

Kennison called the meeting to order with the following members present: Avakian, Baeza, Barnes, Bartels, Bliss, Borland, Chung, Clarke, DeSilva, Holcomb, Holyoak, John, Jones, Lovern, Lowrance, Luttbeg, Materer, McBee, Paio, Takacs, Walker, Wansley, Wu, Yetter and Young.

Also present: Akande, T., Bertholf, D., Bird, L., Brown, S., Campbell, C., Chapman, M., Clark, G., Devuyt, C., Elliott, K., Fry, P., Hamilton, M., Hargis, B., Hawkins, C., M., Kruse, RA., Krysiak, R., Masters, B., Shutt, G., Tally, M., Tucker, S., and Weaver, J.

Absent: Biro, Cornell, Doust, Fisher and VanOverbeke.

HIGHLIGHTS

Special Reports –

Kirk Jewel – OSU Foundation.....

Dr. Brenda Masters – Higher Learning Commission: New Accreditation Criteria and the Assurance System.....

Remarks and Comments from the President.....

Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations and other Vice Presidents.....

Reports of Standing Committees

Academic Standards and Policies

Recommendation: OSU Academic Regulation 7.3: Residence Waiver for Certain Premedical Students

Recommendation: OSU Policy 2-0216: Final Exam Overload Policy
OSU Policy 2-0217: University Academic Format and Final Examination Policy

Athletics

Recommendation: Annual Review of the ASSA by the Faculty Council Athletics Committee

Budget

Campus Facilities, Safety and Security

Diversity.....

Faculty

Long-Range Planning and Information Technology

Research

Retirement and Fringe Benefits

Rules and Procedures

Student Affairs and Learning Resources

Reports of Liaison Representatives

Wellness Center.....

SAC

SGA.....

Kennison called the meeting to order and reminded the councilors to sign the attendance sheet

which is circulating the room. Kennison asked for approval of the February 11, 2014 minutes. McBee moved to accept the minutes and Holyoak seconded. Motion passed. Kennison moved to approve the agenda. DeSilva moved to approve the agenda. Lovern seconded the motion. Motion passed. Kennison stated that there will be two special reports today and introduced Kirk Jewel from the OSU Foundation.

Special Reports:

A. Kirk Jewel – OSU Foundation

Jewel distributed the following PowerPoint presentation to the council in paper form.



Faculty Council
Presentation 3-11-14.ppt

Jewel has been with the Foundation for 10 years. He came to the OSU Foundation from the for-profit world. Jewel stated the mission of the Foundation – Unite donor and University passions and priorities to achieve excellence. Jewel stated that the number one organizational value of the foundation is “Service to OSU”. The Foundation is a separate entity from the university. They are a separate 501(c)(3). The OSU Board of Regents has a written policy that all private philanthropy to OSU is to go through the Foundation. The Foundation is responsible for receiving, receipting and ensuring that the restrictions that the donor specifies are adhered to by the university when it spends the money. Since they are a separate entity, neither the President nor any staff member of the university may sit on the Foundation Board of Trustees. This board consists of 25 trustees. A number of people from the university leadership are invited to attend budget committee meetings and participate but they are not voting members of the Board. Last year’s operating budget was almost \$20 million. 50% of this comes from endowment fees. The other 36% comes from short term fees. The Foundation has a contract with OSU that consists of 11% of the budget. The fees are negotiated every year. Salaries and benefits are 61% of their total budget. OSU program support (Spears School Executive Management briefing, the Tulsa Business Forum, Chef Series and other programs) is 11%. The Foundation employees 138 people in 4 locations in Stillwater as well as Tulsa and Oklahoma City. The Foundations goal is to sustain \$150 million per year in fundraising. The Foundation tracks the cost per dollar. This is an industry metric that is tracked by all foundations. The OSU Foundation goal is to be .12 cents or less per dollar. They use a three year rolling average to calculate this cost. They are staying within the guidelines. Jewel stated that the endowment has grown nicely. There was a decline in 2008 it but has been increasing since. The Foundation is over \$500 million in the endowment and \$600 million in their investment pool. The spendable dollars that come from the endowment to the university last year was \$18.2 million. Next years projection is \$20.3 million.

Branding Success Campaign – Jewel stated that the campaign is at \$1 billion, 60 million dollars through the end of January 2014. This reflects more than 95,000 donors. The Foundations goal by the end of the campaign is to be at 100,000. The matching chair/professorship campaign helped secure 138 new endowed faculty positions. These are matching funds that include money

from Boone Pickens, donors and the state. So a \$500,000 gift became a \$2 million endowed faculty position. There are now 2,570 endowed scholarships. This is 1,056 more than before the campaign. These are scholarship funds, not actual scholarships. The impact of these funds is tremendous. The Pickens scholarship match pledge commitments are due to be paid the end of February 2016. Next steps in the campaign: finish strong by December 31, 2014, hit the 100,000 donor mark, engage with President Hargis on high potential prospects that have not made a campaign gift yet and continue to focus on high priority projects. The Foundation will do a campaign analysis at the conclusion of the campaign.

