#####  FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union

October 12, 2010

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

Also present: Bosserman, D., Chapman, M., Chezem, C., Gates, G., Miller, B., Payton, M., Scott, M., Simpson, J., Skaer, C., Sternberg, R. and Weaver, J.

Absent: Atekwana, DeWitt, Harris, and Kennison.

**HIGHLIGHTS**

Impact of State Question 744

Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations

Remarks and Comments from the Provost

Reports of Standing Committees

 Academic Standards and Policies

 Athletics

 Budget

 Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security

 Faculty

 Long-Range Planning and Information Technology

 Research

 Retirement and Fringe Benefits

 Rules and Procedures

 Student Affairs and Learning Resources

Reports of Liaison Representatives

 Woman’s Faculty Council

 Staff Advisory Council

Veenstra called the meeting to order and announced a sign-up sheet is being passed around.

Veenstra asked for approval of the September 14, 2010 minutes. Avakian moved acceptance of the Minutes. Jordan seconded. The Minutes were approved.

Veenstra asked for approval of the October 12, 2010 amended agenda. Smay moved to accept the amended agenda, DeSilva seconded. The Agenda was approved.

**Special Reports:**

1. **Joe Weaver – Assoc. VP/CH Budget Officer – Impact of State Question 744**

 Weaver will be discussing the impact of State Question 744, if it passes, will be on Oklahoma State University. He’s not telling you how to vote just for the record. Background on State Question 744 – it’s a notion that common education funding should be on average per pupil funded at the same level as the surrounding states. Anyone who deals with statistics will understand that there are multiple was to look at the numbers. It’s really hard to say the specific number that OK will have to achieve because it depends on how state government interprets the average. This is not delineated in State Question 744. By one measure per pupil spending is about $8,000 in OK by one estimate OK would need to move spending up about $1,600 per student. The state would have to increase expenditures for common education for each of the next three years (the state has three years to get into compliance). It’s not entirely clear whether the state can do this over three years or loading up in the first year. This is unknown and that’s within the purview of the government to do. One thing is clear; the measure does not provide a revenue source. So how it’s funded seems pretty clear there’s three ways the tax base expands through growth, taxes are raised or reallocation occurs. There was a state question passed a number of years ago that taxes cannot be raised in OK unless the legislature passes it by a super majority or it goes to a vote of the people. So a tax increase is off the table. The base will grow as the economy improves but whether is grows sufficiently to raise $1. 7 billion that could go to common education by most people’s calculations the best or most likely way to raise the funds would be through reallocation.

 A few statistics – the economies fully implemented the question would require about 12.7% growth in state revenue. The state would have to raise state income tax by 34%, sales tax by 38% or at least a 20% additional set of budget cuts to state agencies for next if you were to implement it entirely next year. They would not necessarily have to do this. For a budget guy, if the state decides to do the 20% budget cut, we would need to come up with about $25 million. If the university was to decide, which Weaver would never recommend, to raise it by tuition and fees we do not even have enough authority to do that. The university is limited by law right now to the Big 12 average and would need to rise by at least 22%. If this was done by just tuition and fees this would move OSU past the Big 12 average. OSU would move into 5th place. Back in August, State Question 744 was polling at 70% for, it was going to pass. Since that time, over the past 6 to 8 weeks, it’s flipped. The no’s are at 60% and the yes’s at roughly 27%. It’s still 3 weeks from the election and everyone needs to be paying attention to this but it does appear that President Borin and President Hargis getting out there and making comments about the impact on the universities, the state chamber and TV ads speaking against 744 have obviously influenced some people. So we see that once the information gets out there, people are hearing and understanding what the impact would be. A serious weakness in the plan is OSU’s budget is impacted in a significant way by the economic conditions of the surrounding states, not our own. OK could be going down in revenue while the other states recover quicker but OK would be forced to respond based on how the economy of those other states are doing. As you know each state has their tax base and taxing system. All the states are different regarding how their public schools are organized.

