

**ANNUAL REPORTS**

**2009-10**

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COUNCIL (Norman)

ATHLETICS COUNCIL (University)

BUDGET COUNCIL (Norman)

CAMPUS PLANNING COUNCIL (Norman) [inactive]

CONTINUING EDUCATION COUNCIL (University)

COUNCIL ON FACULTY AWARDS AND HONORS (University)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL (Norman)

RESEARCH COUNCIL (Norman)

FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE (Norman)

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE (Norman)

Distributed by the Faculty Senate Office  
University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)  
August 2010

---

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COUNCIL (NORMAN)**  
**2009-10 ANNUAL REPORT**  
**SUBMITTED BY CRAIG W. HOFFORD, CHAIR**

Membership of the Academic Programs Council (APC) includes nine faculty appointees, four student appointees, and four ex-officio, non-voting members. This 2009-2010 academic year began with the Council at full faculty strength with one student representing the University of Oklahoma Student Association (UOSA). The faculty members for this year were Marilyn Breen (Mathematics), Jerry Crain (Electrical & Computer Engineering), Donald Gilstrap (Libraries), Karen Hayes-Thumann (Art & Art History), Craig Hofford (Health & Exercise Science), Irene Karpiak (Educational Leadership & Policy Studies), Misha Nedeljkovich (Film & Video Studies), Sean O'Neill (Anthropology), and Al Schwarzkopf (Management Information Systems). Dr. O'Neill was only able to attend meetings during the Fall semester due to a class conflict in the Spring. He was, however, able to contribute his comments electronically to the Council when requested. The ex-officio members continue to be Paul B. Bell (Vice Provost for Instruction), Matt Hamilton (Associate Vice President for Admissions and Records and Financial Aid), Nancy L. Mergler (Senior Vice President and Provost) and Judy K. Cain (Coordinator, C-Pub). In addition, Jean Ware (Manager of Administration and Operations in Admissions and Records) provided significant and appropriate administrative support, critical to the effective operation of the Council. This was especially critical this Fall, as Judy Cain was on medical leave for much of the semester. Mechelle Gibson, representing the Provost's Office, was able to attend and contribute to a couple of this year's meetings. Though four students were appointed to APC (UOSA, President's Office), only one was in attendance in the Fall; none of these students attended meetings during the Spring Semester. This was an improvement over past years, and the student input proved valuable when called upon.

Dr. Craig Hofford served as Chair of the Council, Dr. Jerry Crain served as Chair of the Policy & Program Subcommittee, and Dr. Karen Hayes-Thumann served as Chair of the Course & Curriculum Subcommittee. The Council met regularly this year in Buchanan Hall, primarily on the first Wednesday of each month at 1:30pm (September 2, October 7, November 4, December 9, February 3, March 3, April 7, May 5). An extra meeting was scheduled with representatives of the Graduate College on January 20<sup>th</sup> to discuss the Graduate College guidelines associated with the approval of proposed Graduate Certificates. That meeting led to some further editing and clarification of the guidelines in place concerning these certificates and will be helpful in guiding the APC in future recommendations on submitted Graduate Certificate proposals. The normal turnaround time once a request reached the Council was one month. Exceptions were typically related to requests that required clarification, including additions and/or corrections. We were thankful to Matt Hamilton for his divisional support of our meetings. Besides the ongoing staff support (Judy, Jean), lunch was provided for the last meeting of each semester.

As has become the norm for the Council, 2009-2010 was another highly productive year. As a result of the efforts of a diverse and committed Council, we were able to review 434 course requests (new courses, changes, deletions) and 96 program requests (new programs/ options/minors, modifications, administrative/internal changes, deletions). See the review numbers by month and College in the spreadsheet below. Given the significant numbers of requests, we were especially blessed to have both Judy Cain and Jean Ware working with us, especially during the February through May time period. Thankfully, most departments and colleges were timelier in their submittals this year as compared with the previous two years of my Council tenure. Even so, those last four months presented a significant challenge.

College	Oct. 2009		Nov. 2009		Dec. 2009		Feb. 2010		March 2010		April 2010		May 2010		June 2010	
	courses	programs	courses	programs	courses	programs	courses	programs	courses	programs	courses	programs	courses	programs	courses	programs
Academic Affairs																
Architecture	3				33	1					7		17			
Arts and Sciences	1		2		15	3	73	17	16	7	21	5	19	1		1
Atmospheric & Geographic Sciences		2		1	7		6	2	13		7	1		2		
Business	8	1	7				1	10		2	9	3		1		1
CCE																
Earth and Energy	3	2	2		3		5		5	1	2	1	13			
Education	1		3		14	1	1	8		2	4	2	10			
Engineering	8		1	1	1		12		19			1	1	2		
Fine Arts					1		12	2					1			
Graduate																
Honors																
International & Area Studies			4	2	15	2	2	3		2	1					
Journalism											2		6	1		
Law																
Liberal Studies					8					1		1	9			
TOTAL REQUESTS	24	5	19	4	97	7	112	42	53	15	53	14	76	7	0	2
TOTAL FOR ENTIRE YEAR	434	96														

There are three issues that seem to be consistent, even normal, with the Council work despite ongoing efforts to improve upon these issues. First, not all requests were accompanied by support documentation from other departments or colleges when appropriate. This oversight continues to lead to the delay of course and program request reviews. Second, the workload continues to be exceptionally heavy in the Spring (February through May). It would be nice to see colleges and departments working on their submittals over the Summer. However, that may be a bit naïve when considering that many of the people responsible for change submittals are not working over the summer semester. Unfortunately, when looking at how the enrollment process has changed this year, we are anticipating a high volume of course change requests (e.g., pre-requisite courses) so that the enrollment process goes more smoothly for the departments (i.e., less manual overrides or special permissions). Third, we still review requests that could/should have been stopped at the departmental and/or college level for obvious reasons (e.g., missing information, incomplete budgets). These circumstances will always give the appearance that APC is the “bad guy” when we deny those requests. During this year, we agreed to meet later in May to help a college complete their “new program” submittal in a way that could be approved by both the Provost’s Office and Regents later in the Summer. This is certainly not our role as a Council and should never become the expectation or norm.

At the final meeting in May, Dr. Jerry Crain was nominated by Dr. Hofford and approved by unanimous vote to serve as APC Chair for the 2010-2011 academic year. Dr. Crain then asked for council member interest in serving as either Chair of the Policy & Program Subcommittee or Chair of the Course & Curriculum Subcommittee. Neither had been identified at the writing of this report.

---

**ATHLETICS COUNCIL  
2009-10 ANNUAL REPORT  
SUBMITTED BY FRAN AYRES, CHAIR**

The Athletics Council met five times during 2009-2010. Meeting dates were October 6, November 19, February 10, March 31, and June 17.

2009-10 Athletics Council membership:

Faculty members: Abimbola Asojo, Frances Ayres, Kelly Damphousse, D. Jody Foote, Penny Hopkins, Emily Johnson, Larry Regens, and Francene Weatherby.

Staff Members: Matt Cloud and Maggie McGowan.

Student Members: UOSA – Taylor Huff, OUHSC – Jessica Goldbeck, student-athletes – Carolyn Winchester and Jacob Messina

Alumni: Sandy Kinney and Lindy Ritz.

Ex Officio: Joseph Castiglione (Athletic Director), Connie Dillon (Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA).

Athletics Department: Jason Leonard (Executive Director, Athletics Compliance), Gerald Gurney (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Academics), Larry Naifeh (Executive Associate Athletics Director), Greg Phillips (Associate Athletic Director, Chief Financial Officer), Brandon Martin (Associate Athletic Director), and Robert Smith (Assistant Athletics Director, Business Manager).

Secretary: Francene Monenerkit (Administrative Assistant).

At the October 6 meeting Larry Regens presented the Fiscal Integrity report for FY 2009, including the FY 2010 budget. He noted that the budget was developed with conservative assumptions. Greg Phillips noted that OU is one of only a handful of schools throughout the country that does not use university allocations or student fees in support of its athletic programs.

Joe Castiglione advised the Council that the Department's risk assessment document had been approved by the Regents. He noted that the document was developed with the assumption that the Athletics Department will continue to be self-sustaining. He also discussed cost containment actions in the Athletics Department, including some positions left open. He said that with the academic enhancement fee included in tickets, the level of academic support provided by athletics to the university was nearing \$8 million. He also said that they anticipated that the "working capital" loan from the university to the athletics department from a number of years ago was ahead of schedule on repayment and that they anticipated it would be repaid in full by the end of the next fiscal year. Joe Castiglione also distributed the Athletics Council Annual Report and discussed the strategic planning process. He encouraged questions, emphasizing the transparency of the Athletics Department. He noted that with the addition of women's rowing, we are closer to meeting gender equity goals. He also said that the Athletics Department annual giving and licensure programs have been very successful and that the department surpassed its previous record in FY 2000 with 10,000 donors.

Connie Dillon provided an orientation to the Athletics Council on the role of the Council and her responsibilities advising the Council that it serves as a key element in maintaining institutional control required by the NCAA.

At the November meeting Larry Regens reported on the Fiscal Integrity Subcommittee Activities and goals for 2009-2010. These include increasing the annual giving donor base, maximizing retention of current donors and seeking creative ways to generate new revenues.

Larry Naifeh provided a detailed discussion of the Athletics Department travel policy as it relates to safety of student athletes. He noted that whenever possible commercial flights are used, but in some circumstances charter services are used for smaller teams with tight travel schedules. He also noted that they do not use private planes for team travel. We currently exceed NCAA recommendations and standards on travel.

Abi Asojo presented the Academic Integrity Subcommittee report. This year we had the highest GPA for all teams ever. Gerald Gurney discussed more details in the report and the special admission

students. The report generated considerable discussion. OU is on the third year of the 30 hour rule (requiring student athletes to complete 30 hours/year). All sports had over 34 hours on average.

At the February meeting Jason Leonard presented the compliance report. This report addressed issues to be submitted with the University's NCAA report due April 1, 2010. He noted that the University's probationary term will end in May 2010, assuming no violations occur over the next few months. He summarized OU's key compliance initiatives and reviewed some significant developments in compliance monitoring and rules education, including implementation of compliance software, internal and external audit reports, rules interpretation data based, monitoring social networking site and a five-year comprehensive compliance review. He provided the Council with a summary of major infraction cases in the NCAA heard by the Committee on Infractions.

Joe Castiglione provided an update on the Athletics Department indicating that revenue streams were on target. He also noted that for the fall semester the student-athlete GPA exceeded 3.0 for the first time in department history. He also provided an update on facilities projects, including the expansion and renovation of the Viersen Gymnastics Center and the women's rowing program facility plans.

On March 2, the Norman Campus Faculty Senate hosted a reception (funded by the Athletics Department), expressing appreciating for the Athletics Department's contribution to the University mission. The Athletics Department at OU is one of only a handful of schools nationally that is financially self-sufficient. Additionally, the OU Athletics Department gives back substantial funds to the University Libraries and other programs.

At the March meeting Emily Johnson was nominated as Chair-elect of the Council. She was elected to this position at the June meeting. She will serve as Chair-elect during 2010-2011 and Chair during 2011-2012. Larry Regens will serve as Chair during 2010-2011.

Carolyn Winchester provided an update to the Council on the activities of the Student-Athlete Advisory Council (SACC). Connie Dillon provided an update on the men's basketball tournament expansion. Some questions were raised about its possible impact on missed class time. Connie agreed that the expanded tournament could have some negative impact especially on lower ranked schools that had to play more games.

At the June meeting Larry Regens presented the report of the Fiscal Integrity Subcommittee and the Budget Recommendation for FY 2011. He noted that the report had been reviewed by an external auditor, but was not formally audited. This led to some discussion. But it was noted that that Athletics Department is also reviewed by the University's Internal Audit as well as being part of the overall external audit conducted annually. The report was accepted.

Penny Hopkins presented the 2009-2010 Academic Integrity Review. This is the third year of a mandatory review of OU Athletics Department policies. Areas reviewed in 2009-10 included academic support facilities and academic evaluation of prospective student athletes. The committee thought support facilities were excellent. They recommended that more information be provided about success measures of marginal student athletes to help guide committee recommendations.

---

**BUDGET COUNCIL (NORMAN)**  
**2009-10 ANNUAL REPORT**  
**SUBMITTED BY ANDREW STROUT, CHAIR**

Voting members of the Budget Council for 2009-10: *Faculty* -- John Albert (Mathematics), Michael Bemben (Health & Exercise Science), Kim Milton (Physics & Astronomy), Susan Shaughnessy (Drama), Andrew Strout (Art), Susan Vehik (Anthropology); *Staff* – Melody Astani (Bursar), Elaine Masters (Education), Sue-Anna Miller (Physical Plant); *Student* -- Jess Eddy

The Budget Council met nine times this academic year. During this period, the impact of the economic downturn manifested itself across the university community and the necessity of reviewing the budgets with an eye to reducing expenses both short term and long term became apparent.

Mark Jones provided the first look at the budget outlook for the University at our September 21, 2009 meeting. This was a fairly generalized examination of the fiscal situation and broadly covered possible considerations by the administration and potential consequences for the university at large. October followed with David Annis, Director of Housing and Food Services for the University, providing a detailed report on the budget considerations for this aspect of the university. This organization is self supporting and has the responsibility for all campus food service including the Union and has responsibility for all campus housing issues including the costs for maintenance. The discussion was both informative and lively as many of the committee members were unaware of the extent of this organization's mission.

By November, the presentations were beginning to have a similar quality of being instructive but without a contributing role from the Budget Council. Nick Kelly and Julius Hilburn attended with a discussion focused upon projected budget cuts and methods for meeting reduced revenues. Central to their discussion were two strategies that were being reviewed by the Employee Benefits Committee (EBC): one was to use furlough days to meet the shortfall and the other was a longer term strategy to cut Direct Contributions for retirement. In retrospect, very few questions were raised nor did the Council members challenge the proposed solutions at the meeting. Subsequent to the meeting, several faculty members submitted responses from their colleagues and departments relative to the benefit reductions and to furloughs. Their responses, as well as the informal reports coming from EBC, suggested significant concerns about the planned reductions and an expectation that the university community-at-large needed to be involved directly in any budget reduction decisions that impacted them. Particular concerns were raised that the action to reduce Direct Contributions by the university for employees was perceived as a long term solution for a short term problem. It was evident that the council felt that we needed more significant information and that we needed to provide some input into budgetary issues that were going to impact employees.

