

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union

April 9, 1996

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Allen, Allison, Anderson, Bertholf, Dolezal, Finn, Harris, Horn, Knobbe, Lau, Lawry, Leong, Marks, Mayer, Moretti, Peters, Richards, Schwarz, Scott, Stone, Tilley, Trapp, Warde, White, Wilkinson, and Williams. Also present: Barger, Beer, Brown, Grantham, Harmon, Keener, Maase, Phillips, Sim, Tye, Uryasz, and Watkins. Absent: Morgan, Paustenbaugh, and Smith

HIGHLIGHTS

Proposed Athletic Facilities Renovation	1
DRAFT OSU Funding Philosophy for Intercollegiate Athletics	3
Research Park	3
Report Of Status Of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	4
Reports of Standing Committees.....	4
Computerized Student Enrollment and Degree Audit Program Recommendation	4
Uniformity of University Calendars Recommendation.....	5
Transcript Information Recommendation.....	6
Policy Concerning Awarding of Honorary Degrees Recommendation.....	6
Guthrie Trolley Company Report	7
Review of Temporary Appointments by Faculty Committee	7
Faculty Council Election Results.....	7
Emeriti Association Liaison Report	8

Dr. Allison moved acceptance of the March 12, 1996, Minutes. Dr. Warde seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Peters moved acceptance of the April 9, 1996, Agenda. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Proposed Athletic Facilities Renovation — Terry Don Phillips

A.D. Phillips stated a lot of planning and preparation needed to be done before a fundraising campaign started. On any university campus there is always an inherent tension between athletics and academics. Athletics has probably been the best social tool for integration. It has certainly served a purpose with respect to gender equality. Athletics has provided a forum for those issues and serves as a rallying point and something students can feel good about. This is a great university. OSU needs to have an athletic program that reflects in a positive manner on the university. For us to be able to reflect in a positive fashion, we have to be able to bring in quality student athletes who can compete effectively on the field or court and we have to be able to graduate these students at comparable rates to the rest of the university and the rest of the Big Twelve. In order to do that, effective recruiting must be done and we have got to be able to train the athletes once they get here. Without quality facilities we cannot compete. We are in a very competitive situation relative to the Big Twelve and other universities outside the Big Twelve. The Athletic Department has to compete for the students just as you have to compete for students. Top student athletes can go to any university. Our people who support this program expect us to be able to compete with those other universities. Those are the standards. If you bring potential athletes on campus and the facilities do not measure up, that is a reflection on the commitment of the university to their son or daughter. Chances are you will lose the student. We cannot compete effectively unless we recruit effectively. We are no different from any other college or department on this campus. The quality of your department or college is directly related to the quality of the faculty and to the quality of the students that you are able to recruit. If we are not able to effectively recruit and retain quality coaches and quality student athletes then we are going to struggle competitively and have problems with our graduation rates.

An international architectural firm was brought in from Atlanta, Georgia. They built the Super Dome, the Georgia Dome, the Pyramid in Memphis, