Veenstra called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ahrberg, Atekwana, Avakian, Bartels, Caldwell, Dare, DeSilva, Emerson, Grafton, Harris, Kennison, Klatt, Krehbiel, Lacy, Lawlor, Materer, McCann, Miller, Osteen, Smay, Suter, Verchot-Lubicz and Yellin.

Also present: Allen, S., Bird, L., Bryan, M., Cruse, A., Damron, S., Elliott, K., Gregory, D., Jacobs, S., Miller, B., O”Geary, S., Offutt, K., Perna, T., Purdie, R., Scott, M., Shutt, G., Simpson, J., Sternberg, R. and Weaver, J.

Absent: DeWitt, Jordan and Schestokat.

**HIGHLIGHTS**

Cowboys on the Move …………………..…………………………………………………………

P-Cards ……………...……………………………………………………………………………...

Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations …………………………………………...

Reports of Standing Committees …………………………………………………………………..

 Academic Standards and Policies ………………………………………………………….

 Athletics ……………………………………………………………………………………

 Budget ……………………………………………………………………………………...

 Campus Facilities, Safety and Security ……………………………………………………

 Faculty ……………………………………………………………………………………...

 Long-Range Planning and Information Technology ………………………………………

 Research ……………………………………………………………………………………

 Recommendation…………………………………………………………………..

 Retirement and Fringe Benefits ……………………………………………………………

 Rules and Procedures ………………………………………………………………………

 Recommendation…………………………………………………………………..

 Student Affairs and Learning Resources …………………………………………………..

Reports of Liaison Representatives ………………………………………………………………..

 SGA ………………………………………………………………………………………..

 Emeriti Association ………………………………………………………………………..

 Student Media Board ………………………………………………………………………

 Staff Advisory Council…………………………………………………………………….

 Women’s Faculty Council …………………………………………………………………

 GPSGA …….………………………………………………………………………………

Veenstra called the meeting to order.

Veenstra asked for approval of the November 9, 2010 minutes. Ken Bartels moved to approve the minutes, and Bob Avakian seconded. Motion passed.

Veenstra asked for approval of the December 14, 2010 agenda. Clint Krehbiel asked to have Recommendation #3 removed from the agenda awaiting clarification of the recommendation. Ken Bartels moved to approve the amended agenda, and Nick Materer seconded. Motioned passed.

**Special Reports:**

1. **Robin Purdie – Cowboys on the Move**

Robin gave the final word on the “Cowboys on the Move” competition in which many of the faculty council members participated. She said that really appreciated all those who

did participate. Faculty just kicked the tails of the students. The competition between faculty/staff and students began on October 1 and ended on November 29. The winning group of the competition had to get the higher number of minutes per participant The faculty/staff group won the competition almost 3 to 1. Even though 1,000 students signed up the faculty/staff had 1,500 sign up, faculty/staff won the competition. Robin showed the Faculty Council the traveling trophy that will go into the President’s office. It will be engraved with the winner and this will hopefully be another, longer competition next year. To keep things new and fresh, a nutrition component might be added for next year. Robin informed the council that Oklahoma is almost dead last in several categories, including lack of physical activity and numbers of fruits and vegetables eaten as well as other health indices. There will continue to be a big push by the state of Oklahoma to become more aware of these issues and move the state out of last place in the US. in terms of health indices. Robin suggested that in the future, Faculty Council think about having a healthy option at the meetings, such as bananas or fresh fruit instead of cookies. Funding for the “Cowboys on the Move” program came from advertising at athletic events and various other advertising venues. $15,000 was spent to get people signed up to participate. Most of the funds came from the Merrick Foundation as a grant. Their four topic areas include physical activity, nutrition, and tobacco and drug abuse. This competition hit a few of these areas with this program. Robin opened the floor to questions. Robin thanked everyone who helps the Seretean Wellness Center strive to become Americas Healthiest campus. This is supported by the administration. Ann Hargis is the spokesperson for this effort. She did the pushups at the Bedlam game. Thanks again for helping shape OSU students to become healthier as they go out into the workforce.

1. **Kathy Elliott – P-Cards**

Kathy explained that OSU participated with the state and started reviewing the RFP’s for the P-cards back in March of 2009. She stated that a lot of people think the change was because of the fraud cases that came to light in summer 2010, but it was not. The committee was actually working for a year before this came to light. The decision was made to use Bank of America and this decision was made in May of 2010. The JP Morgan contract ended July 23, 2010 so there was not a lot of time to make the change and the university convinced JP Morgan to extend their contract through the end of December 2010. The university was faced with training a large number of people and getting a large number of cards issued in a very short period of time; consequently, the groups were divided into three separate groups and a pilot program and three separate groups that were trained one a month over the course of the next 3 months. The most common thing that Kathy hears from faculty is the pre-approval policy. This was something that was presented to administration early in the implementation program. The administration received feedback and realized that it might be impractical to always have pre-approval so the administration made this a recommendation not a requirement. This was published in the P-card guidelines, the Fiscally Fit monthly newsletter as well as deans and department heads. What this means is that each college/department can make the decision as to whether to include the pre-approval policy. Most of the colleges are using a pre-approval policy but whether your college uses one or not it is a recommendation, not a requirement. Kathy asked if there were any questions regarding

this since there seems to be a lot of confusion about the pre-approval. John Veenstra asked if your college goes with the pre-approval can departments under that college choose not to have the pre-approval process or can the department not to follow the college lead. Kathy stated that this would be up to the fiscal officer or dean of the college. Kathy explained that there is an excellent pre-approval policy out there, Jason Pogue wrote it for a research department, and Kathy has shared this policy with all the college fiscal officers. This policy basically says that all the everyday supplies are pre-approved. Anything outside the normal, this includes if you have a grant everything that would apply under a budget line item is already pre-approved.

 Kathy met with the fiscal officers last week and they seem to all be very happy with the application that we now use. Kathy explained the probably the main reason the state decided to go with Bank of America is because of the reconciliation application they use. It requires that 3 separate individuals see a transaction. The application will actually stop the process if all 3 have not seen it. This gives people an opportunity to really see what is being purchased and if they find something that they don’t think is necessary, they can stop it. Kathy doesn’t know how the users like the new system, but stated that the she and the fiscal officers like it a lot. She thinks it’s very easy, all electronic. No big paper trails going everywhere. Ken Bartels asked what the time commitment is for 3 people to approve, that approval is not needed for day-to-day things (lab supplies) and how is this determined. What is out of the ordinary? Some line items may say laboratory supplies and you send for a year’s worth of test tubes and it hits above the $5K mark. Again you go through 3 people. Kathy asked if this was regarding the pre-approval. Ken said yes, the time it takes to fill out the forms, the time it takes to get the pre-approvals. Kathy stated that in her department they have decided that if someone wants to buy something they just send Kathy an email stated what they are purchasing and the costs. Kathy will say OK via the email and that’s their pre-approval process. The pre-approval policy that Jason Pogue wrote is very inclusive of just about anything that someone would want to buy including a grant that falls under the budget line item, it is already pre-approved. You don’t have to do anything else. It’s just an annual evaluation of what would probably be purchased throughout the year. So the time commitment on this type of pre-approval is, other than writing the policy and coming up with the items that are already pre-approved, not the faculty responsibility but the fiscal officers responsibility. Ken stated that there seems to be a lot of discussion across campus that the training plus the pre-approval process (3 people reviewing the purchase) seems to be impeding the progress of researchers. Ken asked Kathy if she thinks this is happening or she just hasn’t heard it. Kathy responded that she is not hearing that type of feedback. The only feedback that she has had is from people who were worried about using the new roles system (which is the user, the approver and the accountant) that it would be time consuming, but they have said this in not the case. They feel that the card is very easy to use. Kathy said the system is designed to review the transaction and pushing a button. Art Klatt stated that this is not all he has to do as a purchaser. Art asked if the university did not reacted to the fraud, why did we take a system that didn’t seem to have any problems and worked very comfortably, very efficiently and go to a system that seems to take a tremendous amount of faculty and staff time. He has talked to his financial people and they say the amount of time they spend on purchasing now has doubled and maybe even more. Kathy stated that the University had used JP Morgan for 10 years; the contract was up and had actually started looking at a new system a year before the frauds came out. Art still wanted to know why we moved from one that seemed to be efficient to one that seems to be terribly inefficient as far as staff and faculty time. Kathy said the University went with the state contract. Her experience with the new system is that it is not inefficient, in fact she finds it be more efficient. Kathy said before they were always chasing down paper and they had no way of knowing if someone was keeping up with their responsibilities and, in fact, have since found out that a lot of people were not doing the transaction logs, not verifying what other people were buying. This was not happening. The reason the state and OSU decided to go with Bank of America is because of the works application they have. It does give the university more control. Art asked if the University decided to change because there was fraud in what people were buying and what they said they were buying. Kathy stated, no. The University started looking for a new P-card provider a year before any fraud issues were discovered. They also decided to go with the state contract. The state and OSU choose Bank of America. The frauds first came to light in February and the state decided on which contract to take in May. People put these two things together and decided that one was the cause of the other. That is just not the case. Art asked again why we went for a system that seemed to be working fine to one that seems to be very cumbersome and inefficient as far as time in concerned. Kathy said that from her perspective the new system is working and she doesn’t see it as cumbersome and inefficient. She thinks it is much more efficient and is more robust. Steve O’Geary said that for someone who manages an administrative office, he’s actually seen what Kathy is saying. It’s far more efficient for administration. He spends 5 minutes, you log in, review a transaction and you either sign off on it (which is approving it) or you don’t. He doesn’t have to deal with the paper logs that he used to have to deal with each P-card. So it’s far more efficient from his perspective. Shelia Kennison stated that one of the issues is that communication on campus is never quite where it should be. She’s in the College of Arts and Sciences and she has 2 financial people who help with purchases – one in the

department of psychology and one in the college. Frequently, there is a communication

gap. What one thinks is required to be done is often different from the other thinks must be done. So if I have worked really hard to get a grant and when it is time to make purchases, it has been arduous to spend the money in a timely manner. Kennison also stated that as a member of the Research Committee, she has heard many, many people have given feedback about the P-card situation, how much it adds complication to their lives. Shelia believes that the procedures on the administrative end are smoother, but on the faculty end there is a lot of confusion that takes time away from research, grant-writing, and teaching. Kennison encouraged Kathy to get faculty feedback on how the process could be improved for researchers because she thinks right now it’s perceived as an impediment to research on campus. Kathy said she would be glad to do this. Jim Smay stated he can understand how this is more efficient for administrators and people in Steve O’Geary’s position. He offered an example from his department: under the old P-card system if he wanted something for his research he would go online, find it, buy it with a normal credit card transaction, hand their financial assistant the receipt. At the end of the month she will bring him a piece of paper that has a list of everything he purchased. He looks over the list and says yep, signs it and it’s done. With the new P-card system he has emails coming from Billy Watt every other day. He has to look online and ok a transaction, his financial assistant has to ok the transaction, then the department head has to ok the transaction. Kathy asked if the email from Billy Watt was actually coming from the Works system. Jim said he doesn’t know. It used to be someone coming into his office once a month and having him sign something. Kathy thinks that Jim can turn off those emails so that he doesn’t receive them. She will check on this and get back to Jim. Kathy stated that the way works is set up so that if you have a transaction that day you get an email. If you get another one, she doesn’t know about that and will check on it. Jim stated that this is the difference in perception between what’s efficient for someone at the administrative level vs what’s efficient for researchers. When Jim had spoken with Kathy earlier about the pre-approval process, the research committee had brought it to his attention, and he brought it to Kathy’s attention, Jim’s unit financial assistant and their department head thought the pre-approval is a mandate and you must do it with the 3 oks. The same day, Jim spoke with Kathy and she told him that it was just a recommendation. The last time Jim spoke with them, they still did not know it was a recommendation a few weeks ago. It doesn’t appear that it is being communicated back to the units that this is just a recommended procedure, not a required procedure. Maybe it’s going to the CFO of the college. Kathy stated that she sent it out in Fiscally Fit more than once, sent it out to Deans, Directors and Department Heads, it’s been in the training. This has been communicated in every way Kathy knows how. If people aren’t hearing it, maybe they don’t want to. She doesn’t know how anyone could not know that it is a recommendation not a requirement. It very clearly says this in the P-card guidelines, several publications and she says it every chance she gets on campus. Mindy McCann stated that if it’s a requirement for your college it may very well be a requirement for your department. Kathy thinks this is where the confusion may be. The college may be requiring it but the university recommended it. Udaya DeSilva asked why we don’t just take it that way since we have figured out that it is inefficient.

Joe Weaver stated that this issue has been discussed a number of times over the last couple of weeks and Kathy has implemented a policy, as she was directed to implement it. The administration rolled out a plan that had a set of guidelines and these were changed based on feedback that the administration received from people. This introduced communication difficulties. Joe suggested we are in a transition right now and he will be assuming Dr. Bosserman’s position as of January 1st. He said he would be happy to come to the Research Committee and/or whichever committee you would like to have them attend and discuss specific issues. They would try to get a handle on specifically what the problems are. Joe feels this would be more effective than trying to hash it out at the Faculty Council meeting. Art Klatt asked Kathy if the monthly log is supposed to be sent out automatically or does faculty have to request it. Kathy said that it should go out as an email if that is how you requested it as an email. But you should automatically get it at the end of the month. You print is out and take it to your accountant. Art had received a strongly worded email from the financial officer asking for his November log and Art had never seen the log. So he had to go into works and retrieve it. Kathy said you have to go into works and print it but you should still get an email notification. The log had never been sent to Art for approval. Kathy said that it’s a document that you print and attach your receipts to it and take it to your accountant. You don’t approve it in works. Art also asked if he made a purchase he automatically gets an email to approve that purchase correct. Kathy said yes that is correct. Art wanted to know how long that usually takes. Kathy said you should get an email the same day that you make the purchase. She also said if you have a transaction out there that needs attention you are supposed to get an email. If you have 50 you are still supposed to get an email. They are all listed together. Ken Bartels feels that part of the reason this was brought up is because of the communication issue. John Veenstra said that the objective of talking about this is to get out to the colleges what the current status of the regulations are since there are people from all different colleges in attendance and they can take the information back to their respective colleges and departments. Ken felt that this entire presentation was beneficial to all present. Kathy stated she did meet with fiscal officers last week and reminded them that it’s a recommendation and they need to let everyone in their respective colleges know what the policy for the college or department is. John Veenstra asked that Joe and Kathy meet with the Research Committee and maybe the Budget Committee to take a closer look at some of these issues and have the committees report back to the Council.

**Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations:**

Provost Robert Sternberg gave the status of the following resolutions/recommendations:

**Resolution:** **Academic Standards & Policies – Requirement for Graduate and Undergraduate Minors.**

 **Accepted** – Recommended P & P outlining procedures for awarding minors at the undergraduate and graduate levels was approved by the Council of Deans on November 11.

**2010-09-01-RES** **Supplemental Pay Plan for Rewarding External Research Support** – **Accepted as Modified –** The administration and the Council of Deans unanimously approved returning to the faculty member a minimum of 10% of the overhead returned to the college. This allocation plan will become effective July 1, 2011.

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICIES – Mindy McCann – No Report**

**ATHLECTICS – Art Klatt**

The committee has been working on two surveys for about the last year and a half, in cooperation with the Statistics Department, Dr. Mindy McCann, and a couple of her students. One of these surveys has been implemented, and we have preliminary results. The second survey is about to go and will be explained later. The first survey was looking at the perception that OSU Faculty had with the athletic department and student athletes. There were 360+ faculty that responded to the survey, which Art stated is a very good return. This represents about 35 to 40% of the total faculty at OSU. Almost 50% of the respondents reported that the high cost of tickets is the main reason for not attending athletic events (21% of the faculty that responded are season ticket holders). A majority of the faculty were very willing to give early exam dates for student athletes or to give make-up exams. There were some problems with parking restrictions that games interfered with parking on campus to some extent but we all know this happens. The majority of the faculty also thought that student athletes, from an academic perspective, were treated the same as other students (i.e., that they were not given special treatment). Art commented that this was a great response. Almost ¾ of the respondents believe that the athletic financial needs receive a higher priority than academic financial needs. A majority of the respondents also do not think that the University village will improve our relations with the city of Stillwater. Also a majority of the respondents were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied with athletics at the university. These are some of the preliminary results. The complete report should be ready sometime during the first quarter of 2011. The Athletic Committee will report these findings back to the Council.

The second survey is looking at Division 1 schools (that play division 1 football and basketball) to see if they apply an academic surcharge to tickets. This is a very brief survey that is going out to the athletic offices of these schools. Art thinks that there are about 350 Division 1 basketball schools. Art believes this survey will go out via email sometime in early January and the results should be back fairly quickly since it is an email response. This survey is specifically looking at how many schools actually add $1, $2 or $5 to the cost of a ticket to support academics. This is the real objective of the second survey.