The Foundation has an investment committee (11 people) that is a subset of the Board of Trustees. The committee members all have investment backgrounds. The Foundation has a director of investments (Ryan Tidwell) and 4 staff people. The Foundation has changed their consultant to Cambridge Associates. Jewel states this is significant in that Cambridge Associates consult 70% of US-based higher education endowments. Jewel stated that the Foundations investment pool is up to \$650 million. Last year the Alumni Association was added. They have \$12 million endowment that they raised and the Foundation now manages.

The Foundation is trying to be much more risk averse than they have in the past. Jewel opened the floor for questions.

Kennison asked how a faculty member would go about setting up a scholarship in their name and is there a minimum amount needed to start the fund? Jewel stated that the commitment can be over a period of time and the minimum to endow a scholarship is \$25,000. Jewel stated that there are a number of people who do annual scholarships and create an endowed scholarship later with an estate gift. Jewel stated that the easiest way to get information is to talk to the development officer for the college. If a faculty member would like funding for a project, the Foundation development officer will have the faculty member go to their dean. The Foundation looks to the college deans to set the priorities for each college. The Foundation refers to their college development officers as major gift officers; they do not handle smaller projects. The gifts that they officers are targeting are \$25,000 or more. They will help with smaller gifts but their focus is the larger dollars. Kennison stated that some of the feedback she gets is that when they have an endowed chair they have a hard time getting information about the funds included in the endowed chair. Jewel stated that the money the state has matched is not at the Foundation and they only know the donors portion of the amount. The state match resides at the state. Weaver suggested that any faculty member should contact their college fiscal officer and they should be well versed in what chairs and professorships each college has. Weaver stated that they have regular meetings with the Foundation to make sure what is available. Weaver stated that if the fiscal officer does not have the answer they should know where to go to get the answer.

Kennison would like to see a smoother management of the endowments. Jewel stated that they never know what the state money will be. They have a different spending policy and the Foundation would be happy to help with anything on their side as far as what's available. Baeza asked if the information on the endowments is sent to the department or the individual faculty member. Jewels' understanding of this issue is that the information is sent to the financial person for each unit and a copy to the dean. Baeza stated that if there is a miscommunication is probably at the department level. Jewel stated that the Foundation has gone to great lengths the last few years to make this information easier for the colleges to access. It's now online. You log on and see in real time what funds are available in each account. Bartels asked if the Foundation charges each college a fee as well as the fee it charges the university. Jewel stated that each college is

charged a \$60,000 fee per year for what he calls the back office. It's the planned giving piece and gift processing. Jewel stated that 1% of the cash gifts in the door that the college pays (it doesn't come out of the donors money). So these are out of the colleges' state funds. Bartels confirmed the amount charged to each college is \$60,000. Jewel confirmed this amount. Gilbert would like to know how the Foundation treats associations. He is referring specifically to the Native American Faculty and Staff Association on campus. The organization has access to regular donations and has created a Foundation account. Gilbert asked if these organizations are treated differently in terms of their working relationship. Jewel stated that they do not charge a fee for managing (holding) people's money. Jewel stated that the Foundation would want to know what the criteria for spending is and who's authorized to request funds from the account. Once this information is given to the Foundation, they can manage the funds. Jewel stated that they do handle funds for student organizations. Gilbert asked if there was a limit to the funds. Jewel stated no. Jewel stated that the Foundation can set up automatic debits from credit cards if there are people who want to support whatever it is that the group/organization is doing. Chung stated that some chair/professorship programs are 3, 4 or 5 years. Chung asked if the Foundation had a regulation for this. Jewel stated no, this is either a college policy or it's something the donor has put in the agreement for the gift. Sometimes this is donor driven and sometimes it's the college. The Foundation does not have any input into this at all. Chung asked if there should be some type of criteria set up. Fry stated that each college dean is working on this. Jewel stated that it is very rare for the donor to stipulate this. They usually allow the college to set the guidelines. DeSilva asked if all the underwater funds have been awarded. Jewel stated that the Foundation does not award the colleges do and the funds are all above water. Kennison stated that through the last Provost Faculty Council became aware that the Foundation provided input to candidates on campus for deans' positions. Kennison asked if Jewel could talk about the role the Foundation plays in this process. Jewel stated that the Foundation is usually included in the dean searches and have a chance to have breakfast with the candidates. What they are looking for is how well the candidate connects with people. Jewel stated that at the end of the day do they connect and have a compelling story to tell a donor. Donors hear from every organization under the sun "we need your help". What donors really love to support is a vision. This is where we want to go and this is how your gift will help us reach the goal.

B. Dr. Brenda Masters – Higher Learning Commission: New Accreditation Criteria and the Assurance System

Dr. Masters presented the following PowerPoint presentation and handout:



20140312 FC
Presentation HLC.ppt

Oklahoma State University
Accreditation Cycle 2015-2016
Open Pathway
A New Model for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Oklahoma State University will utilize a new and transformed model for maintaining institutional accreditation, the Open Pathway. The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, referred to as the HLC, is replacing the Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality with two new Pathways, the Standard Pathway and the Open Pathway. OSU has been approved to adopt the highest accreditation standard represented by the Open Pathway.

Open Pathway seeks to achieve the following goals:

- Institution chooses a Quality Initiative to suit the current circumstances
- Utilizes as much information and data as possible from existing institutional processes and collecting them in electronic form as they naturally occur over time
- Checks institutional data annually and conducting Assurance Reviews twice in the ten-year cycle
- Integrate as much as possible all HLC processes/requests for data into the reaffirmation of accreditation cycle

The Open Pathway separates the process into two components:

Assurance Review

- Two Assurance Reviews - one in Year 4, one in Year 10
- The Year 4 review occurs asynchronously via the Commission's online Assurance System and without a visit.
- The Year 10 review also is conducted with the Assurance System but includes a visit to the campus during the academic year 2015-2016.

Quality Initiative

- Between Years 5 and 9 of the cycle OSU will complete a Quality Initiative that focuses on retention and freshman success.



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 Chicago, IL 60604-1411
312 263-0456 800-621-7440 Fax: 312-263-7462 | hlc.org

The Criteria for Accreditation

Criterion One.

Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Core Components

1.A. The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.

1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

1.D. The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Criterion Two.

Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Components

- 2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.**
- 2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.**
- 2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.**
1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
 2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
 3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
 4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.
- 2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.**
- 2.E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.**
1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
 2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
 3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Criterion Three.

Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Components

3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Core Components

4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning out-comes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).

4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Criterion Five. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Components

5.A. The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
2. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
3. The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Dr. Masters will be inviting faculty to provide input on the website for the core components in

the assurance process. She is looking for initial ideas not polished ideas. She is looking for 15 people who have basic ideas about the different specific pieces (the core criteria) and let them input the documents they believe should be included. She would then open it up to 15 more people and keep building. The work will then be polished and presented to faculty through open forums and faculty discussions. Masters will be contacting several people and she is looking forward to working on this with many faculty. Masters hopes OSU's next self-study visit is in the spring of 2016. They have requested 4 dates – 2 in fall 2015 and 2 in spring 2016. She hopes for spring of 2016.

Masters opened the floor to questions. Baeza stated that at the beginning of the presentation Dr. Masters referenced 10 items they are looking at that have been narrowed down to 5. Baeza asked if these could be things that someone would be doing in their area to support LASSO. Would they then try to figure out to fit this into the criteria? Masters stated that this quality initiative and the report will be separate from these statements and support of these statements. Masters stated that people will find when they read through the criteria there is very much information about support for student success. So the information that will be provided in the quality initiative report will certainly overlap with this information because communicating well with students and having a nice/effective support system are things that would also be in the self-study report. This information could be on both sides (the quality initiative and the self-study) report.

Remarks and Comments from the President:

President Hargis gave the following update on searches. Ag dean candidates were on campus yesterday and today for a prescreening visit. The four candidates for the Honors College are on campus. The Spears School of Business is narrowing down to those who will be invited to campus. Provost search is getting close. VP for Research is just getting started.

Hargis stated that the Regents did approve the block tuition proposal. It was suggested that the hours be increased from 16 to 18 so the proposal is for 12-18 hours. Hargis stated they will be monitoring drop issues and if there is a problem they might have to adjust the hours. Hargis stated that they are working on the “banking” hours for summer. This is a complicated issue because all courses are not offered in the summer. An answer to this question will not be known until the spring of 2015 for the 2015 summer sessions. The interim Provost and President have been discussing increasing the online offerings at OSU for the summer to help accommodate these students. Hargis stated that the goal of this block tuition program is to get students to graduate faster. Currently OSU's 4 year graduation rate is 31%. This is low and the state Regents are moving toward performance funding and the graduation rate will have an impact. Hargis also stated that advising needs to be amped up and have plans so students can see how to graduate in 4 years. Another problem is switching majors. This can slow down the 4 year graduation potential of students. Hargis stated this is a work in progress. The entire Big 10 as well as some Big 12 school uses the block tuition system so OSU has a lot of models to look at.

Hargis said that the state estimates that appropriations will be down \$188 million from last year and there is no more money. Hargis stated that OSU does have some priorities one which they funded last year was the hospital in Tulsa. The hospital has 150 residencies for OSU medical students. This was matched by the Healthcare Authority to total \$18.5 million. OSU has been doing an RFP for a partner and Hargis feels this is very close to being accomplished. Hargis expects another tough budget year and it's been this way since 2008.

