Veenstra called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ahrberg, Atekwana, Avakian, Bartels, Caldwell, Damron, DeSilva, Emerson, Grafton, Harris, Jordan, Kennison, Klatt, Krehbiel, Lawlor, Materer, McCann, Miller, Osteen, Schestokat, Smay, and Yellin.

Also present: Allen, S., Bird, L., Hargis, B., Holcomb, R., Jacobs, S., Louthan, C., Matoy, A., McKeever, S., O’Geary, S., Polson, L., Price, S., Shutt, G., Sternberg, R. and Weaver, J.

Absent: Dare, Lacy, Suter and Verchot-Lubicz.

**HIGHLIGHTS**

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

Remarks and Comments from the President

Research and Intellectual Property…………………………………………………………………

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

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

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

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

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

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 ………………………………………………………………..

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

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

Veenstra called the meeting to order.

Veenstra asked for approval of the December 14, 2010 minutes. Veenstra read two changes to the December 14th minutes. Jim Smay moved to approve the corrected minutes and Tom Jordan seconded. Motion passed.

Veenstra asked for approval of the January 11, 2011 agenda. Jim Smay moved to approve the agenda and Bob Avakian seconded. Motioned passed.

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

Provost Robert Sternberg gave the status of the following recommendations:

**10-12-01-RES:** **Recommendations to approve changes to “Care and Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching” policy.**

**Accepted** – 12-14-10. Proposed modifications have been approved by all research-related groups and Legal Counsel. Final review and approval by the Council of Deans is expected on January 13.

**10-09-01-RE**P **Consecutive Term Clarification**

**Approved**

Provost Sternberg announced that Friday is the due date for Nominations for Honorary Degrees. He stressed that he wants to use the 5 slots available and needs the faculty to make nominations of the great people who are worthy of honorary degrees at Oklahoma State. People who have made contributions to scholarship, the state, to the nation and/or donors who have made outstanding donations to the state or world. President Hargis stated that OSU has been incredibly stingy with honorary degrees when compared to other institutions. President Hargis believes that OSU has only given 18 in its history. President Hargis encouraged everyone to consider nominating someone.

**Remarks and Comments from the President – Burns Hargis**

President Hargis stated that the budget is, of course, always that cloud that hangs over everyone’s head. He just received word that the December numbers were better than had been estimated. President Hargis talked with Scott Meachem, the former finance director. Mr. Meachem estimates a short fall in the $200 to $300 million range. It could even go a little lower, if things get real robust. This would be very good news. The university’s goal all along has been to never cut into the academic side of the budget, President Hargis stressed. President Hargis asked Joe Weaver what OSU’s share of this short fall would be, and Joe answered 4% to 6% range. This short fall may not be proportionate, because higher education has been sheltered from big cuts so far. However, the new legislatures and their regard for higher education are not completely known at this point. President Hargis stated that he is reasonably optimistic about this cut.

The university continues to have record applications and admits are also up. This is very encouraging news. The university still needs to close the deal on enrollment. At least, there are a lot of people looking at OSU for their college choice. Kyle Wray and his staff have done a wonderful job. Retention is also up from the fall to this spring. Provost Sternberg and President Hargis are working hard on an initiative to dramatically improve retention, which is currently around 78%. President Hargis announced that the Student Union renovation should be done next fall.

Bruce Russell asked President Hargis if he had a strategy or something that faculty could do or participate in to help with the perception with higher education and the legislature. Hargis responded that the most persuasive argument is that states with more college graduates have a higher per capita income. He doesn’t know how well this sells to all the legislators. He does feel that what does sell with them is the service the university provides to the state. Also as a land grant university, we do more than just educate our students. We also serve the state. Having faculty communicate this point could be very helpful. The Ag College just put out a very good brochure that highlighted many of those measurements. President Hargis would encourage faculty and departments to think about how they are serving the state; then the university can make a case to the legislature. Bob Avakian asked if the university knew what percentage of OSU graduates stay in the state. Joe Weaver did not have a number, but indicated that he could get this information. President Hargis stated that this percentage is a problem because the students have to leave to go get jobs because companies are not in Oklahoma, because Oklahoma does not have enough college graduates to attract business to the state – it’s a chicken and egg problem. President Hargis has been through this before during his chamber days. You need jobs to keep graduates here; you need graduates to get companies to open businesses here. OSU and OU are graduating in the low 60’s; regional schools are significantly less than that. It’s a big problem that needs to be addressed. President Hargis has talked to the new governor about this issue. President Hargis stated for the council that the governor and the Lieutenant Governor are both OSU Grads. Bob Miller asked what the demographics were for college educated vs non-college educated of the legislators. President Hargis was not sure.