**BUDGET – Ken Bartels – No Report**

Ken has no formal report. He asked Joe Weaver to provide some input on the budget based on changes that have occurred. Joe responded that it’s not as bad as was previously thought so that would be good news. Early indications from revenue estimators as saying that the cuts/shortfalls won’t be as large as previously estimated. The university had heard $1 billion, $800. Now they are saying roughly $400 million. If this ends up being true, that’s about an 8 1/2% cut. Keep in mind that this next fiscal year is when the stimulus funds won’t be around. December 21st is the date that Board of Equalization will meet, and they will certify the first estimate that will give the Governor the ability to build a budget based on those figures so the legislature can go to work. Ken asked if there is a possibility of a faculty salary package/compensation increase. Joe responded that a pay increase will remain on the universities priority sheet until they absolutely have to take it off. Admittedly, if the university takes an 8 ½% cut; it’s going to be very fiscally challenging to implement a raise program. Even if the money was available, the university has to deal with the political side of things. Basically if other agencies in state government are not doing raises, other universities are not doing raises would we step out there by our self and do a raise and draw the ire of the legislature and the governor. He doesn’t know. This might not be very wise. But it’s honestly too early to make this call so there’s no reason to say that a raise is off the table. One option the university could do is to raise tuition to whatever level it wants to in order to fund a raise program, again that falls on the “is this a wise policy”. Ken said that historically as you study the raise programs this would be an unprecedented 3rd year without a raise. But there have been in the past onetime bonus payments, like $250 or $500, that didn’t cause an incremental percentage raise. Joe assured the council that the administration is considering any and all options and that President Hargis is painfully aware that next year would be the third year in a row without raises. A bonus or some other adjustment could be considered. Bill Dare asked what percentage of the budget is faculty salary. Kathy Elliot said a guess would be around 25% to 30 %. Joe said that ¾ of the money is in the academic areas. It’s in the colleges, and the colleges budgets are made up of about 85% salary and faculty are probably half of this. When you look at raise programs, in general, it costs about a million five per percent and half of this will go to faculty and half to the staff. The university has far more staff but the faculty make more on average. So it balances out. Bill Dare asked if there is any discussions between administration and faculty on what we think, as a joint group effort, will need to be cut in this 8 ½% or is the administration just making the decisions. Joe said the provost has set up a committee to look at various ways that we can make productions or gain efficiencies. Faculty are on this committee. Provost Sternberg stated that the purpose of this committee is for faculty as well as staff to provide input to the administration. But since we don’t know exactly what the budget is going to be it has been wisely recommended that we defer making major decisions until we see what the new legislature is going to be like, what the new governor is like and what other schools will be doing. The purpose of the committee, however, is really to establish communication among different groups on campus regarding fiscal prudence and how can we maximize our resources. Joe stated that he is willing to come to the Budget Committee meetings and discuss these things. The Budget Committee has asked if they could review documents that the Deans provide and the administration has made a commitment to do this. This is a very strange with the changeover in leadership at the state capitol. We need to see the governor’s state of address and see what kind she says about education. As soon as all the pieces come together more talks will take place. Provost Sternberg wanted to let the council know that he has been in constant contact with John Veenstra or the executive committee for any decision that is of any consequence. Bruce Russell added that historically the Faculty Council has had a very robust Budget Committee and Ken Bartels serves as the current chair. His predecessors were also very active and there has been extremely good discussion with the administration in regards to budget issues. If faculty are concerned about these issues and want to raise issues to the administration and believe that they can have impact on the decisions that are made, we need volunteers for Faculty Council and committees that we populate across campus. Barbara Miller had heard that there will be Secretary of Education this year, which there hasn’t been one at the state house and asked Joe if he has heard anything about this. Provost Sternberg and Joe Weaver said the position has been filled. Provost Sternberg has already met with the Phyllis Hudecki and corresponded with her several times. She seems very thoughtful and concerned with education. Nick Materer commented that senior faculty (people who have been here 10 to 15 years) are suffering. Nick feels that there is a center segment that needs to be looked at. They have not been hired from elsewhere and they are doing more outside work and consulting for additional money. This effects volunteerism and affects the university as a whole. Joe knows that there has been 2 years without a raise program but if you look at this decade, it’s been lousy across the country. There has been other times that the university did not do raises early this decade. The administration is looking at all the options to address this matter. The truth is if the moneys are not there, we can’t do a program. Where the university goes to bonuses or something else is still to be determined. Nick stated that we are still hiring outside people that are coming in at a very competitive salaries. He feels that faculty who have been here a long time have been hit hard because of the raise situation. Provost Sternberg stated that when he arrived on campus he noticed a severe salary inversion problem. If the economic situations were better, one of the first things he would do would be to address this salary inversion problem for this very reason. When you hire someone from the outside you have to follow the market in regards to compensation. When the budget improves this is one of Provost Sternberg’s top priorities; “we just can’t do anything right now.” Bill Dare stated that the mid-level people who are inverted are just going to move up 3% or 4% not the 25% vault they need to get them up to market level. Provost Sternberg said there is a fixed amount of money, and he is open to any input from Faculty Council given the very limited budget and decreasing resources. The administration and faculty interests are no different. Provost Sternberg is very concerned that if the university does not give raises that it will have a very bad effect on morale. Everyone wants to give raises and any suggestions would be appreciated. Bob Avakian asked if tuition money stays on campus. Joe Weaver stated yes. Bob said there’s an out, if people want a raise, get more students enrolled. Provost Sternberg stated that enrollment has increased substantially and academic qualifications have also gone up. But it’s not enough to compensate for the tremendous shortfall of the effects of the recession. Many of the endowments went under water and the loss of the stimulus money. Ken Bartels said it was also important to include retention as well as enrollment increase. Provost Sternberg said this is his top priority. He is just forming a university committee on Retention and Graduation. He has consulted with the Faculty Council to get recommendations of people to be on this committee. This new committee is a university wide committee and will work with Faculty Council. Provost Sternberg’s top fundraising priority in the spring will be to fund the grant that Martha McMillan and Marilyn Middlebrook have been working on to extend academic services to as many students as possible. John Veenstra let the council know that Provost Sternberg has been proactive in keeping Faculty Council engaged and apprised of what is happening.

**CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY – Tom Jordan – No Report**

**FACULTY – Udaya DeSilva – No Report**

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

 **No Report**

**RESEARCH – Jim Smay**

Jim thanked Kathy Elliot for attending the meeting and explaining P-cards to the council. Jim also asked the council to accept the revision to the “Care and Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching policy.” Steve O’Geary is here today to answer any questions that might arise. The policy is attached to the agenda and is a policy that was last revised in May 2004. This is an updated version. John Veenstra asked for questions about the recommendation. Steve O’Geary stated that they worked with the institutional animal care use committee (which a faculty committee chaired by faculty) and looked at this policy, which they have been working on for two years. When this policy was adopted (i.e., the current version), it was really geared toward OSU Stillwater and laboratory animals. The federal regulations are actually broader than that now and, as a result, the policy has been modified so it is applicable to all OSU campuses that engage in live vertebrae animal research, teaching and testing. The version of the policy that is before you in this recommendation is compliant with current federal regulations. Ken Bartels stated that the inputs that were brought into this policy change were broad. Steve O’Geary said they had input from faculty and administrators from OSU-OKC, OSU-CHS, Faculty Council Research Committee and it has been reviewed by legal counsel. Ken Bartels stated that the other issue is the species that are included in the guidelines have been expanded to include agriculture animals. Steve said that Ag Guide was revised with specific focus on IACUC review for the use and care of agriculture animals in research and teaching activities. So this issue has also been addressed in the policy revision. Jim stated that the Research Committee has reviewed and approved the new policy and moves that the general faculty council approves this revised policy and sends it to the administration for their acceptance. Motion passed.

**RETIREMENT and FRINGE BENEFITS - Mark Lawlor**

Mark told the council that he is working on a recommendation that he will bring to the council at the January meeting. This recommendation is dealing with the equalization of the use of accumulated unused sick leave towards OSU retirement criteria. Currently only OTRS participants are able to apply. The committee is working on having this benefit also available to TIAAC participants as well.

The committee has also been working on a survey of benefits. The survey is completed and it is in the testing stages right now. The survey will be published in December with 2 reminder mailings in January. Most folks find that when you send out surveys the response spikes within the first 2 hours of receiving it. So it will be sent out 3 different times. The survey will be available for a month. So there will be plenty of time for participation. Mark stated that the health benefits through BC/BS is only a 1 year contract. This will be ending in December 2011, and Ann Matoy and human resources are staring to renegotiate that contract and other outside participants as well. The responses to the survey will serve as input on what the faculty feels are important needs and benefits. Bob Avakian asked if it included the branch campuses. Mark stated that it did and also retirees.