Hargis opened the floor to questions. Holcomb asked if banking hours was part of the current block tuition proposal. Hargis stated that when the proposal was approved by the Regents the banking hours issue was still up in the air and is not finally figured out. Hargis said the inclination is to allow students to bank hours with the understanding that courses may not be available in the summer. Holcomb stated that the bursar's website states that summer courses will continue to be charged on a per credit hour basis. Hargis said this needs to be fixed because this was how the proposal went to the Regents. Weaver stated that summer will still be per credit hour but if you bank the summer will be free as long as the course the student needs is available. Weaver stated there might be able to create a separate block system for summer school. Kennison asked if there was a maximum that students can bank for the summer. Weaver said the idea is for students to graduate in 4 years and if they take 12 in the fall and 12 in the spring they are short 6 hours of the 30 needed per year to graduate in 4 years. So 6 hours would be the maximum bankable hours to be taken in the summer. Weaver stated again that the block is 12-18 hours with the rate based on 15 hours. So if a student wants to take one extra course it is basically free. Kennison was excited to see the Enterprise System on the Regents plan and asked Hargis to address the new SIS program. Weaver stated that OSU will be negotiating a contract and plan to implement the new system over the next 18 months to 2 years. Weaver stated this system would move off the main-frame system to a more mobile system so students can be enrolled by mobile devices and information would be available from mobile devices. This will get away from batch processing into real-time processing. \$22 million cost that is being funded internally off the top of the budget and paying ourselves back over time. Weaver is very excited about the project and it will position OSU very well in the future. We will have better access to the funded chair data which was discussed earlier. DeSilva asked what the implementation time frame was for the new program. Weaver stated 18 months to two years from last Friday. Barnes asked about exceptions for students who cannot take 15 hours. Barnes stated this is a concern for Tulsa faculty since some of their students could be encouraged to take 12 hours but cannot take 15. Christie Hawkins stated that there will be appeals and exceptions to the block tuition. Hawkins knows there are concerns about the Tulsa students and she has had conversations with President Barnett about having the Tulsa students as an overall exception. Hawkins does realize that there is a different population in Tulsa and they are in the process of handling the dually enrolled students but there will certainly be exceptions. Barnes stated that they may not have that many hours available for students to take in a semester. Hargis stated that the other exceptions are if the student needs less than 30 hours to graduate. By law Oklahoma Promise students will be exempted. There are cases where students need to work and cannot take that many hours. Weaver said that on the issue of banking if the student applies for an exemption or asks for a waiver and they only pay for 12 hours they will not be able to bank the extra 3 hours for the summer. So administration has to analyze whether the student would be charged for the full 15 hours and then allow them to bank the extra 3 or just exempt them and charge them per credit hour. What will be the most administratively convenient, efficient and what's in the best interest of the student. Weaver stated that there are a lot of details to work out still. DeSilva asked if the students who work 40 hours a week will be exempt. Hawkins stated that there will be a process where students can file an appeal if they have extenuating circumstances. These will be reviewed. Hawkins stated that Tulsa is a special population and will be treated as a blanket exemption so 400 Tulsa students are filing appeals. Takacs asked about the dually enrolled students and in fact the majority of Tulsa students will fall into this category. Hawkins stated that

this is a detail they are working on but do not have everything finalized yet. DeSilva stated that there are some maximum enrollment guidelines on campus as well. Will these remain as such. Hawkins stated that if there is something contractual that a student can only take so many hours this will be looked at. Oklahoma Promise students can be identified and will be exempted, students who have contractual agreements are not tracked in SIS but they can file an appeal. DeSilva asked if there is a maximum guideline for courses? Celeste Campbell stated yes. Undergraduate students can only take 19 credit hours in a fall or spring term without special permission. Campbell stated that this will not change because it is a state Regents' requirement. DeSilva asked if there was a summer maximum guideline as well. Campbell stated yes there is a website on the registrar's page that lists all the maximums for each session of the summer.

Report of Status of Council Recommendations:

Interim Provost Pam Fry stated that there are no recommendations to report. Kennison stated that RPT policy did not go to the Board of Regents this last time but will hopefully be on the agenda for the April meeting. Fry stated there were discussions about language that legal counsel wanted added. Today the deans met with Scott Fern to discuss the language. Deans Council is Thursday so she will have an update after this meeting. Hopefully this will be resolved and then sent back to Faculty Council. Fry clarified that each of the dean search committees handle the semi-finalist process a little differently. The Honors College Skype and these four finalists are on campus. Fry thanked everyone for their participation in these forums. Most of the other searches are in the pre-screening process now. Fry said they are working on the Finish in Four initiative. This is for each undergraduate degree, creating easily understood degree maps that will demonstrate to the student how they could finish an undergraduate degree in 4 years. Fry believes this will be in line with the block tuition. A version will be created to show the utilization of summer courses. Fry mentioned that the online education steering committee is creating recommendations and hopefully the Education Advisory Board system will be rolling out soon. The first ones are LASSO, College of Education, some departments in Art & Sciences and these will continue down to the other units. Kennison asked about the hiring of a centralized online education person. Fry stated this is one of the recommendations that will be coming from the steering committee. It's still in progress. DeSilva asked if this would be at Assistant Provost level. Fry stated it has not been determined yet. DeSilva also asked if there were dates for the Ag dean on campus yet? Weaver stated no. Not yet.

Vice President Reports:

Kennison asked if Weaver could update the council on the custodial transfer. Weaver stated that he has a meeting with their Vice President of Operations next week. They will brief Weaver on their first month experience. Weaver stated their start as rocky. They came in with 110 personnel when we needed 150. As of last Thursday they were staffed up to 137 so they have been improving their numbers each week. Weaver appreciates when faculty call the Physical Plant and

report problems. One of the benchmarks that Weaver is reviewing is the number of complaints. If there are problems please call they are happy to fix whatever the problem may be. Weaver stated that at the rate in which the company has been improving each week he anticipates they will be at 150 by the first of the month which is where they need to be. Weaver appreciates everyone patience while we are working through this.