**Special Reports:**

1. **Stephen McKeever - Research**

Stephen McKeever updated the Faculty Council on how the research funding is doing at OSU. McKeever presented the following Power Point presentation highlighting the past year or two in the area of research.



The biggest highlight is the new research building, the Henry Bellman Research Center. McKeever encouraged everyone to tour the facility. There will be a major ribbon cutting ceremony sometime in August. The other two major buildings are Helmrick Advanced Technology Center (HTRC) on the Tulsa Campus (which is 100% complete and about 20% occupied); and the Morgan Building (OTRP) in partnership with the city of Stillwater and the Meridian Technology Center. This building is located at the technology park and is jointly administered by the three entities and is open to private sector. There are no OSU labs in the facility but there are OSU research related activities in collaboration with the private sector labs.

Another highlight is the University Multi-spectral labs (UML) in Ponca City. It is owned by the university but operated by Trident Scientific; a government owned contractor operated entity. The university does a lot of work for the Federal Government, a lot of which is classified. This building was created off-site so the university could do classified work, which cannot be done on a public campus. The UML does collaborate with several groups on campus, most notably Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering and in the Center for Veterinary Science. Provost Sternberg asked McKeever to explain what Multi- spectral means. Mutli-spectral means across the entire spectrum of sensor technologies. The focus has been on CBRNE – Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and Explosive sensors. The other sensor class is C5ISR – Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Combat Systems, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance. In other words, electronic devices that are used in monitoring of all types. As an offshoot of both of these activities, we developed an interest in unmanned aerial vehicles. OSU has one of the finest UAV education programs in the nation. The UML and OSU have the nation’s only privately run university-related restricted airspace UAV site in the nation. Since this is the only one of these outside the military, this opens up an enormous opportunity for people who want to develop UAVs. We have now become an extremely attractive site for commercial developers. As a result, for example, Boeing is going to establish a part of their UMV program in Lawton.

Awards this year have reached an all-time high. 40% jump from the previous year. Expenditures also increased.

McKeever reviewed the campus award numbers and expenditure slides. These numbers do not include the research awards from the UML. They are counted separately. On the OSU data slide, there are State (General) funds, Federal funds, State funds and Private funds. State General funds include the % of each full-time faculty member whose appointment is research, example 75% instruction/25 % research. The research percentage of the salary is included in the State General figure. Private sector funds are very small.

McKeever reviewed the Top 100 and Top 75 universities and how OSU ranks among these universities. This includes private and public universities. Bruce Russell stated that there was a significant change in slope in 2008 and wanted to know if there was an event or set of policies that contributed to this up swing. McKeever stated that there is no single entity, but there is a strong one – that is the number of faculty. McKeever has followed the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty and found that once a faculty member is hired it takes 2 years for that faculty member to make an impact. When a faculty member leaves, it takes 2 years to recover. The type of faculty also makes an impact – adjunct vs tenure track faculty. This impacted research because adjunct faculty do not do research. Provost Sternberg thought a graph that would be interesting would be research per capita, tenure stream faculty, because it could be that a smaller university has a much higher citation rate but because they are small their research expenditures were low. McKeever stated that the 2010 research expenditures NSF numbers is $134 million. Divide that by 1,000 faculty and OSU is about $130,000 per faculty which is very competitive. Bruce Russell stated that the Engineering program is in the range of $150-$250 K per FTE. McKeever is integrating his figure over the entire university system. If you figured this on just the major science and technology colleges, the number is much higher. President Hargis stated that this is a perfect argument for state contributions, because these dollars, if they come from outside the state, are examples of economic development. President Hargis feels that investing in faculty that can produce grants, from an economic development perspective, is a good idea. He uses these numbers when arguing that OSU is contributing a lot to the state economically.

1. **Steven Price – Intellectual Property**

Stephen McKeever introduced Steven Price who has been the Director of Technology Transfer Office since December 2004. Price reviewed the following Power Point presentation:



OIPM – Office of Intellectual Property Management receives the invention (disclosure) and does various procedures to get to the final outcome – a new company. Price stated that it takes on average $2 - $3 million to produce a disclosure. Price stated that if you want to increase inventive activity, the way to do that is to increase research funding.

Price stated that OSU has between 30 and 40 licenses yielding income. This is a contract that exists between OSU and a commercial entity that dictates commercial terms (the amount of money the university receives per year) from their sale of OSU patented technology. OSU has 3 big royalty generators:

1. Bacterial strain that is added to animal feed. This generates approximately $400,000 to $500,000 per year.

2. Radiation badges that Dr. McKeever is a co-inventor on. This generates $200,000 - $300,000 per year.

3. An anti-body generated from Vet Med for diagnostic testing that generates $150,000 per year.

There are also quite a few smaller licenses that generate income for the university. Some of the plant varieties which are primarily wheat varieties generate between $140,000 and $150,000 per year collectively. Price feels this number will continue to increase rapidly. Overall OSU receives $1.4 million per year from royalties. OSU does very well in royalties when compared to other universities in the state.

Technology and Business Development Program (TBDP) distributes $200,000 per year and is funded by royalties. This is from monies received from royalties that are over and above money that is needed for salaries, etc. The program has returned $950,000 back to the university representing 139 proposals resulting in 15 start-up companies. Every submission period yields approximately 15 proposals from campus and there are two submission periods per year. Price reviewed the funding leverage slide stating that for every dollar that the TBDP puts in, 2.28 dollars come back to the university.

Price also reviewed the Co-start program slide and the companies started with TBDP money.

Another activity that is part of the OIPM and is an intensive interaction with the Business School is the area of Entrepreneurship. Due to the support of OIPM, six projects have graduated from the Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship Scholars Program (CIE).

Robert Emerson wanted to know how to let his faculty know how to get into the pre- training for TBDP program. Price said that twice a year an RFP is sent out. In this RFP there is a portion to fill out for a pre-TBDP program. This program is designed to help get to the next level. The OIPM also will award up to $5,000 for the pre-TBDP. Have the faculty member contact Steve Price.

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICIES – Mindy McCann – Update**

Mindy stated that the committee has been asked to look into the difference in the time schedule for the MWF fall class time versus TTH class time. Bob Miller asked for clarification. McCann replied that if you have a 3 hour MWF class your contact hours are less than if you have a TTh class. This only happens in the fall semester. This is because of Labor Day and other holidays. Bruce Russell stated that the university replaced a Tuesday holiday with a Wednesday holiday a few years ago. It went from a Mon/Tues fall break to a Monday fall break and added Wednesday before Thanksgiving as a class holiday. That is the difference.

**ATHLECTICS – Art Klatt - Update**

The committee is working on two surveys. The one assessing faculty perceptions of athletics and student athletes is almost complete. The committee will hopefully have the final results in the next couple of weeks. The committee will review these results and present a summary of these to the faculty council hopefully at the February meeting.

The second survey is looking at the practice of surcharges on tickets. It is in the final stages of preparation and should be distributed sometime hopefully in January. Results are expected to be in a few months after that.

**BUDGET – Ken Bartels – Update**

Ken stated that the committee has been meeting on a monthly basis and working on information from Joe Weaver and the University budget committee. The committee also initiated the Phased Retirement program. The committee recommended forming the Phased Retirement Task Force that is composed of faculty members as well as HR personnel. The Task Force published their report as of December 3, 2010. The budget committee has reviewed this report. There is a joint recommendation from the Budget and the Retirement and Fringe Benefits committees:

**Recommendation: Support for the Report from the Phased Retirement Task Force**

Ken moved that Faculty Council support this recommendation. John Veenstra asked Rodney Holcomb who is the chair of the Phased Retirement Task Force if he had any comments and also asked Ann Matoy, HR, if she had any comments. Rodney thanked all the people who were on the task force for all their hard work: Gary Foutch from Chemical Engineering, Tammy Henderson from Human Development and Family Sciences, Dan Rickman from Economics and Legal Studies, Maureen Sullivan from Psychology, John Veenstra from Civil and Environmental Engineering and Ken Clinkenbeard from Veterinary Medicine. The task force did quite a bit of work reviewing programs at other institutions. Reviewed the literature regarding phased retirement programs and also leaned on Ann Matoy and the Human Resources staff. The task force contributed a lot of hypothetical scenarios on the table and Ann and her staff would check all the legal possibilities for all the options. They would in turn get the information back to the task force regarding the impact of certain programs that HR had from other institutions as well. Some of the things you need to take a look at when talking about a Phased Retirement program are the number of faculty who are eligible for retirement right now. There are quite a few on the OSU campus who are currently eligible for retirement through OTRS. OTRS also becomes the elephant in the room because they have certain rules and stipulations about retirement. You have to pay attention to OTRS eligibility as well as factors related to age. If you are between 55 and 62 you have a certain set of conditions that you will face. If you are between 62 and 65 there is another set of conditions. Over 65 is yet another scenario. The task force discussed who to include – do you focus on tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, clinical track faculty, professional staff, etc. Where do you draw the line on the phased retirement program? Because of the time frame, the task force limited what they did to looking at a pilot program to propose something to try out on a known population and this is the report they have for you today. Those eligible for this pilot program will be 65 and over and are eligible for OTRS retirement. This gave the task force a known population of 80+ faculty members on campus. The task force wants to propose the pilot program to this population, see who is interested in participating in the phased retirement program and then go back and survey the entire population to see why they entered the program or why they did not enter the program. The survey will also ask them what aspects of the program they did or did not like about the program. After that, a long-term policy would be developed, which takes into account issues related to OTRS and differences in ages, rules of 80, rules of 90, etc. This program was not devised to be a right to the faculty member, rather it is an option that is mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and his/her unit administrator. This would also be something that could be a benefit to the faculty member, if the faculty member is considering retirement, but not ready to step away all together. It could also be a bargaining chip for a unit administrator, who fears that he or she is about to lose one of his or her key faculty. That is why this contractual agreement is set up to offer the faculty member the option to hang around for 1 to 3 years. These agreements would need to be approved at the Dean and Provost level, so there wouldn’t be a case where someone enters that Phased Retirement as a faculty member and they make out a 3 year time frame and then the administrator comes back and says they are calling it quits after 6 months or the first year. The recommendation before the council is the report for this pilot program, but with the condition that the task force stays in effect, so that a long term standing policy can be put in place for the university. Ann Matoy thanked the council for their role on this task force. It’s been a marvelous experience. Matoy stated that this does involve integration with a number of the university benefit programs, which will require contractual and legal changes as well as new documents. The task force feels that they have covered all the bases with what is being proposed. It would still need to be implemented, however. Ken Bartels acknowledged the task force and HR for all their hard work. He thanked Dr. Holcomb, in particular, since he also serves on the Budget Committee and is very knowledgeable and addressed difficult questions. When this recommendation was first being created, there was some type of incentives to allow faculty some type of incentive. One of the first things considered was instead of having benefits on a pro-rated basis based on the amount of salary to have it based on the salary at the time of retirement. The task force looked at this and basically came back with the idea that it would be pro-rated. The idea of an incentive is something that may need to be considered, Ken Bartels continued. There has been a proposed amendment to the Phased Retirement recommendation. Bruce Russell stated that upon acceptance of the report and recommendation of the Phased Retirement task force to be made a part of the report and recommendation the following article:

**Proposed Amendment to Phased Retirement Recommendation and Report**

January 11, 2011

To be adopted upon acceptance of the report and recommendation from the Phased Retirement Task (PRT) Force and to be made a part of the report and recommendation, the following article is proposed as an amendment:

**The University shall offer a financial incentive approximately equivalent to 50% of one year compensation to the faculty member who voluntarily enters the Phased Retirement Program. A one-time lump sum payment to the faculty member equal to 2% of their retirement base annual compensation times the number of years of service shall be considered approximately equivalent to 50% of their one year compensation. For a faculty member to receive this benefit, they must agree to three years’ service during a phased retirement program.**