The budget crisis led to Aimee Franklin, Faculty Senate Chair, contacting me directly regarding the Council's response to the proposed solutions to the revenue shortfalls and a possibility of increased interaction between the Budget Council and the Faculty Senate, specifically the Executive Committee. She inquired whether it might be useful to have a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee sit in on the meetings to provide a more direct liaison particularly regarding actions that might be taken by the university. It seemed to be inappropriate to add a seat in the Budget Council for a member of the Executive Committee and when I presented our fall semester report to the Executive Committee, we discussed a solution that would provide greater interaction between the Council and the Faculty Senate. A tentative solution resulted in my sitting on the Executive Committee as an ad hoc member to provide direct communication between the two committees. This completed a loop for the issues of budget and benefits since Scott Moses already served on EBC and was a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. During this early phase of discussions, I raised questions about the role of the Budget Council relative to any actual involvement in the budgetary decisions. Therefore at the January meeting, which had been scheduled for a time prior to the beginning of classes and was not cancelled, rather than bring in another person to present to the members, we used it as an opportunity to examine the Budget

Council's role and to discuss whether it was an unnecessary board that could be eliminated. This meeting did not have a quorum present, but it was attended by Aimee Franklin and Provost Mergler. We reviewed Annual Reports that had been submitted during the past twenty years and determined that the role had shifted considerably over the years. It appeared historically to have been established to actually determine the university budget but over the years had been relegated to a Review status and recently to merely an observational role. At the conclusion of this meeting and throughout the rest of the Spring 2010 semester, the Council members made it clear that they were very supportive of being more actively involved in budget process, review and decision making input. Although we recognize that the complexity of the university precluded our making actual decisions, the members felt that it was incumbent that they serve to review budgets and to disseminate information to the faculty and staff for additional input. To this end, I participated in the discussions of the Executive Committee where the two resolutions, *GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR BUDGETARY ACTIONS*, were crafted that were then presented to, and voted on by, the Faculty Senate and forwarded to President Boren. These resolutions were also presented to the Budget Council at the May meeting where they were unanimously endorsed.

Throughout the spring semester meetings, the committee discussed the budget status, considered the impact of reduced funding and the recommendation that was to be sent forward from the EBC, and finally voiced strong opposition to the proposed reduction to Defined Contributions. The consensus of the committee held that the budget shortfall was a short term problem but was being handled as if it were long term and that it was extremely short-sighted to ignore the long range effect this would have on retirees and their families. All faculty members were also responding to the opinions voiced by their colleagues. The staff view was more mixed, a direct result of salary levels for many of the staff personnel who were more concerned with the day to day costs that they are facing.

Inevitably, beginning with the January meeting the attendees agreed that the Budget Council provided a vital mission to the University and that the members felt that it should assume a more proactive role in fulfilling the responsibility as an oversight committee. This message was reiterated at every meeting. In addition, instead of canceling the May meeting, we chose to hear Danny Hilliard's comments on the budget as it neared the end of the fiscal year. Unfortunately, Danny was unable to meet with the committee due to the end of the year wrangling that accompanies the state budget. In the final meetings of the year, the Budget Council voted to pursue active roles that could require more frequent meetings and/or longer sessions. Mark Jones and Linda Anderson offered to provide preparatory meetings for the membership for reviewing the university budgets in an effort to improve understanding. Appreciation was expressed by all members. Additionally, Mike Bembem was elected to chair the council for the 2010-11 academic year.

It should be noted that although the EBC sent a recommendation to reduce the Defined Contributions and not have furloughs, President Boren announced during the Faculty Awards ceremony there would be no cuts in the Defined Contributions and that the furloughs would be absorbed by the administration members for the present time. This was cautiously hailed as a positive step for *all* employees. In summarizing the responsibilities and achievements of the Budget Council during the 2009-10 academic year, the most significant was their unanimous recognition and support for an active role in the budget process especially where it impacts the faculty and staff and their roles in the mission of the university. We urge the administration to put all three resolutions for the *GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR BUDGETARY ACTIONS* into practice, thereby utilizing the organizations, *and its membership*, that are already in place in a more effective manner.

---

**CONTINUING EDUCATION COUNCIL  
2009-10 ANNUAL REPORT  
SUBMITTED BY KIRBY GILLILAND, CHAIR**

Members: Kirby Gilliland, Chair, Pam Lewis, Julie Raadschelders, Mark Pelfry, Allison Palmer, Shannon Bert, Molly Murphy, Stephanie Moore  
Ex-officio: Jim Pappas, VP University Outreach; Nancy Mergler, Senior VP & Provost; T. H. Lee Williams, VP Research  
Vacancies: Faculty Senate Appointee (1); Presidential Appointee (1)

**Transitions:** Dan O’Hair (Past CE Council Chair) resigned; Linda Wallace resigned; Kirby Gilliland agreed to serve as Chair of the Council. The CE Council now has standing requests to replace one (1) Presidential appointee and one (1) Faculty Senate appointee.

**Revisiting our Purpose:** We began the year by revisiting the CE Council’s Charge to refresh ourselves regarding our responsibilities and roles as an OU Council. After reviewing past annual reports and reflecting on past meetings, it was clear that there were many instances where the Council made recommendations and offered reactions, insights, or suggestions. However, the instances of the CE Council functioning in our proper advisory and “sounding board” role to CCE may not have been fully conveyed by the annual reports. We will make an effort now and in the future to give a richer representation of the Council’s activities.

**An Overview of Outreach:** Prior to the October 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, Dr. Gilliland met with Dr. Pappas and discussed actions that could be taken to enhance CE Council activities. It was decided that Dr. Pappas would start the first meeting with a brief review of Outreach activities, including its programs and budget, to better prepare and inform the Council for the upcoming year. Important highlights include:

- “Outreach” was created as a combination of CCE & CLS in 2000 as a business-oriented division of engagement for OU.
- Outreach has a budget of over \$100M, and grant and contract expenditures were over half of the G&C for the Norman campus for 2008-09.
- CLS applications and admissions have had a steady growth since 2000, and now have over 25 staff members.
- Most of CCE’s activities involve training, technical assistance, public service and engagement.

Dr. Gilliland emphasized the breadth of activities within Outreach and commented on how well OU’s Outreach is known nationally within the field.

**Online Education:** Online education was a topic that the Council discussed across all meetings during the year. In the Fall of 2009, an Inside Higher Education article titled “*The Evidence on Online Education*” was distributed and discussed. [The Dept. of Education released this study done by SRI to evaluate the effectiveness of online education.] The Council discussed a number of issues regarding online classes and the challenges they present, especially for Outreach: e.g., some students attempt to take online classes but can’t figure out how to enroll or engage the course fully; some students are not ready to meet the challenge of online courses and drop the course; some disciplines that rely on more personal interaction or visual presentation of material might be difficult to deliver.

In the spring, Dr. Pappas presented his Annual Report to the CLS Faculty and shared that presentation with the Council. He included information regarding developments in higher

education and information from Eduventures on students regarding online learners, their priorities when selecting a class, sources of recruitment, etc. The Council discussed the educational and economic shifts and influences that OU may face. This will be a continuing dialogue as the Council will seek suggestions to share with the administration.

The accrediting model is also changing. The new accrediting model will emphasize student outcomes, rather than student inputs. For-profit institutions have embraced this idea. Dr. Pappas shared Capella University's Desired Student Outcomes (DSO's) hierarchy which highlights three aspects: Outcomes (the expected results that institutions have for their learners), Competencies (bundles of skills needed to demonstrate the outcomes), and Criteria (measurable descriptions of learning performance). Non-profit institutions are working directly with accrediting associations to establish the competencies that are needed. While traditional universities like OU may advance their advantages compared to for-profit institutions, a degree from for-profit institutions may increasingly be defined by the attainment of the self-defined "competencies" for-profit institutions are constructing. The for-profits will no doubt be glad to compare their competency-added approach and outcomes with that of traditional universities, especially if their requisite competencies and their metrics are the basis of the comparison. There is some cause for concern that if accreditation standards are influenced by such an approach, traditional universities might find themselves increasingly evaluated by the self-defined standards of for-profit institutions. The Council will monitor this development to see the influence such competency-based approaches may have on accreditation.