Sheryl Tucker stated that most of you should have received an email about Academic Policy forums. There is a laundry list of clean up items that are being tracked. Tucker stated that there is one new policy, Best Practice for Annual Review of Graduate Students. This is not a requirement but just ask that you look at graduate students and meet with them particularly in research programs. Tucker stated that there are changes to the graduate faculty. These are being driven by all the concerns from faculty. This will be part of the open forum meetings as well. They are trying to align for tenure track faculty which is really where they felt it would align with the normal hiring of a tenure track faculty member and retaining of this tenure track individual. The tenuring, promoting and five year review will be done in the units and will not go through the group process. The non-tenure track is still part of the group process. This is just a draft. There will need to be a bylaws change and this is a full graduate faculty vote. There is not an understanding that this was to reduce the work, it was not to increase it. If you are reading it that way we did not do a good job of communicating it because the whole point is to try to take out the vast majority of faculty into the normal unit process. This could be a simple form in your unit. If you are tenured and promoted just let us know that you are tenured graduate faculty status. We do due diligence as an institution in the manner that is appropriate to ensure that those involved in graduate education still choose to be involved in graduate education. Hopefully everyone can attend the group meetings and open forums this month.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICIES – Carol Jones – Update

Jones presented the OSU Academic Regulation 7.3 recommendation. Recommendation was attached to the agenda. Revision to the recommendation will be made prior to forwarding to administration. DeSilva stated that this has been done internally for regular students so the pre-law and pre-medical are coming from a different institutions. What do they send back to us – GPA calculation and so on? How is this going to work? Keely James stated that the assumption is that we have been doing this as an internal process. We have also been doing it with any doctoral health professions program. We can transfer back 30 hours from a doctoral physical therapy program or from a medical program that isn't an OSU medical program but a medical program from anywhere in the country. Similarly it's just a matter of verifying at the registrar's level when they send back the transcript these are completed hours. So just like we accept in our unofficial transcript the course work but we do not list them on our official transcript with the grades or GPA calculated. Campbell stated that it would be up to the individual department offering the degree to validate that the courses coming back are satisfying the requirements of the degree. So the actual courses are transferred back. Motion passed.

Jones then presented the second recommendation formalizing what we have been doing all along. Motion passed.

ATHLECTICS – Gary Young – Update

The Athletic Committee has the following three (3) items to report.

1. We plan to make a recommendation to the general Faculty Council at the meeting on March 11 concerning our committee's proposed annual review of the Academic Services for Student-Athletes (ASSA).

Young presented the recommendation that was distributed with the agenda. Motion passed.

2. We invited Meredith Hamilton (OSU Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA – National Collegiate Athletic Association) to give a short report to our committee on her recent NCAA national conference in San Diego, CA. A summary of her report follows.

The 2014 NCAA convention was held 15-18 January in San Diego. The main event this year focused on a 2-day discussion of Division I Governance. The Board of Directors of the NCAA initiated a review process of the current governance structure and opened up discussions on how to best restructure the system into an effective and viable governance structure.

850 Division I members delved deeper into many restructuring concepts, providing valuable feedback for the Steering Committee's efforts to move the redesign of the division's structure and processes forward.

Numerous table discussions were conducted and clicker polls surveyed such things as who should be part of governance structure, what should the guiding principles be, what role should student athletes play in governance, etc.

Many NCAA members are looking for a governance structure that is organized around governing principles such as athlete well-being and academic rigor, and maintaining a clear focus on higher education. The new structure will most likely see a shift in the composition of the NCAA governing body (perhaps including more athletic directors and perhaps Faculty Athletics Representatives) and a more streamlined approach to governance.

3. I was asked by Shelia Kennison to look into the rental structure of Gallagher-Iba (G-I) Arena and the rationale for funds flowing from the Educational & General (E&G) account to the Athletic Department.

Last month I met with Jason Lewis (Associate Athletic Director for Business Affairs) to discuss this topic. At one time there was a Special Events Account that was used by departments such as the physical plant, the OSU Police, and Environmental Health & Safety to charge for their services associated with these activities. The Athletic Department did not bill to this account. Until around 2005 – 2006 this account was not

monitored very well and the account had gone into the red. Around this time, David Bosserman (Vice President for Administration and Finance) eliminated this account and meetings were held to decide what portion should be paid by E&G funds and what portion should be paid by the Athletic Department. Fees were determined based on the cost of utilities and required personnel to staff special events and clean-up afterwards. These events include graduations / convocations, Special Olympics, High School games and playoffs (which are effective recruiting events for both Athletics and Academics), the CEAT Career Fair, hosting of outside speakers, and intramural events.

It was determined that E&G funds would contribute \$500,000 to cover their share of the costs for the scheduled events each year. This sum is a reduction from the \$944,000 that was paid previously. The Athletic Department would cover the remainder of the costs. Currently, the Athletic Department bills the University (E&G funds) monthly for the annual rent.