Bruce asked Faculty Council Chair, John Veenstra, if he wanted to ask for a second or consider it a friendly amendment. Tom Jordan seconded the motion to adopt the proposed amendment. Russell distributed extra copies of the amendment for the council members to review which included the rationale for the amendment. Mindy McCann asked if there needed to be a minimum because the other document called for a maximum of 3 years. Russell responded that the faculty must agree to a minimum of 3 years to receive the benefit (incentive). Dr. Holcomb stated that the contract is between 1 and 3 years, but for an incentive to take place, really for the university to recoup its investment in the incentive. McCann stated that the minimum implies that it is possible to go above 3 years but this would not be correct. Russell stated that the amendment would change to three years’ service. Bob Avakian asked if the university decided to make it a 2 year contract that would not affect this. Russell stated that this would be part of the negotiation between the unit head and the faculty member. Russell is suggesting that the more rational policy is for this benefit to be extended to the faculty member, they should agree to 3 years’ service. Ken Bartels stated that the Budget Committee as well as the Retirement Fringe Benefit Committee and the Task Force did consider the idea of an incentive program. He said that has no problem with this, but it does have a financial impact for the university. It’s not just a break even thing either. His only concern is that for some folks who would want to implement this into their financial plans for this year with this added amendment may require a delay because of consideration by the administration. If this is not a problem then the process could start, but Bartels believes that to meet the OTRS 60 day off time for someone who is 65 this policy needs to be implemented about June 1st.If the amendment caused the process to slow down, due to additional review, Bartels feels that this cannot be done. This doesn’t mean that the council should not consider it but he wants everyone to consider the reality of the situation.

Provost Sternberg said that he thought it’s wonderful that there is a Phased Retirement plan. Regarding the incentive, Provost Sternberg said that in principle, everyone would like to see this happen, but he’s a little bit concerned about the costs for the different numbers of people who might take it. Before any kind of decision, it would be extremely important to cost this out, especially because of compression of salaries, hiring new people is sometimes more expensive than paying the salaries of the people who retire. Provost Sternberg thinks it would be very important to 1) cost it out so we can see whether we can afford it and 2) consider how it would be perceived at this time by citizens of the state of Oklahoma and people in the legislature because given the high unemployment rate and some of the economic problems the state is facing. If you are concerned about immediate implementation, Provost Sternberg said that he thought this would delay the implementation, because the university would have to look at the cost ramifications. That’s not to say it shouldn’t be done, but it is really important to be sensitive to entire cost and the political climate.

Russell responded that the budget impact was considered, but the reality is that we are either paying the faculty member 100% of their salary or they would retire possibly and leave. Then the university would be scrambling to find a replacement for them. One of the things to do is to encourage people into a phased system so that the university, then the unit, the department, the college and Provost have a chance to plan for a transition period. There is, if you will, a 1.0 FTE there, let’s consider the period of 3 years which we are talking about the phased retirement over the 3 years, so if a faculty member elects to or is offered the opportunity to enter the Phased Retirement program there is essentially a 1.5 FTE cost savings. Sure, there may be some costs associated with replacing necessary duties and responsibilities, but there would be that cost anyway. Provost Sternberg said that he was talking about the incentive for the phased retirement. The idea that we would offer another .5 FTE to a faculty member is still well within the cost savings, if you will, on the phased period of time. Russell feels that it is important to offer faculty an incentive to enter the Phased Retirement program. Russell is concerned that there will not be very much interest in the program without the incentive. He feels it can be a very powerful tool help transition the faculty into a robust, creative faculty. Russell feels this is a very progressive thing to do. As far as what people might think about on the outside, the tax payers of Oklahoma generally view incentives for retirement as a way of saving money. Rodney Holcomb stated that the task force did consider incentive and what it would mean. The reason the pilot program focuses on 65 and over for eligibility is because of some of the issues related to Social Security, which caps compensation through OTRC. So some of those incentives may already be there because of age. Realizing that long term the possibility of someone that’s 60 years old and who meets the rule of 80/90, if you are going to lose them altogether and would like to keep them, some incentive might be necessary. At the same time, this was developed not as a right, but to be something that was mutually agreed upon by unit administrator and faculty member. If the unit administrator examines his or her resources and says for this person, this is expensive or half my department wants to do this, or it cannot be done for everyone. There’s some self-policing there, as to what incentives can be offered to someone. David Yellin wanted to know if anyone could briefly describe what is meant by the Phased Retirement in terms of teaching versus research. Is this going to differ from department to department? Is there some rule of thumb? Rodney Holcomb stated that for the task force that was formed from different colleges on campus, there was a quick realization that there is not going to be a one-size-fits-all program. So the contracts would need to be mutually agreeable between the unit administrator and the faculty member for what would constitute 50% work load. Whether that is on the teaching side or includes research responsibilities, some outreach or service activity, it’s hard to say. That would be between the administrator and the faculty member. It comes down a cost benefit analysis. I, as the faculty member, would have to say this works well for me, I’m willing to work ½ time and handle these activities. For the department head, he or she would have to say the same thing; I’m paying this person ½ time but for what they are doing it’s worth more than what I’m paying. The thought is, going back to what Dr. McKeever said earlier, is that adjuncts don’t do research and new faculty members take a couple of years before they really get there programs going and start bringing in dollars. So it’s a way for the faculty member to transition out of this profession, and for an administrative unit it is a way to not lose a knowledge base immediately. It helps them with long term planning, if the unit administrator can tie this person up at least part time for 3 years, he or she still have him or her as part of the program.

