek, Miller, Schestokat, Scott, Smay, Taylor, Verchot and Veenstra.

Also present: Alexander, K., Ausman, K., Bird, L., Campbell, C., Fry, P., Gililland, J., Hargis, B., Lewis, D., Martindale, A., Miller, B., Richardson, T., Shutt, G., Simpson, J., Sternberg, R., and Weaver, J.

Absent: Atekwana, Damron, Lovern, VanOverbeke and Yellin.

HIGHLIGHTS

Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations
Remarks and Comments from the President
Remember the 10
Reports of Standing Committees
Academic Standards and Policies
Recommendation
Athletics
Budget
Campus Facilities, Safety and Security
Faculty
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology
Research
Retirement and Fringe Benefits
Rules and Procedures
Student Affairs and Learning Resources
Reports of Liaison Representatives
GPSGA
A&S Faculty Council

Clint Krehbiel called the meeting to order and asked for a roll call. Krehbiel asked for approval of the March 13, 2012 minutes. Reed Holyoak moved and Ed Harris seconded to approve the minutes. Motion passed.

Krehbiel asked for approval of the April 10, 2012 agenda noting the change to move Provost Sternberg to the beginning of the meeting. Udaya DeSilva moved and Ed Harris seconded to approve the modified agenda. Motion passed.

Report of Status of Council Recommendations:

Provost Sternberg thanked the Council for moving him up in the agenda. He will be attending the talk of the third candidate for the A&D Dean position. Two candidates have given talks so far. There will be a fourth candidate talk next week. They will then move to conclude the search process. If all goes well the search will be concluded this month. This will conclude all the active searches for Deans and all the positions will have been filled. The one new search is for the Dean of DASNR. Mike Woods has been appointed as the interim Dean. Nominations are now being taken for members of a search committee. The search should be started shortly.

In other news, a task force has been formed to consider what the process would be if OSU were to go ACT optional. This would be for the two options that currently do not even require the ACT which is admissions by high school record only or admissions in the holistic category. These are options 2 and 4. These two categories do not actually require the ACT but OSU makes potential students take the ACT. This task force will look into this issue as well as the issue of placement testing. This task force is now complete and will start meeting shortly.

OSU has made it to the final steps of getting a Phi Beta Kappa chapter. A group will be attending the last meeting this summer. Roger Blais, the Provost at the University of Tulsa, will be speaking for OSU because of the rule not allowing a university to speak for itself.

Provost Sternberg gave a talk at the accreditation agency, the Higher Learning Commission, which was focused on OSU's initiatives in terms of admissions, instruction and assessment. Sternberg felt there was a lot of enthusiasm for what OSU is doing. He received over 100 requests for the talk. He believes that people are very excited about the things that are happening at OSU.

Provost Sternberg gave the status of the following recommendations:

11-12-01- FAC: Revision to OSU Attendance Policy

Pending – Revisions under review by Student Academic Services

Directors and Instruction Council (Associate Deans).

12-01-01-Research: Institutional Radiation Safety Policy

Pending – Proposed policy has been approved by the College Research Directors and will be submitted to the Council of Deans for consideration

at their April 12th meeting.

12-02-01-ASP: Veterinary Research Scholars

Pending – Proposed designation is pending review by Instruction Council

and the Council of Deans.

Remarks and Comments from President Hargis:

President Hargis stated that there is some positive news in terms of the economy and therefore the revenues. There are some negatives as well which are natural gas prices that are at historic lows. There are also talks at the Capitol of cutting income tax. But he expects a flat budget which is actually a cut because of mandatory increases that need to be dealt with. Enrollment will

soften this some. This is all speculation. Hargis is going to the Capitol on Thursday with OU's President Boren. They will be talking to leadership and legislatures.

Hargis explained the master lease program. It is a streamline way to do bond issues without having to do a separate bond for certain items. Normally you would have to go to the legislature. They would have to approve the bond. The Master Lease is an overall bond issue. This allows universities to access the funds with approved projects. You would write a letter, it is reviewed and unless there are objections the project is approved. This really streamlines the process. It cuts down on time and expenses. OSU has a number of projects that they would like to re-fund (refinance) – the Colvin Center, equipment and other capital type projects. There have been some questions regarding the constitutionality of this process that has been sent to the attorney general.

\$168 million has been raised for the Endowed Chairs program with \$20 million already in the queue. The total raised over the years since the program was authorized by Henry Bellmon is \$60 million. OU has raised about \$250 million (with \$90 million in the queue) through this period since June of 2008. There was a bond issue of \$100 million in 2009 or 2012, OU got \$47 million, OSU got \$47 million and the regional schools split the balance. There has been nothing since this time. Administration is hoping to persuade the legislature that this promise needs to be kept. These funds were solicited with the understanding that the state would match the amount. The dollars that have been committed can be pulled out. Hargis feels that there is a real sense that the legislatures want to deal with this issue in some way. They won't do it all (about \$279 million) at once. Hargis feels the legislatures understand the situation and they need to honor their commitment. It's a tough thing to do in this budget year but Hargis and Boren have given them some creative and legal ideas.

OSU continues to raise funds. Hargis stated that Malone Mitchell just pledged another \$7 million to the Business Building. Hargis also stated that progress is being made on the new performing arts center and art museum. Hargis feels these two projects were positive in the Phi Beta Kappa discussions.

Barbara Miller asked that in view of the fact that the money has not been released from the state to this point, how is OSU handling the endowed chairs that have been created. Is money being pulled out of other pots? Hargis stated that a good deal of the endowed chairs have not been awarded because the funds have been underwater. You don't spend underwater endowments without the consent of the donor. Some donors have approved spending, but others have not. For example, Chesapeake and Devon went together on a chair and they are spending out of the fund. The markets have recovered enough that the fund are just about whole with a few exceptions. Hargis stated that chairs in Oklahoma are not expensive enough. If you have \$1 million, it only produces \$50,000 a year. You can't hire anyone for this amount. Hargis feels you need at least \$3 million per chair. Hopefully the money will come in from the state, the market will cooperate and the shares will be whole to start allocating money. By the way, OSU doesn't get the state money. The state money goes to the state Regents and then they distribute 5% of this money annually. DeSilva asked if there were plans to release the held up fellowships once the fund reaches liquidity or wait until it accumulates some money. Hargis stated that they could go ahead even without the state money and just add it later. But Hargis doesn't believe this has been done

much in the past. Sternberg stated that they have been trying to get the Deans to award the chairs. Administration has met with the deans to encourage them not to hold chairs back but rather to warrant the chairs with the understanding that when the endowments are underwater there may not be large amounts (or in some cases any amount) of extra money associated with the chair. Sternberg stated that the reason for this normally the deans try to hire someone new because this could be an incentive to bring someone new to OSU. The position administration is taking is that there are a lot of good people already at OSU who could be given these chairs. It doesn't make sense from a donor relations standpoint to hold back because the donors feel like they have given money and the money is just sitting there which is not what they gave the money for. It doesn't make sense from a faculty point of view because there if there are faculty who are qualified for the chair you award it. The chair shouldn't be used as only an incentive to hire outside people. All of the deans have provided a plan for utilizing the chairs and this is moving forward. In some cases there will not be extra stipends that they would receive in a better situation. Ken Bartels asked if there has been any progress in how the recipients of the chairs stay in contact with the donors. This is the most effective way to let the donors know just what has been done with their money. Hargis feels it is critical to speak with the donor though this is not required. The donors are giving to the academic mission and the more they know about how the money has been spent the more they will likely give in the future. If you are holding a chair you should stay in touch with the donor. The donors appreciate hearing from faculty.

Hargis wanted to encourage as many faculty as possible to attend their college commencements. There are a few colleges who have a tremendous turnout while others not so good. Please encourage your colleagues to attend the ceremony. Part of Hargis's announcement is to thank the faculty and ask them to stand. When only 4 or 5 stand it's awkward.

Clint Krehbiel thanked President Hargis and Provost Sternberg for all that they do for OSU and the faculty.

Special Report:

A. Kerry Alexander/Dr. Trevor Richardson – Remember the 10

Kerry Alexander thanked the council for the time to talk and introduced Trevor Richardson who is the Coordinator of Student Counseling Services at OSU. The Remember the 10 Run has been a surprise to all those who run it. Originally they were hoping to turn the energy of those who felt so strongly about the 10 men who were lost in the plane crash 11 years ago into something positive. If everything went really well they were hoping for 300 to 500 participants/runners, host the event for a few years and see how things went. That's not what happened. The success of the run reflects so well on the Stillwater community, OSU and the Alumni base. To bring the council up to date, over the last 5 years (the 6th annual run is 11 days away on Saturday, April 21st) the committee has be able to give \$100,000 to OSU counseling. A scholarship has also been started that will be announced this year. Last year almost 2,000 runners participated. The run has gone from the first year of around 800 to 1,400 to 2,000. The 2011 run was the 10 year anniversary. The 2012 run is currently ahead of pace as far as the number of runners