Weaver added that the \$500,000 amount was derived from the budget committee of Faculty Council and the budget staff. The amount was stepped down from \$944,000 to the \$500,000 over the period of a few years. Kennison felt that there was a not a general understanding that the \$500,000 paid for more than graduation. The funds are used for more than graduation. Kennison did ask that if a student group brings a speaker to campus in some ways is the rental of Gallagher/Iba free to them or they also charged a fee for using the building. Weavers understanding is if someone is coming in and there is a charge for the activity then athletics will charge them for clean up after the event. There is no charge for the facility. Bartels stated that how the \$500,000 was actually spent was never discussed. It was more of a general fund provided to the athletic department to cover these other aspects that are required such as convocation. Is this still the case? Weaver stated yes. They could look and see how the funds are disbursed but he can assure the council that the \$500,000 does not cover the utilities. So to a certain degree he is not concerned about how the funds are used, it's just for utility type expenses. It's not Cowboy Athletics it is the Athletic Department. Kennison stated to clarify if we looked at just the days in which these events for the university were using the facility the \$500,000 does not cover the utilities for the events? Weaver stated it's an estimated value for the cost of events in the building. John stated that the Native American Association Powwow has been moved off campus because of the cost. John didn't know if this issue has been brought to the administrations attention on how they might be able to negotiate a lesser charge and bring the event back on campus. Dr. Bird stated that the decision to move some of the Powwows off campus but her office has paid for a number of them. They cover the rental fees and continue to do so for a number of groups. If a group wants to do a special event her office typically covers the cost of the space. She doesn't believe the issue was covering the cost of facility but the availability and the ability to bring in food and do a number of others things that were requested.

BUDGET –Rodney Holcomb – No Report

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY – Nathan Walker – No Report

DIVERSITY – Georgette Yetter – No Report

FACULTY – Matt Lovern – Update

Lovern stated that the committee will have a meeting later this month and hopefully have something to discuss with the council in April. This will most likely be something to do with the current OSU Appraisal and Development Policy.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING and INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY – Victor Baeza – Update

Baeza stated that over a year ago there was a recommendation from this committee regarding copyright usage warning. This has finally completed the process and has approval from all parties. The statement should start appearing in D2L on the main screen this week or next week. As part of this recommendation the Library in conjunction with legal counsel and ITLE would create a webpage to help answer questions for faculty about copyright usage. This page should be up definitely by the end of the semester. Baeza is hoping for the end of this month. Baeza will be doing a copyright presentation this Friday for ITLE.

The committee has been taking a lot of questions to Darlene Hightower about policies and procedures dealing with email and computer usage. An OSU/A&M system policy and procedure workgroup has been created to address these issues. As part of the LRPT committee, Baeza was invited to be part of this committee. They will be discussing issues that faculty as well as IT people from all campuses that are involved and try to put together policies that everyone can agree with. Hightower also noticed that the computer usage policy had never been approved by Faculty Council or the Deans Council. The committee will be meeting every two to three weeks to try to get something in place by this summer.

Baeza announced that Window XP support is ending on April 8th. IT was able to identify any computers on campus that were owned by OSU that were still running XP to upgrade them to Windows 7. But if faculty have purchased their own machines IT cannot identify it. They are expecting that April 9th there will be a lot of attacks and there will not be any security fixes coming from Windows. If a machine gets a virus and OSU spots it, they will cut the machine off from the network and the only way to get it fixed is to upgrade to at least Windows 7. If you have trouble doing this contact the help desk. They will up get your machine up to the new level. Kennison stated that the software downloads are available and IT will help you install it.

RESEARCH – Gilbert John – Update

John stated that the committee met and received a request from the Vice President of Research to have the committee review a bio safety policy change that was made by the university research compliant office and the bio safety committee. The policy was reviewed by the committee. The committee invited the chair of the committee Dr. Shaw who provided more details about the changes. The two significant changes that were made are:

1. Recommendation to include campus wide inspections of bio safety level one spaces. Previous inspections by the bio safety officer were only meant to inspect bio safety 2 and 3 facilities. But now it includes 1, 2 and 3.
2. Making updates to identify what is known as responsible officer/official and the alternative responsible officials. These are individuals who will be responsible for decisions made with

people working with select agents and toxins on campus. This requires identification of these people so that it is open depending on who happens to be Vice President of Research since they hold the official title. John submitted the summary of these changes for the record.

John said the committee has been discussing Cowboy Technologies. Will this become a requirement for faculty or just an option. The committee asked Dr. Tucker if any policies in place right now require faculty to utilize Cowboy Technologies. Tucker stated that she is meeting with the person responsible for Cowboy Technologies and they will discuss this. Tucker believes they are looking for a collaborative relationship with faculty. There will be an opportunity in the future to meet with the Faculty Council officers to discuss where they are with Cowboy Technologies and what the opportunities are in the future to be successful with our technology transfer.

John stated another concern was with the overload pay policy. He knows this was passed last year but again faculty are discussing it and concerned about the language and how it affects certain faculty depending on their situation particularly online teaching. This is an ongoing discussion.

Another item to be discussed is the Physical Plant. Is progress being made on faculty issues such as fees? Weaver stated that they have tried to re-engineer how their process and projects roll out. Part of the recommendation is to move away from the work order system for a lot of general maintenance items and fund this type of work centrally. Weaver anticipates by the beginning of the fiscal year there will be something to talk about as far as the concerns. Weaver states they hope to have a website that would have total transparency about what things cost. Have by college, an agreement regarding the level of service that will be provided for free and other items that will be an additional cost and what those costs would be. John asked when this would be happening, Weaver stated at the beginning of the fiscal year. DeSilva asked if it would be possible for faculty have input on the types of things that should be considered free of charge. Weaver said sure.