**Grants and Contracts:** This year, the CE Council was given a report on the recent external review of research at OU. The report listed four existing examples of excellence in research at the University in sponsored program areas. It is noteworthy that one of the four was CCE. Council members discussed the nature and extent of research activities within CCE. They generally agreed that most faculty members on campus do not realize the rather large contribution that CCE makes to the research enterprise on campus and suggested some ways to distribute that information. The Provost stated that there will be broader showcasing of the research enterprise at OU, including HSC. More resources are being directed to the research enterprise. CE Council members felt we should revisit this topic with respect to CCE, and it was suggested that we invite Dr. Kelvin Droegemeier, the new VP for Research, to the next meeting. Dr. Droegemeier attended the next meeting and described the new campus research initiatives and the launching of Aspire 2020. CE Council members wanted to know where Outreach could help the research enterprise. Dr. Droegemeier stated that he is excited about the opportunity for collaboration. It was agreed that we need to get faculty more aware of Outreach and discuss common areas of research interest. The CE Council discussion advanced three areas where CCE could extend research activities: 1) Reach the faculty and make them aware of the research activities/opportunities at CCE. 2) We are limited in what we can do as a university; however, a 501c3 may help and CCE may be able to sponsor it. Outreach will look at creating an affiliate organization that will help submit grants that might not otherwise be possible. 3) We need to think about the research model we implement. Most OU faculty members have worked primarily with the individual PI model. We need larger "center models" and CCE has experience with that approach.

**Outreach Losses and Cutbacks:** Outreach had a difficult year, partly related to many of their supporting agencies making significant cutbacks. The large US Postal Service contract was cut back (and the Postal Service will probably continue to cut back their training generally). Also, a lot of state agencies, such as the Department of Mental Health, are being cut back. A lot of

the agencies Outreach works with are not starting new initiatives, which inhibits the ability to submit grants. Outreach isn't losing many grants, but there are not many new grants or funded projects being initiated.

**Online Marketing:** The CE council reviewed and provided reactions to three, 30-60 second commercials Outreach created with Sooner Sports including integrated billboards, NPR, ads, etc. The Council learned about new initiatives focusing on older students, working mothers, and military audiences. Outreach has been working with JMH Consultants to upgrade their website for electronic marketing. After reviewing the Outreach websites, JMH suggested that Outreach consolidate. Outreach has 30 to 40 program units with their own websites, which does not allow for consistency. Though each website is attractive for their particular audience, it does not cross-market the college well. In the fall, the CE Council will revisit these marketing initiatives and their effectiveness.

**Non-traditional Doctorate.** Nontraditional doctorate degrees have seen a large growth along with distance education. In order to increase status, many practice-oriented disciplines have created doctoral degrees. The Sloan Consortium states that by 2015-20 there will be more non-traditional doctorates than traditional doctorates. Many traditional universities are looking at non-traditional doctorates, as well as online doctoral programs. The CE Council explored this new trend in our meetings. The Council suggested that CCE consider sponsoring a national conference on the non-traditional doctorate. Dr. Pappas and Dr. Gilliland may meet this summer to explore more deeply this suggestion and report to the Council in the Fall.

Suggested future agenda items or topics for discussion:

- Lack of knowledge of CE programs on main campus. Students are just discovering online classes through CLS. Discuss if programs can be better publicized.
- Increasing CCE awareness among donors to the university. This presents another group of people who could become acquainted with CCE. We may have more people out there who might be interested in Elderhostel, Osher, or other Outreach programs.
- Continuing Education and the need for those credits as a possible target of opportunity for CCE. Professional continuing education may or may not be a target of opportunity for Outreach.
- D2L training for non-traditional students may be another discussion area. Students on campus are required to take D2L training, but non-traditional students are not. CCE has discussed having a training module. It is part of orientation class in CLS and might be useful for other CCE areas as well.
- Reaching alumni at a distance. The Alumni Association sends out a lot of e-newsletters to the alumni group and they are always looking for things of interest to the alumni. It was suggested that this might be an opportunity for Outreach to expand its visibility.
- Senior Adult Services was converted to Osher and is growing dramatically. They have applied and received scholarships for non-traditional students and have also received funding. They are submitting a large grant. Some of their activities include Fears Book Club and Mornings with the Professors.

**Continuing Education Council Membership:** The CE Council operated without two members for the entire year. While this did not prevent us from conducting our meetings, it did detract from a richer representation and expression of campus perspectives. We are hoping to have a full complement of members by the first meeting in the Fall of 2010. Related to general membership issues is the fact that recent central administrative changes have

influenced the makeup of the CE Council. Specifically, among the ex-officio members of the Council is the Vice President for Research. Previously, this position was combined with the position of Dean of the Graduate College. Dr. Williams held this joint position in the past, and having him represent both areas on the CE Council was very helpful. (Outreach generates about half of the externally-funded projects on the Norman Campus each year and represents about one-third of graduate students enrolled on the Norman Campus.) For this reason, Dr. Pappas has requested, with CE Council support, that both the Vice President for Research and the Dean of the Graduate College be included among the ex-officio members of the CE Council. We await the decision on this request.

**COUNCIL ON FACULTY AWARDS AND HONORS  
2009-10 ANNUAL REPORT  
SUBMITTED BY NIM RAZOOK, CHAIR**

The University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors met on February 2, 2010, to consider nominees and recommend recipients of awards. The following Council members attended the meeting:

Nim Razook	College of Business	Division of Marketing
Rozmeri Basic	College of Fine Arts	School of Art & Art History
LeRoy Blank	College of Arts & Sciences	Dept. of Chemistry & Biochemistry
Linda Zagzebski	College of Arts & Sciences	Department of Philosophy
Nancy Chu	College of Nursing	Nursing Academic Program
Kevin Haney	College of Dentistry	Pediatric Dentistry
Satish Kumar	College of Medicine	Department of Medicine

The following Council members were absent:

S. Lakshmiarahan	College of Engineering	Department of Computer Science
Dora DiGiancinto	College of Allied Health	Dept. of Medical Imaging & Radiation Science
Abby Overacre		UOSA Representative
A.F. Al-Assaf	College of Public Health	Dept. of Health Admin. & Policy
Brenda Keeling		Alumnus

The Council considered an outstanding group of 71 nominees. Our recipients for the 2009-2010 academic year were as follows (in alphabetical order, by category.):

David Ross Boyd Professorship. (10 Nominations Received)

- Douglas Gaffin, Department of Zoology, College of Arts & Science
- Barbara Neas, Department of Biostatistics & Epidemiology, College of Public Health
- Joy Nelson, School of Music, College of Fine Arts
- Russell Postier, Department of Surgery, College of Medicine

General Education Teaching Award. (2 Nominations Received)

- Piers Hale, Department of History of Science, College of Arts & Science

Good Teaching Award. (14 Nominations Received)

- Loretta Bass, Department of Sociology, College of Arts & Science

- David Tarpenning, College of Journalism

Merrick Teaching Award. (1 Nominations Received)

- Marjorie Callahan, Division of Architecture, College of Architecture

Regents' Professorship. (2 Nominations Received)

- David Charles Kem, Department of Medicine, College of Medicine

Regents' Award for Superior Professional and University Service. (7 Nominations Received)

- Douglas Folger, Department of Medicine, College of Medicine

Regents' Award for Superior Research and Creative Activity. (17 Nominations Received)

- Michael Ashby, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, College of Arts & Science
- Edgar, O'Rear, Department of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering

Regents' Award for Superior Teaching. (18 Nominations Received)

- Sanjay Bidichandani, Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, College of Medicine
- Traci Carte, Division of Management Information Systems
- Kuang-Hue Chang, School of Aerospace,
- Mark Morvant, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Arts & Science
- Ken Stephenson, School of Music, College of Fine Arts
- Grady Wray, Department of Modern Languages, Literatures and Linguistics

The Council elected Professor Kevin Haney, College of Dentistry, HSC, the University Faculty Awards and Honors Council Chair for 2010-2011.

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL (NORMAN)  
2009-10 ANNUAL REPORT  
SUBMITTED BY TAMERA MCCUEN, CHAIR**

**Membership**

The members of the 2009-10 Information Technology Council, their departments, and terms:

***Faculty Senate Appointees:***

Chung Kao	Physics & Astronomy	2009-12
Suleyman Karabuk	Industrial Engineering	2007-10
Tammy McCuen, Chair	Construction Science	2009-12
Sarah Robbins	University Libraries	2007-10
Todd Stewart	Art	2008-11

***Staff Senate Appointees:***

Stefan Ice	Music	2009-12
Colin FitzSimons	Technology Development	2007-10
Jeffrey Boles	CCE Outreach	2008-11

***Ex-Officio Members:***

Robert Kelly	For the Vice President & Provost
Burr Millsap	Vice President for Administrative Affairs designate
Xiangming Xiao	For the Vice President for Research
Nick Hathaway	President Designee
Dennis Aebersold	Vice President for Information Technology and CIO

The chair would first like to thank Information Technology for providing valuable information to the Council during the year. Nick Key, Matt Singleton, and Mike Sewell have provided ongoing support by attending meetings and making regular reports. The chair would also like to thank Jeff Boles for taking minutes this year and Robert Kelly for his continued willingness to maintain the ITC website. Finally, the chair would like to thank members of the ITC for their active involvement in discussions and investigations throughout the year.

**Meetings:**

2009: September 10, October 08, November 12

2010: February 11, March 11, April 08

**Projects & Issues**

**Exchange 2010:** Migration began in October and after a brief pause during spring enrollment it continued during spring.

**OU2GO:** An application available on the iPhone App Store. The application includes a GPS feature with the campus map, a newsfeed, weather, sports, and the fight songs. A second application is being considered called OU4U. It will be focused toward internal students, with possible access to D2L and oZone. OU2GO has more general campus info, and is more an internal/external applications.

**Laptop Encryption:** The exportation and re-exportation of Symantec Products may be prohibited to certain countries or may require an export license. In some countries encryption technologies are subject to confiscation. Contact the University's Office of Export Controls for more information.

**oZone:** The go-live for oZone services occurred in late September with the roll-out of the site. Spring 2010 enrollment migrated to oZone occurred and student enrollment in oZone was campus wide. A feature to replace the iThink Photo Roster was launched in oZone for the spring semester. IT is receiving continual feedback about oZone, including positive feedback about what is working along with feedback about areas for improvement. IT is working to resolve issues and concerns expressed by all users. An "I Hate oZone" Facebook wall has been established by students to vent frustrations. IT is actively monitoring and posting on the wall in an effort to improve the system. IT reports that the wall has provided useful information to IT.

Phase 1 implementation of oZone was completed in spring. The oZone grading feature was online for the winter 2009 intersession. Spring grading was the first full rollout to campus. Work has been done to develop the helpdesk and training areas.

oZone Phase II – The executive committee has approved a Phase II, with six month chunking for projects set into various priority levels.

a) Priority 1 is the hundreds of reports that have been request across campus. Financial Aid will be upgraded to version 8.6, with work required on transcripts. Institutional degree conversion (still on mainframe), proving problematic due to historical setups. The classroom scheduling is still out for bid, needs to be selected and stood up to work with Banner. Another piece is CRM (Customer Relationship Management) for recruitment services. This will be a brand new system for financial aid/alumni to manage relationships, but interfaces with Banner.

b) Priority 2 (Summer) has second level reports and other requested enhancements to the system as determined by the executive committee. Students had a backlash to the new enrollment system, as it is less feature-rich than the old system. SunGard has a "flexible registration system" for Banner that is an additional purchase. We would be the first University in the nation to use for general enrollment, as it was originally designed for smaller continuing education style groups. Allows several missing features in current enrollment, but still lacks real-time error checking of prerequisites. There is also a "Web Tailor" upgrade to allow better cosmetic adjustments to the Banner external systems. Other elements include a new Master Course Inventory system (separate from Banner) requiring additional

bids, and hardware upgrades for the infrastructure of these systems. The plan is to decommission the mainframe at this point and recoup the ongoing costs of running it.

c) Priority 3 (Feb 2011) Additional reports and enhancements as requested by customer and determined by Executive Committee. Begin developing Workflow for process determination. This should provide useful for staff offices, allowing logical process sequencing, approvals, job scheduling and all built-9i9n to Banner. This is viewed as a good feature, but not critical at present. Another element for this priority phase is the roll-out of the Enterprise Data Warehouse to store operational data for deep reporting and analytics. Currently only have a transactional system for live data, but should allow excellent source for future planning. There are also upgrades to Luminis planned at this time.

d) Priority 4 More reports and enhancements from customers, continuing system support, maintenance upgrades and patches to new systems, and an attempt to move from a project office to an operational office.

**Lecture Capture Initiative:** The Information Technology Council (ITC) joined with IT and the Teaching, Learning, and Writing Center in an enterprise wide lecture capture initiative. The mission is to identify candidate lecture capture products; provide for on-campus demonstration and testing; and move toward recommendation for an enterprise wide solution to lecture capture. ITC and the Teaching, Learning, and Writing Center are working to recruit faculty members across campus to participate in testing products. An enterprise wide solution is sought that is compatible with D2L and streamlines IT support.

IT is working with vendors, attempting to gather requirements and specifics. Basic requirements are compatibility with pre-existing systems, such as D2L and infrastructure. The plan is to do an RFP for a campus solution, but the requirements are diverse. This would be a pay-as-you-go service IT would provide through the RFP. It is likely multiple vendors would receive awards. Echo360 and Integrity demonstrated lecture capture products on campus during the spring semester. More vendors will be invited for demonstrations in fall 2010.

**iTunes U:** iTunes U is a Content Distribution Service, not a content creation tool. It provides a means to push content out to students and beyond both through a special section of the iTunes Store and through a web-portal. This will serve as a secondary location for content compared to the public YouTube presence OU has created. It is perhaps more suitable for audio materials, and to make resources easily accessible to students. There are several issues, including accessibility, fair use, copyright and other concerns that have be resolved and communicated to the users of the system. The planned rollout of the service is by summer. IT is setting up a project tracking page to keep all interested users apprised of the status of the project.

**Invisible Bracelet Program:** A new program that will allow faculty, staff and students to enroll into voluntarily, putting critical medical information in system (allergies, known illnesses...) and receive a keychain fob, wallet card, and sticker. EMT around the nation will be able to scan card and get critical information from system. Marketing of the program will begin in Fall 2010.

**Election of New Chair:** Chung Kao was elected to serve as Chair of the Council in 2010-11.

---

**RESEARCH COUNCIL (NORMAN)  
2009-2010 ANNUAL REPORT  
SUBMITTED BY JOE RODGERS, CHAIR**

**Membership**

The members of the 2009-2010 Research Council, their departments and terms:

Joe Rodgers	Psychology	2007-10
Marvin Lamb	Music	2007-10
Paul Spicer	Anthropology	2007-10
Melissa Stockdale	History	2007-10
Laurie Vitt	SNOMNH	2007-10
Karen Antell	University Libraries	2008-11
Noel Brady	Mathematics	2008-11
Sridhar Radhakrishnan	Computer Science	2008-11
Joanna Rapf	English	2008-11
Elizabeth Butler	CEES	2009-12
David Boeck	Architecture	2009-12
K. David Hambright	Zoology	2009-12
Karen Leighly	Physics/Astronomy	2009-12

Ex-Officio Members:

Kelvin Droegemeier	Vice-President for Research
Andrea Deaton	Associate Vice President for Research

Secretary:

Linda Kilby

Professor Paul Spicer joined the council in August 2009 to complete the term for Mary Dinger.

Professors Lamb, Rodgers, Spicer, Stockdale and Vitt are completing their terms at the end of the 2009-10 academic year. The 2010-2011 Chair of the Research Council was elected at the April meeting and will be Dr. Noel Brady, Department of Mathematics.

The Faculty Senate has appointed Paul Spicer, Anthropology, (a previous Presidential appointment) and Marcia Haag to 2010-2013 terms. They will replace Joe Rodgers and Melissa Stockdale respectively. Marvin Lamb will serve another term as the Fine Arts member.