participating. Kerry then turned it over to Trevor Richardson to discuss the funds that have been raised and how they have been used. Richardson stated that when the accident happened he was in his first year of counseling at OSU. He was in a master's program in community counseling at OSU. He was a transplant from Iowa who thought he would be here a few years and then move on. The accident was a very pivotal moment which showed him a real sense of community and it is the reason why he is still here working at OSU. Unfortunately there has been another tragedy this fall. Due to the funds that have been raised, the counseling center has been able to develop a very extensive library of materials associated with grief for students. Staff has been able to attend group training sessions in Colorado in specific trauma work. One of the counselors has been certified as a grief specialist. Basically the center was prepared for the plane crash in November. Richardson hopes to never have to do this again. The center also helps students who have lost a parent, loved one or significant other. The Remember the 10 Run has provided extra resources to help so many. Going forward from this year there will be scholarships provided. The goal is to give 10 - \$1,000 scholarships to students either in the PhD in Counseling Psychology with a Masters in Community Counseling, the PhD in Clinical Psychology or the Urgent Family Program. Basically students in graduate programs working toward a counseling degree. For the first time this year and hopefully continuing on into the future the Run has provided funding for a graduate assistant position. This graduate student has been getting specialty training in grief. A second session of a grief has seen the Remember the Ten memorial at Gallagher-Iba Arena as well as the banners around campus. If you don't want to run volunteer in some manner.

Alexander stated that there is tremendous support on and off the OSU campus. He also would like help spreading the word about this years run. He handed out the following information about the run. The specific mission is always to remember and celebrate the lives of the 10 who were lost but the indirect message is that if you send your student to OSU we'll take care of them. The funds that are given to counseling are there for a back stop if students run into even the smallest issue. Alexander asked everyone present to send out an email to their distribution lists announcing the run. Alexander encouraged everyone to come out and run or volunteer. Bob Avakian asked if there were any plans to expand to the branch campuses. Alexander stated that they had talked about ways to promote everyone coming to Stillwater. The committee is in talks right now with the Tulsa Alumni base. The committee does not want to have another event on the same day but they are looking at ways to integrate them and play a greater role. President Hargis thanked Kerry Alexander for all his hard work starting this run.

6th Annual Remember the Ten Run - Saturday April 21, 2012

Details

- OSU Stillwater Campus SE corner of Gallagher-Iba Arena
- · Begins at 9 a.m.
- Cost for runners -- \$25 online until 5 p.m. on April 20 at 5 p.m. and until 8 p.m. at Memorial Lobby GIA; \$30 on race day

Beneficiary -- University Counseling Services

The registration fees, contributions, and sponsorships of the Remember the Ten Run support both the coordination and expenses of the annual run and also the work of OSU Counseling Services. UCS assists many students, faculty, and staff as they deal with grief and depression. \$100,000 has been donated to OSU Counseling Services to date.

Remember the Ten Run Scholarship

This year, the Remember the Ten Run Steering Committee announced the creation of the Remember the Ten Run Scholarship. The scholarship provides support to OSU Masters and Doctoral students enrolled in one of the following degree specialities: Clinical Psychology, Counseling Psychology, Community Counseling, and Marriage and Family Therapy. Recipients will receive a \$1,000 cash scholarship with \$500 being awarded in the Fall and Spring semesters. Ultimately, the Steering Committee hopes to be able to fully endow ten Counseling scholarships.



REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICIES – Ed Harris – Update

Harris stated that the committee has two updates to report. One is to modify OSU Academic Regulation 3.4 by deleting the lower division restriction phrase. The other is a report by the Academic Alert task force on data collected on the Academic Alert System.

Concerning Academic Regulation 3.4, this is part of a larger process to examine and verify degree requirements. Harris spoke with Celeste Campbell prior to today's meeting and Campbell stated that this is one of a series of about 5 more policies that the committee will see. Harris stated that regarding the Academic Regulation 3.4 – at least one course in each of the 4 areas must come from the approved lower division course list. This was brought to the Registrars attention and the question arose as to how it even got into existence. Some degree sheets in colleges require this, some do not and the policy has not been consistently applied across campus. The recommendation has not only been to the AS&P committee but also the General Education Advisory Council, Student Academic Services Directors and Instructional Council. There is a unanimous decision that there really is no compelling reason or any reason why this clause is in the policy. Harris asked for Faculty Council to consider this issue and move it forward to the next level. Krehbiel asked for discussion or questions. Ken Bartels asked Harris to read item C with the deletion. Harris stated that item C stated that at least 6 semester credit hours in each of the approved general education designated areas of analytical and quantitative thought (A. Humanities (H), Natural Sciences (N) and Social and Behavioral Sciences (S) and at least 3 hours of analytical and quantitative thought (A. must be earned in a general education math course). Bob Miller stated that if the parenthesis is left in then the "and" should be deleted. But if the parenthesis is deleted then the "and" should stay in. Bartels wanted to make sure it was understood. It was decided to leave as presented. Harris stated that through the course of various committee reviews so it's a parenthetical comment so the "and" was added when he was verbally stating item C. Celeste Campbell stated that it is correct as written. Motion passed.

Barb Miller asked if the task force for general education is separate from this discussion. Krehbiel stated that yes that is a separate task force.

Harris asked Celeste Campbell and Amy Martindale to update the Council on the Academic Alert System data. Campbell stated that the entire task force consist of Pam Fry, Ed Harris, herself and Amy Martindale. Campbell distributed the following Executive Summary sheet to the council members.

Executive Summary

OSU Academic Alert Fall 2011 Pilot: Use of the Alert System and Instructor and Advisor Perceptions

Prepared by the Academic Alert Task Force¹, March 27, 2012

Purpose of the Academic Alert System

The Academic Alert System was developed as a communication tool to facilitate undergraduate retention and success. Instructors use the system to voluntarily report concerns about the attendance and academic performance of the students in their classes. This resource is available during the first 12 weeks of the semester and uses the same online Faculty/Advisor Self Service (SIS) that is used to report grades. The alert generates an email message to the student and provides information to the student's advisor. Students are asked to contact their instructors to discuss ways to improve and to contact their academic advisors to obtain help with developing a plan for success. Academic advisors are expected to initiate contact with students identified by the alert to provide advising assistance and appropriate referrals to tutoring services, career counseling, personal counseling, the Learning and Student Success Opportunity Center (LASSO), and other campus resources.

Use of the Academic Alert System during the Fall 2011 Pilot Semester

During the pilot semester 5,876 alerts were reported (3,362 by instructors and 2,514 by advisors in response to the instructor alerts). Approximately 30% of the undergraduate instructors submitted alerts for 2,149 unique students (43% freshmen, 22% sophomores, 19% juniors, and 16% seniors). Students from the College of Arts and Sciences received the most alerts, followed by the College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology and students advised in the LASSO Center. A total of 201 academic advisors received alerts for the students they advise. The average number of alerts per academic advisor was 17.2, and the median was 5.

Perceptions from Instructors

The 408 instructors who used the Academic Alert System were asked to respond to an online survey regarding the system, and 157 completed surveys were received (a 38.5% response rate). Approximately 75% of the instructors rated their satisfaction with the Academic Alert system as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, where 1 = not satisfied and 5 = very satisfied (mean 3.90). The vast majority of the responses favored retaining the current alert categories: attendance, poor quality work, missing work, cannot pass with remaining coursework, and instructor comments. Approximately 75% of the respondents reported improvement in at least some students. When asked whether they detected *significant* improvement, the percent decreased to approximately 45. One of the themes that emerged from the open-ended instructor comments is summarized by the following: "I think that it is a good idea, but the follow up done by the advisors needs to be a little more robust. In cases where I submitted something through the academic alert system the advisor only sent an email. This is not sufficient. I can (and do) send emails to students that are struggling. I need the advisor to meet with the student and discuss the problem and then I would like to receive a report, either from the student or from the advisor." See the instructor survey report for more complete results.

Perceptions from Advisors

Of the 189 academic advisors who received alerts and were still employed at OSU during the spring term, 89 completed an online Academic Alert survey (a 47.1% response rate). Sixty-three percent of the advisors indicated they were "strongly satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the Academic Alert System. Most favored retaining the existing alert categories. Approximately 70% reported using email as their first attempt to contact a student following an alert. Nearly 60% reported successfully contacting at least 60% of their advisees who received alerts. Almost two-thirds of the advisors used SIS to record responses to at least 60% of their alerts, which allowed the advisor feedback to be viewed by the instructor. Twenty-eight percent observed significant improvement in at least some students, with 59% observing some improvement in at least some students. Open-ended advisor comments varied, but themes included a need for more student accountability, the burden of time for advisors to respond to alerts, students' lack of response to advisor contacts, desired improvement for the ease of system use, and need for more accurate student contact information. See the advisor survey report for more complete results.

Perceptions from Students

During the Spring 2012 term, a survey is planned to evaluate from the student perspective the effectiveness of the system and how it can be improved.

¹ Academic Alert Task Force Members: K. Celeste Campbell, University Registrar; Pamela Fry, Associate Provost; Ed Harris, Professor, Educational Studies, and Academic Standards and Policies Committee Chair; Amy Martindale, Director, Arts and Sciences Academic Student Services

Campbell stated that this executive summary along with the reports of the surveys are available online at the Faculty Council website under Academic Standards and Policies link if anyone would like to take a closer look at the details. To recap the Academic Alert System it is a communication tool to facilitate instructors providing information to students directly and to their advisors where there are concerns about the students' academic performance or attendance in a course. This system was piloted in the fall and continued into the spring semester. The focus of this report is on the fall semester. Campbell mentioned that the Registrar's office is also surveying students who received Academic Alerts during the spring semester. The first notification went out today to students who received an alert this semester to get feedback from them. Campbell stated that there were approximately 3,300 alerts submitted by instructors during the fall semester. These pertained to about 2,100 unique students. This constitutes about 30% of the undergraduate instructors. Most of the alerts were submitted regarding freshman (43%), sophomores (22%), junior (19%) and seniors (16%). The academic advisors were given approximately 200 alerts/information about their students and asked to respond. This is an average of about 17 alerts per academic advisor for the entire semester. The instructor survey was an online survey. 400 instructors who submitted alerts were asked to give their feedback about the system. Campbell's office received 157 responses which is about a 38% response rate. Most of the instructors expressed satisfaction with the system. About 75% of the instructors reported that after they sent an alert they saw at least some improvement in some students. When asked if they saw a significant improvement, that percent decreased to 45%. The instructors were asked some open ended questions as well and one of the things that emerged is some of the instructors expressed concern about the closing of the loop of communication with the advisors. When an academic alert is submitted by an instructor it automatically generates an email to the student first stating the faculty member, what the concern was and to contact the advisor. Notice also goes to the advisor. There is an expectation that the advisor will try to contact the student to follow up. The advisor can then go back into the system and report or comment on the advisors interaction with the student. Campbell stated that when the task force examined the individual responses from the faculty members, they immediately tried to learn from these responses and see what changes can could be made before the spring semester started. Some of these include: addition of help screens on the faculty SIS Academic Alert system and help prompts on what to do with online classes if the instructor is asked to report attendance. Some faculty were concerned about releasing student performance information to advisors whether this violated FERPA. Campbell added information to the prompts that the advisors receiving the information about a particular student are their advisors. Information is still being provided to only those people who have a legitimate educational interest in the individual student. So there are no FERPA violations.

Martindale stated that the task force conducted an advisor survey this spring semester but it was regarding the fall semesters pilot. Of the 200 or so advisors who received alerts during the fall, 189 of them are still currently employed at OSU by the time the survey was started. There was a 47% response rate from those advisors. In general, the quantitative indicators showed a lot of support from the advisors but the comments in the open ended questions were less favorable. The task force discovered that about 70% of the advisors initial attempt to contact a student was done via email. This was not what the task force had hoped for. They were hoping for phone follow up and are working to encourage this type of contact with students. The advisors indicated that they

responded to about 60% of the alerts that they received. The data in the usage summary which is available on the Faculty Council website goes into more detail. This data however does not include students who withdrew from the class. One of the themes from the open ended comments from the advisors stated that students really need to be more responsible for themselves. With the underlying theme being some advisors resented the need to contact the students to follow up on the alerts. Other comments were about accuracy of phone contact information in SIS for students. Martindale stated that students are prompted every 90 days to update their mailing address but not their phone number. Advisors following up on academic alerts were not sending snail mail. The task force realizes that there needs to be a better way to get students to update their phone numbers. The task force will be looking at integrating the academic alert system into the grades first system. This will be an academic advising online system that will basically replace paper files for academic advising on campus. This system has been through the bidding process and the last report that Martindale received was that it was in the contracting process and she is hoping that this will be implemented in the fall. This will allow advisors to keep basically online records of students rather than putting them into paper files. This has been through Campbell's office to verify that this is all FERPA compliant. Martindale stated that the task force is hoping to integrate the Academic Alert system into this online advising system so that an advisor could type a note once that would be a response back to the student as well as faculty member about what took place. Martindale stressed that the task force would like to maintain that the instructor entry system remains as is as part of the faculty web SIS. This will continue to allow instructors to access the system using a system that they are familiar with. This is the same place faculty members go to download class roster and input grades. The goal is to not have faculty members have to learn yet another system that is not being used for another purpose. Joe Weaver asked who was responsible for negotiating the contract. Martindale stated that it went through standard purchasing process. Martindale also mentioned that she will be chairing a task force on academic advising and they are hoping to have a Faculty Council representative on this task force. Once Martindale has a Faculty Council representative she will be looking for a department head representative. This will complete the task force and she would like to have it completed as soon as possible. Clint asked Martindale to send him an email.

Dr. Lee Bird asked of those who indicated a problem is there an indication of the number of students who withdrew from the class. Campbell stated that one of the indicators that the instructors could mark is "cannot pass the class". The task force did take a look at the students who received this type of alert and in those particular classes the rate of withdrawal of these students was that 70% withdrew. One made an A, one made a B, a few made Cs. In general 70% withdrew and 30% got Fs.

DeSilva asked if the new system will be in place this fall. Campbell responded they are hoping that the Grades First Academic Advising system will be in place for the fall depending on purchasing delays. The system may be in place for some colleges and not others by fall. A roll out is being planned for those colleges that will be ready to go in the fall. Dr. Pam Fry stated that the director of student academic services has been involved in this process and 3 units – Human Sciences, Engineering and Academic Advising, have used an early version of this system. DeSilva asked if grad checks can also be done on this system. Martindale did not know if the system will be capable of performing grad checks, but a grad check could be stored on the

system in the student's record. Martindale stated that A&S is working towards electronic storage of their grad checks and they are hoping to store them on the new system. DeSilva said a complaint with the current system is that it is pretty archaic the way you leave feedback as an advisor and it's not very user friendly. Martindale agreed that the current system is functional but clunky. This is why they are hoping to upgrade the system.

Krehbiel asked for a motion and second from the floor to accept the report. Holyoak moved and DeSilva seconded. Motion passed.

ATHLECTICS - Steve Damron - No Report

BUDGET - Rodney Holcomb - No Report

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY - Robert Emerson - No Report

FACULTY - Shelia Kennison - Update

Kennison stated that at the last meeting the committee circulated a draft recommendation relating to RPT letters. The committee is continuing to review the legal issues surrounding this issue and consulting with the Provost and Scott Fern. There is nothing new today on this issue.

The committee is working on the grievance procedure, Appendix E and should have a recommendation at the next meeting.

The committee is also working on the policies for Clinical and Research Professors.

Krehbiel would like to commend the Faculty committee for working very hard on the external review letter issue. The whole idea of confidentiality of letters because of the state law and the potential legal implications has not been easy to unfold and they have done a tremendous job. Holyoak asked if it would be next month before the councilors will discuss the feedback they have received from colleagues. Krehbiel stated that yes this is the case and that there may be some changes to the recommendation coming forward.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING and INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY – Nick Materer – Update

Materer stated that the task force for video tapping of lectures has had 2 meeting. A 3rd meeting is scheduled for late April. Hopefully there will be a phase one report for Faculty Council next month.

RESEARCH – Jim Smay – No Report

RETIREMENT and FRINGE BENEFITS - Stephen Clarke - No Report

RULES and PROCEDURES – Bob Avakian – Update

Avakian announced the election results as follows:

Vice Chair – Shelia Kennison, Psychology
CASNR – 3 year terms – Carol Jones, Biosystems and Yanqi Wu, Plant & Soil Sciences
1 year term – Nathan Walker, Entomology & Plant Pathology
A & S – Karen McBee, Zoology; Barney Luttbeg, Zoology and Melanie Page, Psychology
CEAT – Gary Young, Mechanical & Aero-space Engineering
Education – Georgette Yetter, Applied Health
Library – Victor Baeza, Graduate and Research Services
Multi-cultural – Chanjin Chun, Ag Economics

Avakian congratulated all new Faculty Council members and all those who participated in the election.

Krehbiel stated that the new councilors will be invited and introduced at the May meeting. Bartels asked how many votes were cast/how many faculty participated. DeSilva reviewed the numbers on the last day of voting and the vice chair had approximately 380 votes counted. The number of participating faculty varies college to college. Krehbiel asked the councilors to encourage faculty colleagues to become involved because there will be calls for members for standing committees in the near future.

STUDENT AFFAIRS and LEARNING RESOURCES – Bob Miller – No Report

Report of Liaison Representatives:

GPSGA – Jeff Simpson

Simpson highlighted a few events happening next week for Graduate Education week. This is the first time that GPSGA and the Grad College have partnered for this event. Traditionally there have been events specifically for students to show appreciation for their efforts at the university, the GPSGA and Grad College have added a few things that are of particular focus for faculty and staff. Next week is Graduate Education week and all the following events are listed on the Graduate College website. On Monday at 3:30 is a session on graduate education assessment. This will be looking at the tools for tracking student progress and learning through graduate free programs. Tuesday is "How to write a graduate certificate". This is at 2:30. Wednesday at 3:30 is "What we know about PhD completion" and "effective interventions". This is a talk by Dean Tucker in which she will be presenting some information from the Council of Graduate schools. Thursday will be the Phoenix Awards. The graduate research awards will also be presented at this time this year. These are normally done at the graduation ceremony but will be done in conjunction with the Phoenix Award ceremony. Friday a new event has been added. It is an event for graduate coordinator appreciation. Two new awards have been created for this event. One is for graduate coordinator and one for staff support (graduate support) person. These applications and nominations can be turned in until the end of this week. Simpson will introduce the new GPSGA president at the May meeting.

A&S Faculty Council – Kevin Ausman

Ausman stated that the A&S Faculty Council has become aware of and are somewhat concerned about a new dual enrollment program that is being run by Tulsa Community College. The A&S Faculty Council is particularly concerned about it because of the impact it will have on OSU students due to transfer credits associated with this particular program. This is not an issue that is restricted to A&S so it was determined that the issue should be brought to the attention of the university wide Faculty Council to see if anything should be done with respect to this issue and what that should be.

This program in particular, called the EXCELerate program, is a pilot program that is due to end this fall and decisions on whether or not it will continue in some form will be made around the same time. There is a final report that is due to the state regents in February of 2013. If any input is to be provided it should be done prior to this date. This is a dual enrollment program sometimes called concurrent enrollment. Such programs exist in a lot of places but this particular program has some key differences. First of all the classes in question are taking place in the high schools themselves. Secondly the program as written allows for these classes to be taught by high school teachers providing those teachers have met the qualifying requirements for being a TCC instructor. Thirdly, the admissions and continuations requirements for participating in this program were reduced from the standards that the regents already had in place. So what we basically have in this case are classes being taught on a high school campus by high school teachers for high school credit to a class entirely of high school students with significantly reduced admissions requirements. These high school students are now getting Tulsa Community College credit that is listed on their transcript in no way identifying it as being from this pilot program. These credits are accepted automatically as transfer credits to any state university. This issue raised some concerns and the A&S Faculty Council has been trying to figure out the best approach to deal with these concerns. The A&S Faculty Council had visitors at the last few meetings to try to gather more information. Two of these visitors were Libby Ray the Assistant Director for Undergraduate Admissions and Pam Fry Associate Provost and Senior Vice President for Undergraduate Education who offered their perspectives on this issue. They offered as much information as they could but the A&S Faculty Councils concerned remained so we are bringing it before the general Faculty Council in the hopes that it will be discussed or handed to the appropriate committee for further review.

Ausman handed out the following letter which highlights the EXCELerate Program the A&S Faculty Council concerns.

April 4, 2012

Dear Members of the University Faculty Council:

The Arts & Sciences Faculty Council (ASFC) wishes to call the University Faculty Council's attention to a Tulsa Community College (TCC) pilot dual enrollment program, known as EXCELerate, which has been offered from the fall of 2010 through the fall of 2012. This program allows high school students to simultaneously earn high school credit and TCC credit, the latter of which automatically qualifies as accepted transfer credit to all state colleges and universities in Oklahoma, including Oklahoma State University (OSU). Although this dual enrollment program shares many features with similar dual or concurrent enrollment programs around the state, there are several unique characteristics of this particular program that have raised serious concerns among the ASFC. These are:

- 1. In contrast to other programs that accept high school students who qualify for college courses on college campuses, EXCELerate classes are offered on the students' high school campuses to classes that consist entirely of high school students.
- 2. The EXCELerate program allows classes to be taught by high school teachers rather than TCC college instructors, as long as the teachers meet TCC faculty qualifications requirements, primarily consisting of fifteen hours of graduate credit in their discipline.
- 3. The admissions and continuations requirements to the EXCELerate program are reduced from the standard State Regents' policies for concurrent enrollment (e.g., ACT of 19 and GPA of 2.5, and dual enrollment allowed to continue under academic probation for students with GPA below 2.0).

We are concerned that unless high school students are merged with and exposed to a college or university environment, the students may "taste" college experience—as promised by the TCC website—but they will not have the intellectual experience, let alone transformation, that a college education is supposed to provide. Further, while we recognize the continuity between secondary and higher education and greatly respect our co-educators working in high schools, we also acknowledge that the two stages of education pose different requirements in training, skills, and work habits. It is doubtful that courses taught on high school campuses, by high school teachers, for high school credit (in order to graduate from high school), and attended only by high school students with significantly reduced admissions requirements could deliver the college education that the program promises and parents expect.

Our most serious concern is this program's probable impacts on the students and on the institutions of higher education involved. Allowing these students to enter college directly at the junior level without appropriate preparation will likely deprive them of the college education that they deserve, reduce their prospects for success, and simultaneously lower the standards and reputations of the colleges and universities that receive graduates from this program.

The EXCELerate pilot program is due to end in fall 2012, and a report on it is due February 2013. We therefore recommend that the University Faculty Council or one of its relevant standing committees evaluate the likely effects of the EXCELerate program on students admitted to OSU, and determine whether OSU Faculty Council input should be provided to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education before they begin evaluating the success of the pilot program.

Yours Sincerely

Art and Sciences Faculty Council

He also has more information that he will be happy to share with the person or persons on whichever committee is asked to review the information. Krehbiel asked for questions. Bartels asked how the A&S Faculty Council understands this issue, how many credit hours could be earned by the high school student in this program. Ausman stated that the material that they reviewed, which he did not remember if this was in the proposal stage or at the implementation stage, the student could earn up to 2 full years of college credit. Whether this was implemented or the norm of how the program was done is a completely different question and they do not have any statistics on what has actually happened. Bartels stated that in essence they can go to high school and graduate from TCC the day they graduate from high school. What the A&S Faculty Council understood from the undergraduate admissions office they have no way to identify that these students went through the EXCELerate Program rather than actually attend classes at TCC campus. Avakian stated that you need to watch this carefully. OSU IT has had cases where their courses have not been transferred to OSU Stillwater. Ausman explained that since this is a pilot program it was designed to end this fall semester there is a data acquisition and recording process that will be going over this program to evaluate its successes and failures. The A&S Faculty Council is not sufficiently plug in to know exactly what the time frame for this process is. This is one of the reasons why they wanted to bring this issue to the general Faculty Council at this time. If there is a Faculty Council consensus on this issue then that can be presented to the state Board of Regents when this evaluation is happening. Ausman stated that the regents are the ones who made the initial policy exemptions that allowed this pilot program to take place in the first place. Ausman does have the original policy exemptions for the committee. Dan Fisher asked who would be developing the matrix to assess the success of the program. Ausman does not know. Fisher stated that in mechanical engineering they have a lot of trouble with TCC students who are ill prepared in mathematics and other areas. If this is not part of the analysis, whether they can actually complete the program successful here at OSU then it's troublesome. Ausman shares Fishers concerns. Ausman is not representing the TCC program at this meeting and he does not know all the ins and outs of the program and how the matrix are supposed to work. But given the short time frame the A&S Faculty Council thought it would be better to turn the matter over to a general Faculty Committee to gather the appropriate information and move forward. Kemit Grafton echoed Avakians concerns with credits transferring from OSU-OKC. Grafton stated that OSU-OCK has concurrent enrollment that the State Regents sponsor. These courses are reimbursed by the state for the high school students that attend. Having said this they get the best and brightest. They don't take a lot of credit hours and there are not that many of them. Grafton feels the idea of concurrent enrollment is to give high school students an opportunity to see what college is all about. Grafton feels that concurrent enrollment is a viable program that the regents have with the higher ACT scores and higher grade point average plus their high school counselor has to approve for them to be a concurrent student. Grafton doesn't feel you should water down the requirements as a back door into something people are trying hard to get into. Bob Miller stated that what Graton was describing was what everyone considers the normal concurrent enrollment type of program which is very successful for advanced high school students. The biggest problem is that OSU does not have a lot of control over what we can and cannot accept from TCC. Miller asked from the A&S Faculty Councils meeting with Dr. Fry is OSU intimately involved in this discussion. Ausman stated that OSU is not currently intimately involved in this discussion. Ausmans understanding is the transfer matrix which is what decides which classes get transfer credit and which don't is

where these sorts of decisions would need to be implemented in the future. Ausman believes that Dr. Fry is on the committee that handles this issue. The A&S Faculty Council has been keeping her apprised of their concerns and keeping her in the loop as more information becomes available. No one on the A&S Faculty Council were sure what the correct official route to making their concerns known so they brought if before the general Faculty Council. Miller feels this is something that the Academic Standards and Policies committee should be looking at. One of the duties of the past chair is to sit on the State Regents Advisory Committee and perhaps Dr. Veenstra could ask about at the next meeting. Dr. Veenstra said they are meeting tomorrow and he will ask.

Ausman said that there is some issues particularly in TCC's success in recruiting qualified teachers to teach these classes.

Ausman stated that as an extra piece of information there seems to be some issues that the program is having particularly with their success in recruiting qualified teachers to be able to teach these classes. There is more demand than they have qualified teachers so as a result many of the classes that TCC has been wanting to offer in the high schools they have not been able to. Ausman feels that one way to read this is that they may already have problems with the program and so it may not be a foregone conclusion that the program will continue without OSU input. None the less, the A&S Faculty Council was unanimous in their concern over this program that they were not interested in leaving it up to chance. Avakian asked if this program was aimed particularly toward students that would not qualify for AP course? Ausman stated that there were no comparisons made in any of the materials that the A&S Faculty Council saw or heard that made any comparisons to AP.

Krehbiel thanked Ausman for bringing this issue forward and it's great to see that our college faculty councils can bridge together with the general Faculty Council. Krehbiel assigned this issue to the Academic Standards and Policies committee for further review. They will start looking at this issue immediately.

Old Business - None

New Business – Spires of Excellence Report, OSU Strategic Plan

Krehbiel stated that two task forces of the Provost have been formed. One on Spires of Excellence and an additional one that has looked at the OSU Strategic Plan which was last done in 2005 or 2006 and there have been some updates. Tricia White will pass out copies of the Spires of Excellence report and the OSU Strategic Plan. The Executive Committee met and the officer team is going to assign this to Nick Materers Long Range Planning and Information Technology committee to start gathering information with regard to the Spires and make recommendations back to Faculty Council. Please take a few moments to read both of these documents. If you have any comments please let Nick Materer or someone on his committee know. Krehbiel stated that he wished Provost Sternberg was still at the meeting and could make a few comments in regards to the Spires of Excellence Report. Krehbiel stated to keep in mind that the intent was not to cover every single research area that OSU does or has excellence in but

to give a broad overview of the major areas in terms of emphasis in research and excellence in research. As you review the document please keep this in mind but at the same time the Faculty Council wanted to provide useful input back to the task forces that will allow them to improve this document.

Krehbiel asked if there was any other new business. Seeing none he asked for a motion to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, May 8, 2012 in **the Browsing Room, Edmon Low Library.**

Respectfully submitted,

Udaya DeSilva, Secretary