RETIREMENT and FRINGE BENEFITS – Stephen Clarke – No Report

RULES and PROCEDURES – Chanjin Chung – Update

Chung stated that the Faculty Council online elections will begin on Monday, March 24 and end Monday, March 31st. Chung stated that at the last meeting nominations for Vice Chair and Secretary were presented. Vice Chair candidates are Stephen Clarke and Jeanmarie Verchot. Secretary candidates are Deb VanOverbeke and Daqing Piao. Chung stated that no new nominations were received so the slate is set. Chung stated that some nominations for councilors have been received. Currently one more nominee is needed from CASNR, two nominees from Spears School of Business, one more nominee needed from OSU-Tulsa and two nominees from OSU-IT. Chung thanked the councilors for their help filling the remaining openings. Kennison stated that if you know someone willing to run, contact Tricia and she'll send out the appropriate forms.

STUDENT AFFAIRS and LEARNING RESOURCES – Barney Luttbeg – No Report

Report of Liaison Representatives:

Wellness Center – Mary Tally

Tally presented the following flyer:

Wellness Wednesday with Dr. Suzy Harrington

Join Chief Wellness Officer Suzy Harrington, DNP, RN, MCHES, and learn about wellness resources available at Oklahoma State University and the pockets of excellence leading to "America's Healthiest Campus".

Free Employee/Member Luncheon*
 April 16, Noon - 12:50 p.m.
 Seretean Wellness Center

"Wellness is the harmony and synergy of our physical, emotional, spiritual, social, professional, and financial health." -Dr. Harrington



Registration Deadline: April 9 at Noon. *No shows will be billed \$10.



Simply Nutrition

5:30-6:30 p.m., 007A Willard, Free*

March 25 - Weight Management and Goal Setting
 April 29 - Healthy Restaurant Options, Cooking Tips, and Healthy Snacks

Register for each class individually.
 *No shows will be billed \$10.



SPORTS NUTRITION

WITH JENNY GRAEF, M.S.

Free *Classes, 6:30 p.m.
 Seretean Wellness Center

April 3 - Basic Nutrition and Hydration
 April 10 - Nutritional Supplements, Nutrient Timing, Race Day Preparation

Register for each class individually.
 *No shows will be billed \$10.

Cowboy Cooking School with Federico Aime

April 11, Noon-1p.m.
 Seretean Wellness Center Kitchen



Menu

Crisp Mushrooms with Eggs and Murcia Pimentón
 The Brightest Orange Pork Loins
 Citrus Confited Loins with Endives
 Mother Frola: Argentinean Style Quince Pie

\$20, for recipes, cooking demonstration and sampling menu items. Registration Deadline: April 7 at 5p.m.



Women & Weights

April 6, 13, 20, & 27
 5-7 p.m. \$20 (includes shirt)

Information Meeting: April 2
 7-8 p.m., Seretean Wellness Center

Do you know how to lift correctly?
 Are you aware how important strength training is for women?

Cowboy Walking Trails GRAND OPENING

April 15, 11:45 a.m.
 Corner of Hester St. and Legacy Walk
 (sidewalk south of Civil Engineering Lab)



RUN RABBIT RUN

1 mile fun run for the whole family!
 April 12, \$5/person
 Intramural Fields
 (located directly west of the Seretean Wellness Center)

Register soon! First 200 registrants will receive a t-shirt. Registration forms are available at the Seretean Wellness Center front desk, or online.

Run begins at 4 p.m.
 Stay after the run for sack races, egg toss and other fun activities

For more information or to register for an event call 405-744-WELL (9355), email wellness@okstate.edu or visit wellness.okstate.edu.


DEPARTMENT OF
Wellness

Staff Advisory Council – Marsha Chapman

Chapman announced that SAC election nomination forms are out. The election will be held in April. The scholarship program is beginning. Applications will out soon. Full time staff who have completed one year of service at the university are eligible. Selected recipients receive \$500 which is split between the fall and spring semesters. The staff appreciation day preparation is

underway. May 22nd will be Staff Appreciation day at Boone Pickens stadium. The Staff Distinguished Service Awards were presented at the recent Staff Development day that was held on February 28th at the Alumni Center. SAC has two recommendations that were sent to administration last month. The 12 month payroll deduction for staff parking permits and short term disability insurance options.

SGA – Temitope Akande

SGA Senator Akande representing the College Engineering, Architecture and Technology. He wanted to discuss with Faculty Council a resolution that was recently passed by the SGA regarding Murray Hall. Akande stated that there has been a lot of debate about changing/not changing the name. These past discussions have been within Faculty Council and the students have not been involved but this is currently changing. The reason for wanting to change the name of Murray Hall is because Governor Murray, to put it simply, was a racist and anti-Semite. The students feel that this type of person should not have a building named after him on this campus. Several years ago the Faculty Council addressed this issue and came up with a compromise with the school to put a display in the basement. The SGA believes now is a good time to revisit the issue and take it one step farther by actually taking the name off the building. The SGA proposes changing the name to Social Sciences and Psychology Building. Akande is very passionate about this issue as an African American. Akande stated that Murray was a racist and promoted segregation in Oklahoma. Murray tried to get this passed in the state constitution. This is what the students have a problem with. Not the fact that he was a racist but what he promoted as Governor of Oklahoma. Akande feels that a lot of people are offended by the fact that Murray is lifted up in this way when there are a lot of other people who have done greater things for the state. Akande has spoken with many people who have said they are worried about donors and such, one of the things to keep in mind that the students of today will be alumni of tomorrow and this kind of issue is important to them. The SGA believes that the right thing to do is to change the name of the building. Akande is attending today's meeting to gain Faculty Councils support in the effort to change the building name. He does not want the issue to go to a committee because things that go to a committee go there to die. The SGA wants real change to happen. Akande asked for a joint resolution between Faculty Council and the SGA to actually make the name change happen. Akande will be meeting with other groups on campus to get their support as well.