Provost Sternberg asked if it was legal to offer this program to some but not to others. While at Tufts, Provost Sternberg said they did a Phased Retirement plan and were told that you had to have a set of criteria and had to offer it to everyone who meets the criteria. Ann Matoy responded that the task force did meet with legal counsel, both OSU and the Retirement expertise that is hired from the outside, and they think the program will meet muster as it is written right now, even limiting it to only tenured faculty who are 65 or over. Provost Sternberg said this is not what he is asking. He continued, someone just said that the department head could say, you can do this but you can’t, even if you meet the criteria. Matoy stated that the assurance that was put in was by requiring the Provosts signature. There was the feeling of the task force that the Provost signature would over-ride any bias that a faculty member might think existed at the department level. Now the proposal does say that this is not a right that the person has (this came out of the budget committee). The idea is that by limiting the initial group it would be offered fairly to all. They would have to come to agreement on the tasks. Legal counsel is telling HR that this would work. Provost Sternberg again said that we can say that one person can have it, but another person can’t even though both meet the criteria. Matoy stated that the decision to deny someone would probably have to be defended, but that is what is being told to her. Provost Sternberg feels this would be really risky legally, if we are giving it to him, but not to you, even though both of you are the exactly the same in qualifications – age, years of service, etc. It just seems really risky.

Russell stated that argument would go whether the program includes the incentive or doesn’t. Maybe Provost Sternberg misunderstood it. The way he understands it is that if you meet a certain set of criteria, then you are eligible. But what he thinks is tricky is if an administrator says well x and y meet the requirements, but I’m only going to let x do it and not y. Rodney Holcomb responded that he may have over simplified things. What it boils down to is when you are looking at a contractual relationship with that faculty member, if you come up with a list of requirements and that person is willing to do these things than that unit administrator may go along with it. If the person is not interested in doing these required tasks than the department head does not have to go along with it. Provost Sternberg feels then that this is not arbitrary. Provost Sternberg gave the example that if the unit administrator says to one person if you do these 537 things, then you can do the plan. Then the unit administrator says to another person if you do these 13 things, then you can do the plan. Provost Sternberg thinks the university would be sued. Rodney Holcomb responded that this is where the review from the Dean and Provost come into play, to overcome bias like this. The unit administrator is going to have to balance his or her resources to make it work so you don’t have a whole department signing up for the program. Holcomb doesn’t feel that this will be an issue anyway.

President Hargis needed to leave the meeting and stated that he feels that costing anything out is prudent. It’s hard to cost, because you do not know how many will sign up. He agrees that incentives can make these things work. If they play out over a period of years, then you don’t see a big effect from this kind of thing. President Hargis said that he believes that if there is a cost factor that is going to trickle down to the rest of the university, then it should be considered. If it’s a delay due to the economy, it needs to be built into the accounting. In terms of an equitable approach, it certainly passes his muster.

David Yellin said, hypothetically, the term Phased Retirement, an administrator is going to be negotiating with a faculty member some type of phased retirement contract. Does the administrator see the faculty as a retired person or a non-retired person? For example what do they do in an A&D, at the end of the school year? What is the faculty member, retired or non-retired? If you are non-retired, they would look at research, service and teaching. Yellin stated that he is on 100% teaching, even though he does research and publishes. So if he is in a phased retirement program and they reduce his teaching load, is he still held accountable at the A&D level for research and publishing? Ann Matoy responded that this would depend on the agreement that was negotiated with the department head. The question -- am I retire or not retired -- the program possibilities are structured so that: 1) you meet OSU retirement criteria and yes you retire. OSU retirement does not give you any income. In order to get your income from OTR, you have to meet their retirement. The purpose of the proposal saying that you would be off work for 60 days would allow you to make an individual decision on whether or not you want to retire from OTR and start drawing funds or do you not want to retire from OTR. TIACREF money is out there already and available to you on an annuity basis, but it would also be another decision you would make. The university would call you retired, but under an agreement with tenure, you keep your tenure for the 3 years. In order to create a new subset status of employees is to maximize your retirement income possibilities at your choice. Sue Jacobs asked for a clarification from the committee. In the College of Education, which utilizes a co-faculty governance model, the faculty would also have to write in the criteria for this in terms of what it would want to admit and how it was decided. She doesn’t know how this would work out. These decisions are not just done by the school head. The school head is guided by documents that were approved by the faculty up the line.

Russell stated that phased retirement has been talked about for 2 ½ years by 2 task forces and the details that are being brought up are incredibly important on an individual basis. But they are different on an individual basis. Russell feels that a policy cannot be written successfully that will address all the possibilities, outcomes, etc., that will affect “your deal as it is now” and what “your deal would be in a phased retirement system.” What can happen now is a faculty member can tell the department in March or whenever the requirement is that I, in May, I’m out of here, good bye and good luck. There is no opportunity to the remaining faculty in that unit to plan and strategically figure out where they want to go. Russell feels that this phased retirement program is a great mechanism to maintain the expertise in the faculty. There is a negotiation with the department head, dean and provost about what their responsibilities will be that cannot be predicted in a policy. Russell feels that if the council does not act today that an opportunity will be lost to put the Phased Retirement on the table for the administration to look at.

Art Klatt asked if it has to be ½ FTE. The way the program is currently written it does have to be ½ FTE. What if someone who wants to retire has a 25% teaching component and would like to keep teaching and negotiates this with the department head. Ann Matoy responded this is one of the reasons that the task force felt this was a pilot program. To see what types of questions come out and to see what kind of revisions might be desirable on an ongoing basis as this program would be expanded to the entire university. The problem that we have in a variable FTE is we would have to change that benefits depend on your FTE, there are a lot of ramifications that go with that. So the committee attempted to come up with at least a plan to start something. In other words we can sit around and talk about for the next 3 years and we would be at the same place we are today or we can map out as complete a program (and the committee did an excellent job) and then move forward and find out for sure if we need to tweak the program. Art wanted to know if there were legal aspects of keeping it at ½ or can that be variable. Ann responded that she has to modify benefit programs to cover something other than .75 FTE. This can be done.

Bob Miller stated that this is our chance to move forward and see what will happen. He suggested that the recommendations be encouraged and endorsed, move them to the administration and see what happens. Try the pilot program, that’s what pilot program is about, to find out what works. He feels that a long discussion about individual problems are mute because we do not have a program. Bob Avakian heard a lot of good things but 1) complete equity is possible, 2) programs like this, at least in business, if they are written at the convenience of the company gives the company a lot of latitude. If you want to hold onto your good people you will, 3) as far as the amount of the award being a political hot potato, if you perhaps delay the reward until the end of the 3 years where you realize the savings before you realize the expense it might make it more palatable to those outside the university.

Jim Smay asked how many of the 80 employees over 65 would participate in the pilot program. No one knows. These are things that will be anylized after the one year pilot program. McCann stated that there is still a veto power by the department head, dean or provost. The pilot program is to see who would take it. Ed Harris wanted to know what is before the council to vote on. Chair Veenstra state that there are two things before the council – the amendment and the one year pilot program for the 65 and over population. Ed feels that the task force as spent hours and months on this and he calls a question. Jim Smay asked if the pilot program is a 1 year contract and are we trying to recruit people into the Phased Retirement program for 1 year, they sign for 3. So it’s one year recruitment for up to 3 years’ time. Rodney Holcomb clarified that this pilot program is this fiscal year and you have the opportunity to sign up for 3 years. A question was called on the amendment and was already seconded so a vote was called for. Ken stated a point of order, if you call a question you must vote on that question. If you want more discussion you need to vote the motion down.

Vote was taken on calling the question. Motion passed.

Now the council will vote on the amendment to the recommendation which is for the incentive amendment only. Motion passed.

Bill Meek asked about how this Phased Retirement program will affect CHS? This would only apply to tenure track faculty, not clinical track faculty. Joe Weaver stated that on the question of agencies, if the recommendation passes and the administration took it as the Faculty Councils recommendation this would be worked out with the other agencies. Ken asked how administration will look at recommendation and amendment. Procedurally, they could they pass the recommendation to support the task force report without the amendment and implement this June 1st. The administration can decide that they want to do both parts. David Yellin asked if a buyout was part of this program. This pilot program is something completely different.

Bob Miller called the question on the recommendation. Mindy McCann seconded. Chair Veenstra asked for a vote on the call to question, motion passed. He asked for a vote on the recommendation as amended, motion passed.

**CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY – Tom Jordan – Update**

The committee has not met since the last Faculty Council meeting. We are still trying to find a better time to meet. This month we will be meeting at 1:00pm on Thursday, January 20. Topics for discussion will include the rough draft of the Landscape Master Plan, which is behind schedule, the proposed changes to the parking fees for the next five years and carpool polices.

**FACULTY – Udaya DeSilva – No Report**

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

**No Report**

**RESEARCH – Jim Smay – No Report**

**RETIREMENT and FRINGE BENEFITS - Mark Lawlor - Update**

The committee has put out a survey which was out last week. It will be presented 2 more times for those who have not yet responded. He urged everyone to take the survey.

**RULES and PROCEDURES – Robert Avakian – No Report**

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

**Report of Liaison Representatives:**

**Student Media Board – Sue Jacobs**

Sue introduced new O’Colly staff members and advisors: Amanda Bland who is the new editor-in-chief of the O’Colly who had to leave; Barbara Allen who is the advisor and Ray Catalina who is the business manager.

Ray wanted to let the council know that by the end of the calendar year, a word search will be available on the O’Colly archives, going back to1895. This is done in conjunction with the libraries. You can put in a word or phrase and find the article on the page and show you what it physically looked like on that page. By the end of January, the O’Colly will have a pay wall on the website. It won’t affect anyone in the room, but if one is outside a 25 mile radius, do not have an .edu address, and access the website more than 3 times a month, one will be asked to pay an annual $10 fee.

Barbara Allen wanted to let everyone know that the staff and students at the O’Colly welcome everyone’s comments. At some point, there will be phone bank that should direct you to the correct area. The director of the school of media and communications donated some of the computers that they are not using anymore. This allows the journalism and media com students to come down and work on their stories in the newsroom. They are offering writing coaching and keeping office hours so new students who want to learn about video editing, reporting, etc. can come down and get mentored as they learn. Sue Jacobs wanted to stress that this is a learning experience for the student reporters and this area is a great addition.

**Staff Advisory Council – Lora Polson**

Please have any staff that has concerns find a SAC representative. The SAC is also doing a raffle for scholarships; it’s a Valentine raffle – 2 night stay at the hotel, basketball tickets, movie tickets, etc. See your SAC representative for tickets.

**Old Business – None**

**New Business – Dr. Lee Bird**

She reminded everyone that our university has a Behavioral Consultation Team, which was formerly called the Threat Assessment Team. We renamed it and retooled it. The BCT welcomes any kind of recommendations. If there is someone who raises concerns or threats on campus, please report this to the BCT. Good information is necessary to get this process started. We have dealt with about 80 cases so far this year. Most of these with very satisfactory conclusions. The phone number is 744-3333. It is answered 8 hours a day and has a message to go to the police department after 5:00.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, February 8, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelia Kennison, Secretary