 Bob Avakian commented that there is no direction in State Question 744 on how the money would be spent. Weaver said to go to [www.okpolicy.org](http://www.okpolicy.org) to get a summary of the major features of State Question 744. There is no provision that says how much has to go to teachers vs. administrators vs. new construction. It’s just average dollars per student. There are no bench marks or accountability or assessment features either. It’s just get the funding average up per pupil to the state to match the surrounding state average. Nick Materer asked why OK was so low per pupil – is there demographic or other reason for the difference. OK is heavily rural, property values and tax base are lower. OK is a low income and sales tax total tax base state. OK provides a disproportionate share at the state level when compared to other states. They fund more at the local level than OK. David Yellin stated that there has been an overwhelming amount of advertising over the past few months against this bill. Assuming that this bill fails, doesn’t that just give the mandate to the politicians to do nothing for common education and salaries? Weaver would like to think that if the bill fails, the legislation would at least see that this issue has been given some visibility and they go about trying to figure out how to fix the problem in a proper way if this is deemed improper. Weaver states that timing on this issue is really bad. The university is already facing the loss of stimulus money; this will be a 7% reduction. State revenue hasn’t recovered and they used onetime funds to make the budgets work this year. That’s another 3% to 5%. So we are already looking at a 7% to 12% reduction in the state appropriation for next year. This is a layer on top of that reduction. Other state agencies have taken 10% and 15% cuts for a series of years. Higher Education has been spared because we have been in favorable position compared to these other state agencies. The timing is awful. Bruce Russell asked how much of the state budget actually goes to public/common education. What the percentage is for teacher salaries. Joe Weaver doesn’t have an answer.

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

Provost Robert Sternberg gave the status of the pending recommendation:

 **10-02-01-ASP – General Education Advisory Council Membership**-

**Pending** – The amendments to the original recommendation were discussed and approved by the General Education Advisory Council on Sept 29, 2010 and will be considered by the Council of Deans on Oct. 13.

 **10-09-01-RES – Policy on Supplemental Pay Plan for Rewarding Research Support**-

**Pending** – Recommendation has been shared with the deans for discussion with college leadership teams, and Provost Sternberg and VP McKeever will discuss when they meet in early October.

Bruce Russell stated that the overarching element of this recommendation is about a broad policy on providing incentives for research and creative work. Russell hopes that some common ground can be found to provide those incentives to the faculty who are doing a fair amount of research. Provost Sternberg agrees on the need for incentives for faculty. Provost Sternberg is very much in favor of providing an atmosphere to encourage creativity. The only issue with the recommendation is if this is the optimal mechanism for achieving this goal and that is something that will be discussed with legal counsel.

**Remarks and Comments from the Provost – Robert Sternberg**

Provost Sternberg stated that a search committee has been formed for the Veterinary Deanship. Bob Whitson, the Dean of Agriculture, is chairing the committee. The advertisement has been vetted and the search is now in progress. Provost Sternberg also met with the search committee for the Graduate Deanship and that announcement is ready to go as well. The interim dean is Mark Payton. The search for a new Associate Vice President for International Studies and Outreach will be activated shortly. The announcement has been vetted. There is an excellent interim, David Henneberry, currently. These three searches will be external searches. As everyone probably knows by now, Dr. Gail Gates has decided to return to teaching so a search committee will be formed for this position. This will be an internal search.

Provost Sternberg stated that the Deans Council met and out of this meeting came the idea for the University to provide concrete funding for planning grants Interdisciplinary Collaborations in either Teaching or Research. These collaborations would be across colleges or schools. They would be multi-disciplinary involving at least two and hopefully more disciplines. They would be areas that have integrity so they wouldn’t have to be academic. It could be an academic collaboration with student affairs. This would help us fulfill our Land Grant Mission of service. They would potentially be fundable by outside funders. The university has some internal funds but in the course of the conversation in the President’s office with the President of the Kirkpatrick Foundation, she would be interested in receiving grant proposal from OSU to help fund this initiative. Provost Sternberg prepared a pre-proposal which has been sent to President Hargis and then onto the Kirkpatrick Foundation President. They are still interested in helping fund this endeavor. The university is still looking for external funding. Provost Sternberg stated barring the passage of State Question 744, the university is looking at having this in place later in the academic year.

Provost Sternberg talked to Jean Van Delinder about family leave policy and family friendliness at the university and she pointed out correctly that we don’t have enough institutionalized here. Provost Sternberg talked to Faculty Council chair, John Veenstra, and a task force will be formed to look at family policy issues including maternity leave policies and enhance the family policies as much as we can.