Akande opened the floor to questions. Chung asked what the next step would be since they have made a resolution. Akande stated that the next step would be to put together a petition. Hargis stated that this is not his decision, it's a Regents decision. Akande stated that the SGA is trying to do this in the right way. They are not trying to make any trouble. Akande is graduating in May but believes there are a lot of students who will continue to support this resolution. The online petition will be available soon. Akande stated that in 2002 the school voted not to change the name because they said Murray was the single most important person in Oklahoma history in regards to the state. Akande agrees with this he gives the state a bad name. Kennison asked what the vote was at SGA since Akande stated it was nearly unanimous. Akande said the vote was 30 to 2. Yetter stated that as chair of the Diversity Committee they would be happy to work with the SGA on this issue. DeSilva stated that at this point what Akande and the SGA are asking is for Faculty Councils support. DeSilva made a simple motion that as the Faculty Council we support

the SGA resolution. Holcomb seconded the motion. Young asked to see the resolution is so he would know what is being voted on. Kennison stated that a copy was sent to the council members prior to today's meeting. Akande stated that what the resolution demands that the name of Murray Hall be changed to Social Sciences Building and North Murray be changed to Psychology Building. The display in the basement will stay and highlight what the building used to be and what it is now. Holyoak stated that if we go forward with this resolution will we be stepping on a slippery slope and how many other buildings will also be scrutinized. This is his biggest concern. He's very sympathetic toward the issue the name raises but once we take this step for one building how many more will follow. Holyoak feels this is an issue we should at least consider as we move forward. Holyoak feels that once you open the door the possibility of scrutinizing every name on every building is a downside to this resolution. He feels the council should consider the downside because there are always effects and consequences of which we might not fully be aware. Akande feels this will be inconvenient but will not be a downside. He believes people should be able to raise questions in a free country and let the community decide. DeSilva stated that the other buildings that have been looked at they were former deans or people who had some contribution to OSU. DeSilva was on Faculty Council the first time around when they voted to rename the building it didn't go anywhere. Murray's track record is very different than most other people. Murray has done nothing to advance education in Oklahoma or OSU. Murray was cut from a very different cloth than the other people whose names are on buildings. DeSilva stated that this has been done before. Renaming Boone Pickens Stadium so there is precedence. We are known to name buildings by boring names – North Classroom Building, Life Sciences East, so why not. John stated his feeling on this is that this is a democracy. If this is a concern just wait and see what happens. John doesn't feel this will set in motion name changing of every building on campus. Holyoak stated he didn't say it would but it could. John agreed that it could. John stated that we should wait and see. There may be a time when the second issue comes up and it's voted down. Bartels commended the students for taking an initiative such as this, whether he agrees with it or not, but we do have a process with committee structure that he wonders why our Diversity Committee has not taken a look at this issue with the students and come to Faculty Council with a resolution. Bartels feels that moving forward with the motion which the council needs to unless the council wishes to table it until they get a report from the Diversity Committee. Kennison stated she is ready to take a vote unless there are more questions. McBee stated that today she visited with two of her students, one graduate and one undergraduate of which neither was black or Jewish, and asked them about this issue. McBee expected them to know nothing about the issue but was very surprised to hear that both students knew about Murray and that they thought the name of the building should be changed. McBee believes the Faculty Council does itself a disservice if we do not recognize how strongly our students feel about this. Kennison asked if we were ready to do a show of hands. Kennison stated that her personal view is that if Murray were around today he would not be supportive of OSU's Land Grant Mission and she does worry about the welcoming environment that we have on campus when students walk by the building with the Murray legacy that can cast a shadow over the students experience here. She will be voting in favor of the resolution. Holyoak did not want to come across as against this resolution but he has a point of order that the chairperson voicing her opinion prior to the vote. Kennison said it was ok for him to call her out on this point of order and she retracted her statement. Lovern stated that he was happy to have the students supporting this and he is happy to see some activism on the part of students. Lovern called to question the

motion. Kennison called for a show of hand vote. Motion passed with one abstention.

Old Business - None

New Business

Kennison reported that there was meeting with Joe Weaver, Jason Ramsey from the Board of Regents, Gary Clark, Scott Fern and some Faculty Council officers and Executive Committee members regarding the Anti-retaliation Policy that was approved by the Board of Regents last year. The Policy can be found on their website. This group talked very informally about how this policy is supposed to be implemented. From this meeting we did get a sense that if anyone on campus felt that they had reported something and were being retaliated against that the Ombudsperson would be an appropriate place to go if they felt they couldn't go their local department head or dean. Kennison wanted to get this information out. In terms of faculty dispute forms it turns out that they do not need to be revised. So we will not need to make any changes to incorporate this in our grievance forms.

The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, April 8, 2014 in **412 Student Union, Council Room.**

Respectfully submitted,

Udaya DeSilva, Secretary