The Presidential Appointments to replace Drs. Laurie Vitt and Paul Spicer will be forthcoming.

In accordance to the charge of the Research Council (January 7, 2004), appointments to the Council did include two members in each of the following six areas and one member from Fine Arts:

- a) Engineering: Liz Butler and Sridhar Radhakrishnan.
- b) Physical Sciences: Noel Brady and Karen Leighly
- c) Social Sciences and Education: Paul Spicer and Joe Rodgers
- d) Biological Sciences: Laurie Vitt and K. David Hambright
- e) Humanities and Arts: Melissa Stockdale and Joanna Rapf
- f) Other: Karen Antell and David Boeck
- g) Fine Arts: Marvin Lamb

## Activities (2009-2010)

The primary activity of the Research Council during the 2009-10 academic year was to advise and make recommendations to the Vice-President for Research pertaining to expenditures and awards under his administration, namely

- a) Small Grant Awards (< \$1,200)
- b) Reprint Awards (\$100)
- c) Large Grants (> \$1,200 <\$7,500)
- d) PI Investment Awards (> \$1,200 < \$10,000)
- e) Junior Faculty Fellowships (\$7,000 + Fringe)

The first two awards are decided by the VPR directly without Council involvement; the Council decided the time they would spend on reviewing these applications did not justify the monetary resources involved. A summary of the Council recommendations approved by the Vice-President for Research for the period June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010, is attached.

Also, the Council reviewed nominations and made recommendations to the Provost for the George Lynn Cross Research Professorship and the Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Educational Research.

In addition, there were several additional initiatives to which the Research Council devoted time and discussion. New policy and policy changes included the following:

1) We made several changes to the summer Junior Faculty Fellowships, after a number of years of discussion related to these awards. We voted to increase the amount of the award from \$6000 to \$7000. We voted to cover the cost of fringe benefits through the budget, rather than charging the awardees for fringe benefits (which created a de facto increase for faculty taking their award as salary supplement from \$4500 to \$7000). We also voted to eliminate the requirement that the junior faculty devote the whole summer to research in relation to this approximately one-month of salary supplement, and instead instituted a one-month commitment from the junior faculty member. VPR Droegemeier endorsed all of these proposals, and they were implemented for the 2010 Junior Faculty awards; however, the process is considered dynamic and ongoing, with potential revision in relation to budget issues and the success of the changes. Several Research Council members were interested in increasing the award to a higher level, for example, to \$10,000. The increase to \$7000 was viewed as overdue, and stopgap. Additional interest in senior faculty summer fellowships was also expressed.

2) The Research Council voted to implement an electronic submission processes for applications for Research Council funds, and these were implemented during 2009-10. We were among the only councils on the campus still using paper submissions, which were maintained in an interest to provide security for sensitive submission information. Modern submission methods and procedures used across campus for other secure processes were deemed sufficient to justify moving to online and electronic submission. The process was implemented experimentally in 2009-10, and will be standard operating procedure starting in 2010-11.

3) The 2009-2010 chair, Joe Rodgers, and the past two Research Council chairs, Bob Houser (2008-09) and Fred Beard (2007-08) comprised a task force appointed by VPR Droegemeier to study funding alternatives available on the OU campus, to compare those to other targeted Big 12 comparison institutions, to collect information on funding available at the college level at OU, and to make recommendations for new funding initiatives and procedures. The Research Council discussed this task force activity several times. The task force report was presented to the VPR Advisory Committee in May, and is on file in the VPR office.

4) Among other initiatives recommended by the task force noted in the previous paragraph was one recommending a larger funding mechanism devoted to innovative and/or groundbreaking research. At the May meeting, the Research Council discussed and approved plans to move forward with such a funding mechanism. Short term funding for the initiative would come from carry-over funds in 2010-11, with longer-term plans to obtain ongoing funding through the explicit budget process. The new Research Council chair, Noel Brady, has appointed a task force to develop and Request for Proposals during summer, 2010. The RFP will define timing, amount (\$25K or \$20K levels were discussed), area (separate competitions for hard sciences, social sciences & education, and humanities/fine arts were discussed), and application procedure.

On behalf of the Research Council, the Chair would like to thank Vice-President for Research Lee Williams, who served as VPR through November, 2009, and who provided strong support for research on the OU campus during his ten years as VPR. The Research Council collected contributions and gave VPR Williams a gift of ceramic pottery and a farewell cake during a Research Council mixer in November. We also offer strong thanks to the new Vice-President for Research, Kelvin Droegemeier, for his enthusiastic, consistent and creative support of the OU faculty in their efforts to produce quality research and creative activity. The Council also thanks Associate Vice President for Research Andrea Deaton, Office of Research Services, for her efforts on behalf of the Council and faculty, and Linda Kilby, for the many contributions she made to the smooth, efficient and successful functioning of the Council this year. At our May meeting, the Research Council used collected contributions and gave Ms. Kilby a plant and ceramic pot, and a gift card, to commend her hard work on behalf of the Research Council and the OU research initiative in general.

**FY10 SUMMARY OF COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS  
APPROVED BY THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH**

<b>AWARD</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
<b><i>SMALL GRANT</i></b>		
Engineering		
Physical Sciences		
Social Sciences & Education	1	\$ 1,150
Biological Sciences		
Humanities & Arts	14	14,238
Other		
<b><i>TOTAL</i></b>	<b><i>15</i></b>	<b><i>\$16,588</i></b>
<b><i>LARGE GRANT</i></b>		
Engineering		
Physical Sciences	2	\$85,490
Social Sciences & Education	1	7,200
Biological Sciences	1	5,470
Humanities & Arts	10	9,250
Other	2	56,526
<b><i>TOTAL</i></b>	<b><i>16</i></b>	<b><i>\$86,995</i></b>
<b><i>PI RESEARCH INVESTMENT</i></b>		

Engineering		
Physical Sciences		
Social Sciences & Education		
Biological Sciences		
Other		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>JUNIOR FACULTY (includes Fringe Benej</b>		
Engineering	1	\$ 9,310
Physical Sciences		
Social Sciences & Education	2	18,620
Biological Sciences		
Humanities & Arts	11	99,110
Other	1	9,178
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$136,218</b>
<b>REPRINT</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>\$9,911.48</b>
<b>TOTAL GRANTS AWARDED</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>\$249,712.48</b>

---

**FACULTY SENATE  
FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE (Norman)  
2009-2010 ANNUAL REPORT  
SUBMITTED BY CYNTHIA ROGERS, CHAIR**

Membership:

Fred Beard (Journalism & Mass Comm.) (2009-12)  
Ari Berkowitz (Zoology) (1/10-10)  
Lily Huang (Univ. Libraries) (2008-11)  
Allison Palmer (Art) (2008-11)  
Cynthia Rogers (Economics) (2009-12), Chair

Meetings:

- The Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) chair met with Jeffrey Maiden (the previous FCC chair) and Aimee Franklin in August to discuss the previous year's activities.
- The FCC chair met with FCC members informally and infrequently. The FCC exchanged ideas via email discussion throughout the year.

Summary:

- In Fall of 2009 the FCC identified items of concern on the Norman campus. These included: faculty compensation, compression, the erosion of health benefits, increasing tuition waivers for faculty and staff and their dependents, campus health and wellness programs, day care support, graduate student support, change in OTIS funding for instructional support, and Admissions backlogs.