**RULES and PROCEDURES – Robert Avakian**

The Rules and Procedures committee was left with two questions at the beginning of this year. The “Consecutive Term Clarification” recommendation is the committees reply to the first question (see attached recommendation). The question related to whether the same individual could serve more than one term on the Faculty Council by virtue of changing whom they represented. The committee felt this was not a problem as long as the person was representing a new constituency. The recommendation reads: “The term limit for an individual shall not be interpreted as preventing an otherwise qualified individual from serving successive elected terms on the council if, in the subsequent term (s) the individual is representing a constituency distinctly different from the prior position (s)”. Bob gave the rationale for the recommendation. John Veenstra asked for questions. Motion passed. Bruce Russell stated that when Udaya DeSilva asked if he could run again as a Multi-Cultural representative, after representing the Ag College for a full term, the executive committee met and Steven Perkins (who was chair of the Rules and Procedures committee) ruled then that this was legitimate. Bruce thought it was better to put it in a recommendation.

**STUDENT AFFAIRS and LEARNING RESOURCES – Karen Hickman – No Report**

**Report of Liaison Representatives:**

**SGA – Kelly Offutt**

Kelly said that every week she attends senate meetings and reports back what is happening at Faculty Council. She wanted to let the Faculty Council know about the work of SGA. Recently the SGA along with the President’s office and help from the physical plant decorated the library with a wreath and garland. The University was founded on Christmas day in 1890. The SGA also recently traveled to Baylor for a Big 12 conference and you might be pleasantly surprised to know that students are also talking about the same things faculty is discussing. They are also talking about retention rates and how to make each university better. One interesting thing they do at Baylor (which they started 4 years ago) is that they are going to an Oxford style living group which means their living groups are really connected. Within their living groups, they all eat their meals together in a beautiful dining room, which helps keep them all connected. The SGA will also be traveling to Washington, DC at the end of next semester to talk to senators and congressman about tax-free text books and what can be done about the budget. If the Faculty Council has any concerns that they would like to bring to the SGA, Kelly would love to hear from you.

**Emeriti Association – Margaret Scott**

The Emeriti Association is appreciative of the of the Faculty Council Retirement and Benefits Committee and the University Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee, as well as Ann Matoy, for considering the concerns of Emeriti faculty and staff regarding health benefits. Our representatives will continue to work with these committees.

At the December First Monday Dinner, Dave Lewis was installed as President-Elect and Dennis Bertholf, John Baird, Jim Criswell, and Glade Presnal were installed as Council Members at Large. Because of the resignation due to health reasons of Bob Hamm as Incoming President, it appears I will continue in that capacity.

**Student Media Board – Sue Jacobs**

Sue was asked to come to the council meeting to inform them that the new editor in chief has been selected for the spring semester. The new editor in chief is Amanda Bland. She will be attending the January Faculty Council meeting to update the council on changes that have taken place over the past year. Sue has learned that there are a lot of complaints that come through the O’Colly. Most of the readership is more faculty/staff than students so Sue wanted to let faculty know that she will take all feed back to the board. Please email any concerns or questions to her.

**Staff Advisory Council – Tony Perna**

The last resolution of the Staff Advisory Council was supporting parking’s 3-year $22 per year fee increase.

**Women’s Faculty Council – Barbara Miller**

Women’s Faculty Council met with the Provost last month to discuss some issues. There is another meeting tomorrow to solidify those ideas and get back to him. Barbara also mentioned that the deadline for Women’s Faculty Council research awards is January 7th. She stated that most of the students are not back by January 7th, so faculty should remind them to submit materials before they leave or over the break. The applications are available online. They need to contact their faculty advisors to get a letter of recommendation.

**GPSGA – Joseph Simpson**

Joseph let the council know that GPSGA has put out the call for the Phoenix awards starting at the end of December and the deadline will be February 25th. This is for the outstanding master’s student, Ph.D. student and graduate faculty as well.

**New Business – Clint Krehbiel**

Clint announced that Dr. Christina DeWitt has resigned her post on Faculty Council. She has accepted a position at the western OSU -- Oregon State University, and Dr. Steve Damron has agreed to sit on the council to represent CASNR in her place. Dr. Damron was recently received a prestigious teaching award. He was recognized as the 2010 Oklahoma Teacher of the Year by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Clint congratulated Dr. Damron on his exceptional accomplishment.

John Veenstra reminded the Faculty Council members of the reception and dinner sponsored by the Provost later this evening. The reception begins at 5:15 p.m., dinner at 5:45 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, January 11, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelia Kennison, Secretary