The university has an outside donor who is interested in providing scholarships for leadership and those negotiations are progressing.

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICIES — Mindy McCann**

The ASP committee reviewed a new Policy and Procedures document on minors, both graduate and undergraduate. The committee did not see any problems with the new policy. Nothing that looked controversial or problematic but since it’s a brand new policy the committee wanted to give the Faculty Council members a chance to look at the policy and see if there was something that they felt was a concern that the ASP committee missed. There is not currently a stated policy on minors, particularly with graduate minors. The committee wanted to have something formalized since we are seeing more students taking advantage of having a minor to make themselves more marketable. Dr. Gates is here as well as Mark Payton, Graduate College interim Dean, to answer any questions. John Veenstra asked for questions and clarified that even though this is a resolution he would like to get a vote in the record showing that the council supports this new policy. Karen Hickman asked for clarification on section 2.03 – a student could obtain a minor in a different option within the same major. That is correct. Example – the major and minor cannot be the same – Statistics/statistics. Russell moved to accept the policy as presented. Hickman second. Motion passed.

The committee is also looking at the tuition appeal process.

Provost Sternberg received an answer to an email and stated the Provosts office really appreciates the work that the Faculty Council has done and would like to invite all Faculty Council members to an appreciation dinner. This dinner will be on Tuesday, December 14th at the conclusion of the December Faculty Council meeting. Provost Sternberg hopes all members will be able to attend. More information to come.

**ATHLETICS – Art Klatt**

The committee met recently and finalized the survey that will be distributed to access faculty perceptions of student athletes and the athletic department. The survey should be forthcoming hopefully today. The committee hopes that each council member would encourage faculty in your departments to respond to the survey so it reflects a good cross section of faculty member feelings across the campus. The committee is also working on a second survey document which will access the level of surcharges if any that different universities at the division 1 level put on athletic tickets. The survey will hopefully determine what those surcharges are used for. At the present time OSU does not have any surcharges related to academics associated with ticket prices. Many universities do but we don’t know how those surcharges are used. This survey will be a very small straight forward survey that will be sent out electronically to the athletic departments of Division 1 schools. This is a work in progress and the committee hopes to finish it sometime this calendar year. Klatt thanked Mindy McCann and the statistics department for helping with this process. Two of McCann’s students will be using these surveys as part of their master thesis. Russell wanted to echo Klatts comments that McCann’s group and students did a tremendous job creating these surveys. Yellin stated that most of the universities around the United States have done surveys regarding the surcharge question.

**BUDGET — Ken Bartels**

The committee met and will continue discussion on the athletic subsidy. The athletic ticket surcharge survey may have some impact on this item. The committee also plans to meet with Joe Weaver to provide information about OSU program rankings, salaries, how the increase in enrollment affects the budget and other items. There are also some student fee items that they wish to discuss.

**CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Tom Jordan**

The committee met on September 29 and Mike Buchert, the Director of Long Range Facilities Planning briefed the committee on the reorganization of Physical Plant and his office. Those personnel who worked at Physical Plant in Architectural Serves will join the Long Range Facilities Planning office. Now all projects that require an Architect will be managed by Long Range Facilities Planning. Physical Plant will continue the maintenance of all OSU facilities.

The Alumni parking lot at the corner of University & Hester has become Staff Lot No. 32. Signage was completed last week.

The Landscape Master Plan consultants will hold a second workshop October 26 through October 28. The consultants will be meeting with campus groups, the landscape steering committee, President Burns and Upper Administration. On October 27, 11:30-3:00pm in the South Lobby of the Edmond Low Library will be an Open House forum for students, faculty and staff.

The location of the Greek Centennial Project has been finalized. The Sun Dial will be located in the center of the Formal Gardens and the Time Capsule will be moved to the south end of the gardens.

The new sprinkler system is scheduled for completion in May of 2011. The new system will include an auto-timer controlled by water content in the soil.

Barbara Miller stated that last week at the new multi-science building water was just pouring down the street. She just wanted to bring it to the attention of the committee and make sure the problem has been fixed. Jordan will check on it and stated that the new system is very sophisticated so if the ground is saturated it won’t water. Joe Weaver stated that this was an equipment malfunction and the problem has been fixed.