- Many important compensation issues arose during the year due to the University budget cuts. The Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC) took the lead in investigating several proposals concerning net compensation, including the change in investment options and introduction of a financial record keeper, reductions in defined contributions to retirement, and cuts in retiree health benefits.
  - The FCC members disseminated information and solicited faculty input regarding the proposed reductions in defined contributions. The strong negative reaction by faculty members was passed along to the (FSEC) and then to President Boren.
  - The FSEC charged the FCC with developing a laundry list of ideas for dealing with expected budget cuts. The list included numerous suggestions including voluntary leaves of absence and early retirement among others.
  - These ideas were summarized in a document that emphasized the need for open discussion and transparency regarding University budget cuts. They provided a basis for the development of Faculty Senate Basic Guiding Principles Resolution which was refined and polished by the FSEC. The resolution passed at the May 10, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting.
- 

**FACULTY SENATE  
FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE (Norman)  
2009-2010 ANNUAL REPORT  
SUBMITTED BY CRAIG ST. JOHN, CHAIR**

Membership:

Craig St. John, chair, Sociology  
Debra Bembem, Health and Exercise Science  
Neil Houser, Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum  
Lori Jervis, Anthropology  
Scott Moses, Industrial Engineering

Meetings:

We had two face-to-face meetings in the fall. In one of these meetings we decided upon issues to pursue during the 2009-2010 academic year and in the other Julius Hilburn and Nick Kelly spoke to us about possible mechanisms for dealing with what appeared to be impending cuts to the university's budget (furloughs vs. reductions in defined benefit contributions). In addition, we remained in frequent communication by email.

Issues:

Reductions in retiree health care benefits. We began the year expecting to see action regarding proposed cuts in retiree health care benefits. Thus, we expected to have to keep tabs on this issue throughout the year. However, nothing new materialized on this issue as the university administration chose to pursue no action as it waited for Congress to pass health care reform legislation.

Budget cuts resulting in furloughs and/or reductions in the defined benefit contributions. This is another issue we expected to have to monitor closely throughout the year. But it turned out that, at least for 2009-2010, this concern became a non-issue as the university administration

was able to meet budget shortfalls without having to resort to these strategies for cutting the university's budget.

Health issues. We submitted a report to the Faculty Senate regarding health issues that not only deal with faculty health and productivity but also long-term university expenditures for health care (see attached). We were asked to provide resolutions pertaining to two of these issues (see attached). These resolutions included a focus on wellness and called for making the Norman campus tobacco free and providing faculty and staff with free access to university recreational facilities (Huston Huffman Center and Murray Case Sells Swimming Pool).

Tuition benefit for faculty and staff dependents. Included in the report mentioned above, we noted that many universities provide considerably more generous tuition benefits for the dependents of employees. We were asked to submit a resolution to the Faculty Senate calling for the Sooner Heritage Scholarship used to provide tuition waivers for employee dependents to be doubled (see attached).

\*\*\*\*\*

To: Aimee Franklin, Faculty Senate Chair

From: Faculty Welfare Committee (Debra Bembem, Neil Houser, Lori Jervis, Scott Moses, and Craig St. John, chair)

Date: February 1, 2010

Re: Recommendations to the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Welfare Committee recommends four policy actions for the Faculty Senate to consider.

1. Tobacco free campus. The OU Norman campus should become tobacco free at the earliest possible time. Thus, we are submitting (see attached) a resolution asking the Faculty Senate to request the University of Oklahoma to develop and implement a policy to create a tobacco free campus. Making the OU Norman campus tobacco free will enhance the health of everyone who studies or works at the University of Oklahoma. According to a recent Time magazine article (December 14, 2009), over 365 college and university campuses in the United States already have gone tobacco free. Among these are several in Oklahoma including Oklahoma State, the OU Health Sciences Center campus and the OU-Tulsa campus. It is time for the OU Norman Campus to join them.

In addition to promoting individual health, making the OU Norman campus tobacco free could have the added benefit of reducing future increases in health care costs for the University. As the cost of providing employee health insurance is the most rapidly increasing component of the University's budget, going to a tobacco free campus makes sound economic sense.

2. Aggressive Wellness Program. The University of Oklahoma should implement an aggressive wellness program. The existing wellness program consists primarily of classes, screenings, and promotions that provide information about health issues. It does not provide tangible incentives for University employees to engage in healthy behavior. The University should explore wellness programs that provide financial incentives for healthy behavior. For example, people who don't smoke and who maintain a weight within a medically acceptable range should be rewarded.

In both the private and public sectors, organizations have found ways to financially reward employees for healthy behavior and cost-conscious consumption of health care. For example, Safeway tests its employees yearly for smoking, weight, blood pressure and cholesterol and those who pass are eligible for financial rewards. (Wall Street Journal, June 19, 2009) In addition, Safeway emphasizes a culture of health and encourages its employees to be responsible users of health care. As a result, Safeway's per-capita health-care expenses have remained flat over the past four years compared to an average increase of nearly 40% for the rest of corporate America. Safeway's employees back this plan because they know health-care savings are directly tied to higher wages.

The state of Alabama has begun offering incentives for its employees to improve their health. It currently offers discounts on the portion of monthly premiums paid by employees for not using tobacco and will soon offer an additional discount for employees whose blood pressure, blood glucose, cholesterol and weight are in the normal range or if they are seeing a doctor to address risk factors (Time, November 30, 2009). The latter incentive was the result of a study which showed a significant positive relationship between obesity and health insurance benefit claims for state workers. The state of North Carolina is in the process of following suit. In North Carolina the state will soon pay 80% of employees' health care costs if they don't smoke or weigh too much but only 70% of health care costs if they do.

It is highly likely a wellness program that compensates employees for healthy behavior will cost money in the short run. However, the University needs to have a long-term perspective on this issue. The University's cost of providing a health care benefit for its employees has increased annually by double digit percentage points and there is no reason to expect this trend to change appreciably in the future, unless the University acts aggressively to change how it does business. Thus, money the University spends now to promote health among its employees has the potential to have a huge payback in the future. We believe employees will buy in to healthy behavior incentives particularly if they know health care savings in the long run are tied to improved compensation.

3. Use of recreational facilities. The University has a clear financial interest in a work force that is as healthy as it can be. Thus, it makes no sense for the University to impose any barriers, even small ones, to health conscious behavior. To that end, the University should not charge its employees to use the Huston Huffman Center or the Sells Swimming Pool. Because healthy employees are more productive employees, these facilities should be viewed as contributing to employee productivity in the same way, for example, the library is. The University wouldn't think of charging members of the faculty to use the library. Similarly, the University shouldn't charge its employees to engage in healthy behavior.

Currently, there are approximately 570 faculty/staff members who pay \$240 a year for access to the Huston Huffman Center and the swimming pool. Thus, their contribution to the recreational facility budget is about \$137,000 annually. Even supposing the number of faculty/staff members who would want access to these facilities would double if there were no charge for their use, the expense would be only about \$275,000. Like incentives for healthy behavior, the University needs to have a long-term perspective on this expense. Modest expenditures in the short-run that encourage employee health might result in significant savings in the future in terms of reduced health insurance costs.

4. Dependent tuition waiver. The University should increase the tuition waiver it provides for the dependents of faculty and staff employees. Currently, such dependents can receive a waiver up to \$1200 per academic year that is covered by the Sooner Heritage Scholarship program. While this is a much appreciated benefit by those who pay tuition and fees for dependents enrolled at OU, given tuition and fee increases in recent years, the University should increase this benefit.

We have priced 30 hours of undergraduate credit in the College of Arts and Sciences for the 2009-10 academic year for Oklahoma residents. Not including course-specific fees, the in-state tuition and fees for these credit hours comes to \$7,918 (\$3,537 for tuition and \$4,381 for fees). Thus, \$1200 for a Sooner Heritage Scholarship covers 15% of the total cost.

For the 2008-2009 academic year 224 dependents of OU faculty and staff received a Sooner Heritage Scholarship. If all of them received the maximum amount, the total cost would have been \$268,800. Doubling the value of the scholarship to \$2400 (30% of the cost of tuition and fees for 30 credit hours) would cost a maximum of \$537,600. And, tripling the value to \$3600 (45% of total tuition/fees) would cost \$806,400. Of course, more dependents might take advantage of the scholarship if its value was increased. However, as long as dependents continue to pay a significant portion of their tuition and fees, greater enrollment of dependents might offset the lost revenue resulting from the increased waiver. We believe the faculty would gladly accommodate these additional students if their enrollment was the outcome of an employee benefit.

We examined information for a couple comparison universities to see how these increases might compare. At the University of Nebraska faculty/staff dependents can receive a tuition waiver for up to 15 credit hours per academic year. Resident tuition for undergraduate courses at Nebraska for the 2009-10 school year is \$187 per credit hour, making the value of 15 credit hours \$2805. Tuition and fees for 30 credit hours at Nebraska totals \$6857 (\$5610 for tuition and \$1247 for fees). Thus, the dependent tuition waiver is worth 41% of the total cost of 30 credit hours. At Penn State University faculty/staff dependents get a waiver worth 75% of the cost of tuition and fees. Thirty undergraduate credit hours at the resident tuition rate costs \$14,416 for the 2009-10 school year (\$13,604 for tuition and \$812 for fees). Thus, the value of the dependent waiver at Penn State is \$10,812.

Obviously, this small survey is far from complete. But it does, however, show there are universities among OU's peer institutions that are far more generous with their tuition waivers for faculty and staff dependents than OU is. In the current climate of several years with no pay raises and impending reductions in retirement benefits, increasing tuition waivers for dependents is a simple way for the University to show appreciation for its employees.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Resolution of the  
University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate**

**A resolution supporting modernization of the policy for  
usage of tobacco on the Norman campus**

- Whereas: Secondhand smoke causes lung cancer in nonsmokers, who have chosen to not smoke, and;
- Whereas: Secondhand smoke causes heart disease in adults, with recent studies finding that smoke-free laws reduce the rate of heart attacks by an average of 17% in just the first year after adoption, with the largest reduction occurring in non-smokers, and;
- Whereas: The National Cancer Institute concludes "there is no safe level of exposure to tobacco smoke", and;
- Whereas: Eliminating exposure to secondhand smoke on the Norman campus will have a direct and significant positive effect on the cost of employee benefits over time, and;
- Whereas: Over 380 U.S. colleges and universities are completely smokefree, which in Oklahoma include The University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, The University of Oklahoma Tulsa Campus, Oklahoma State University Stillwater Campus, Oklahoma

State University Tulsa Campus, University of Central Oklahoma, and Oklahoma City University;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of The University of Oklahoma hereby requests that The University of Oklahoma develop and implement, in consultation with the University of Oklahoma Student Association, the Staff Senate, and the Faculty Senate, a policy to substantially or entirely eliminate the usage of tobacco products on the Norman campus.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Resolution: Free Use of University Recreational Facilities (Huston Huffman Center and Murray Case Sells Swimming Pool) for Faculty and Staff**

Whereas the University has a clear financial interest in a work force that is as healthy and productive as it can be, and

Whereas recreational facilities that promote healthy behavior should be viewed as contributing to employee productivity, and

Whereas it makes financial sense for the University to remove any barriers, even small ones, to health-conscious behavior, and

Whereas provision of a recreational facilities benefit will be appreciated by faculty and staff during a period in which there are no pay raises, and

Whereas the cost for the University of providing free use of University recreational facilities by faculty and staff is minimal:

Be it hereby resolved that the University provide free use of University recreational facilities (Huston Huffman Center and Murray Case Sells Swimming Pool) for faculty and staff.

Background: The University has a clear financial interest in a work force that is as healthy as it can be. Thus, it makes no sense for the University to impose any barriers, even small ones, to health conscious behavior. To that end, the University should not charge its employees to use the Huston Huffman Center or the Murray Case Sells Swimming Pool. Because healthy employees are more productive employees, these facilities should be viewed as contributing to employee productivity in the same way, for example, the library is. The University wouldn't think of charging members of the faculty to use the library. Similarly, the University shouldn't charge its employees to engage in healthy behavior.

Currently, there are approximately 570 faculty/staff members who pay \$240 a year for access to the Huston Huffman Center and the Murray Case Sells Swimming Pool. Thus, their contribution to the recreational facility budget is about \$137,000 annually. Even supposing the number of faculty/staff members who would want access to these facilities would double if there were no charge for their use, the expense would be only about \$275,000. The University needs to have a long-term perspective on this expense. Modest expenditures in the short-run that encourage employee health might result in significant savings in the future in terms of reduced health insurance costs.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Resolution: Increase Size of Sooner Heritage Scholarships for Dependents of Faculty and Staff**

Whereas in recent years faculty and staff salaries have not increased nearly as fast as tuition and fees, and are not likely to increase substantially in the near future, and

Whereas, faculty and staff with dependents have actually experienced reductions in take home pay as the cost of providing health insurance for these dependents has increased, and

Whereas, the value of Sooner Heritage Scholarships for dependents of faculty and staff have not kept pace with increases in tuition and fees, and

Whereas, other universities among those OU considers its peers provide substantially more generous tuition benefits for their faculty and staff than OU does, and

Whereas, generous Sooner Heritage Scholarships for dependents of faculty and staff should be viewed as a tool for recruiting and retaining valuable employees and talented students:

Be it therefore resolved that the University immediately at least double the value of the Sooner Heritage Scholarship for dependents of faculty and staff from the current maximum of \$1200 per academic year to \$2400 per academic year.

Background: The University should increase the tuition waiver it provides for the dependents of faculty and staff employees. Currently, such dependents can receive a waiver up to \$1200 per academic year that is covered by the Sooner Heritage Scholarship program. While this is a much appreciated benefit by those who pay tuition and fees for dependents enrolled at OU, given tuition and fee increases in recent years, the University should increase this benefit.

Not including course-specific fees, 30 hours of undergraduate credit in the College of Arts and Sciences at OU for the 2009-10 academic year for Oklahoma residents comes to \$7,918 (\$3,537 for tuition and \$4,381 for fees). Thus, \$1200 for a Sooner Heritage Scholarship covers 15% of the total cost.

For the 2008-2009 academic year 224 dependents of OU faculty and staff received a Sooner Heritage Scholarship. If all of them received the maximum amount, the total cost would have been \$268,800. Doubling the value of the scholarship to \$2400 (30% of the cost of tuition and fees for 30 credit hours) would cost a maximum of \$537,600. And, tripling the value to \$3600 (45% of total tuition/fees) would cost \$806,400. Of course, more dependents might take advantage of the scholarship if its value was increased. However, as long as dependents continue to pay a significant portion of their tuition and fees, greater enrollment of dependents might offset the lost revenue resulting from the increased waiver. The faculty likely would gladly accommodate these additional students if their enrollment was the outcome of an employee benefit.

It is useful to examine information for a couple comparison universities to see how these increases might compare. At the University of Nebraska faculty/staff dependents can receive a tuition waiver for up to 15 credit hours per academic year. Resident tuition for undergraduate courses at Nebraska for the 2009-10 school year is \$187 per credit hour, making the value of 15 credit hours \$2805. Tuition and fees for 30 credit hours at Nebraska totals \$6857 (\$5610 for tuition and \$1247 for fees). Thus, the dependent tuition waiver is worth 41% of the total cost of 30 credit hours. At Penn State University faculty/staff dependents get a waiver worth 75% of the cost of tuition and fees. Thirty undergraduate credit hours at the resident tuition rate costs \$14,416 for the 2009-10 school year (\$13,604 for tuition and \$812 for fees). Thus, the value of the dependent waiver at Penn State is \$10,812.

Obviously, this small survey is far from complete. But it does, however, show there are universities among OU's peer institutions that are far more generous with their tuition waivers for faculty and staff dependents than OU is. In the current climate of several years with no pay raises and impending reductions in retirement benefits, increasing tuition waivers for dependents is a simple way for the University to show appreciation for its employees.