Udaya DeSilva wanted to know if there was an update on the addition of bicycle lanes connecting the university with Sanborn Lake and Boomer Lake. Joe Weaver stated that this is a part of the landscape master plan and they are looking at traffic and the connectivity with the community. This will be done.

Bruce Russell asked what the status was on the parking garage by Murray. Joe Weaver stated that yes the university is planning one. They have gone to the board and asked permission to initiate the process and that’s where we currently stand on it. The idea is to put a garage behind the North Murray building that could serve faculty, staff and residential life. Perhaps commuters as well. The hope is to have this up in the next two years and it would be based on the revenue generated by the garage and the parking permit revenue that the campus collects.

**FACULTY — Udaya DeSilva**

The committee met and one of the things on the front burner that we will be working on is the grievance policy especially pertaining to disputed cases. Through the discussion process it was noted that policy seems to be really different from college to college. The committee will be working on something that is uniform instead of college to college. This is something that will be brought before Faculty Council.

Also discussed was the distribution of teaching associate resources and the teaching mission related to the increase in enrollment numbers.

The issue of family friendliness on campus was also discussed. There were two resolutions that the Faculty Committee passed about 3 years ago under the leadership of Dave Yellin. One has to do with tenured compensation. The second one is with the spousal accommodation policy especially when the university hires new faculty members. The committee will be revisiting both of these issues. The committee hopes to schedule a meeting with Provost Sternberg in November and discuss these items at that time.

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

The committee has a long range issue on its plate. It has to do with the content management system that was initiated by ITLE. Background on the issue, D2L was chosen about 5 years ago after a bad accreditation review. D2L is being used by our branch campuses as well as ORU and Northeast Oklahoma University. Consequently it is a big system that is being used by not only OSU but by other campuses as well. As we approach the end of the 5 year agreement there is concern about the renewal costs. We are currently on a year by year contract. Materer was assured that the renewal costs will be the same as this year. Materer asked IT to get this in writing. From the IT perspective, there is a lot invested in D2L. From the end-user perspective (this is where ITLE comes in) they are asking good questions regarding the type of features do we want/need in a management content system. The LRPIT committee raised some concerns just because of the large scope of changing the current system. Does the committee want to review D2L as a content management system, does it do what faculty wants it to do, does it have the capability to do what faculty wants it to do and then expand the discussion to all contact management systems. To this end, John Veenstra and Nick Materer have met with Blayne Mayfield who has made some changes to the verbiage on the website about the review. Materer feels there is general agreement that a review of the content management systems makes sense. The committee wants to make sure that faculty is well served by IT. There is still a different level of emphasis on what should be done. The committee will continue to oversee the process. This is very important for branch campuses to be properly represented on this review. The committee would appreciate any input from the faculty and the committee will attempt to oversee the process with an eye to maintaining faculty investment while providing a system that does what it needs to do to stay current with technology. McCann stated that Blayne Mayfield asked someone from ASP serve on the committee and McCann will be serving. Hickman stated that SALR was also contacted to serve on the committee and two members will be serving. An undergraduate representative is involved as well. DeSilva stated that part of the frustration with D2L is the system is not very responsive. Which he feels is why people want to move away from it. Materer has noticed that IT does all the management of the system and implementation of changes while ITLE does all the training but the two do not communicate. Kemit Grafton speaking from a branch campus said they will be discussing the system at their next faculty senate meeting. They are not opposed to doing a review or making changes they just want to make sure they are represented if there will be a change to the system. Materer feels the verbiage is part of the problem. How do you communicate what you are doing so everyone is comfortable with moving forward? Veenstra stated that there will be another representative on this committee.

**RESEARCH — Jim Smay**

The committee met and discussed an animal care and use policy given to the committee by Steve O’Geary. This item was tabled until the November meeting.

Two other small issues came up as concerns of the committee. One is the impact of the new P-card policy might have on the ability to do research on a day to day basis. The committee will be keeping an eye on this issue. The other issue was that was brought up by one of the committee members regarding small dollar items such as laptops, cameras, Ipads, etc. and who is liable for these pieces of equipment if they go off campus on a research project and they are damaged while off campus. There is concern that this might have a stifling effect on research specifically for people who do off campus research. Again, just a concern not something they are necessarily taking up as an issue yet. Russell feels the idea of checking out/getting permission to take a laptop or some other electronic devise off campus is absurd. Many faculty members attend meetings/conferences and they carry laptops. This enables faculty to work on the road. The thought that this is sort of a “nanny state” doesn’t lend itself to professionalism that we would like our university to exude towards its faculty. There needs to be some sort of understanding that faculty are professional people who are trying to do their jobs to the best of their abilities. David Bosserman would like to send someone to the meeting regarding P-cards so the administration can hear of the faculty’s issues and concerns.

**RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS – Mark Lawlor – No Report**

**RULES AND PROCEDURES — Robert Avakian – No Report**

**STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Karen Hickman**

The committee had their first meeting of the year and their goals are initially to address three issues.

1. Results of the first cohort of Holistic Admission students. The committee has received results from Dr. Gates office concerning their retention rates and GPAs at the end of their first year. The committee will meet with Dr. Gates to discuss these results in more detail and to determine if there are any alternative plans to deal with these students.
2. Dealing with ITLE regarding two SALR members serve on the committee to address classroom management system review.
3. Access the success of linked courses for increasing retention or success of freshman students that have completed the courses. This will be done in conjunction with Dr. Gates office as well.

**Report of Liaison Representatives:**

**Staff Advisory Council – Marsha Chapman**

Let the committee members know that Wednesday, October 13th was the last day to get raffle tickets for the homecoming game.

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

Miller mentioned that the council was really gratified to find out that, after speaking with Anne Matoy at the last meeting, that HR is preparing a two year study asking for input from other agencies to create some kind of daycare/working women outside agency rather than establishing a daycare on campus. Women’s Faculty Council has been invited to have someone on the committee.

The council has already received $2,000 in their research award money. Thank you to the Provosts office and the graduate college. The council continues to work on this project. The award applications should be on the website by the end of next week.

The council is continuing to work on the Women’s Faculty Council endowment which is to honor other women who have inspired you in leadership. The council is trying to do a grass roots type of contribution asking people have money taken out of their paycheck every month rather than seeking large donors for this endowment. The council is working on a reception at the University Club to attract and get more information out to people.

The council will be meeting with the Provost in November to go over current issues.

**Old Business: None**

**New Business:**

Bill Dare had some concerns regarding the anonymity of the electronic surveys. He feels that the surveys are not anonymous. He suggested some type of policy announcing anonymity of surveys that are not anonymous. He is concerned that if he does not answer a survey, he receives an email stating that he has not answered the survey. One could conclude from this that the survey is not anonymous. McCann cannot address his concerns in general, but regarding the Athletic survey, she agrees that someone keeps the IP address this information is being deleted from the system. The survey will go out to the entire listserv and a follow up email will go out to the entire listserv as well. This will include those people who have already responded. The information will not be tracked as to who has responded or who has not. She cannot comment on other surveys but this is how the Athletic survey will be handled. Dare still feels this is a problem. McCann agrees but states that the IP address when you respond to an online survey can be collected. If it’s done correctly, the information is discarded and not kept. It could be, but it’s not supposed to be. You need to make sure that you have some level of trust with whoever is running the survey. McCann feels this is a very valid point and you should be concerned about answering a survey that someone sends you. Avakian state that the only way around this issue would be to go to paper. Klatt stated that you could always print the survey and answer the questions that way and then the data would be input. Dare stated that somehow the people requesting the response know that he did not take the survey. Even if he printed the survey, they would know that he did not take the survey. McCann asked if Dare was sure that people who had responded to the survey did not receive the same request. Dare stated that when the email addresses him by name and knows he has not completed the survey he thinks that’s wrong. Dare would like someone to look into this issue.

Bob Avakian wanted to let the council know that the remedial program at OSU-IT has been cited by the Regents as being the most effective as far as their clients remaining in school and graduating. Russell asked if this was for college students and Avakian said yes. The program is remedial math, English and tutoring center. Apparently their students that succeed in completing the program have a higher chance of graduating with a degree than any other place in the state. Russell asked if OSU-IT has collaboration with the Creek Nation College/University. Avakian said yes. Russell asked if they cross teach courses. Avakian stated that right now some of their students are taking courses with OSU-IT. The Creek Nation College/University also has space at OSU-IT until their building is finished. Once they move into their new building they will be more antonymous than they are now. Avakian does not know how the relationship will change once they move.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is November 9, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelia Kennison, Secretary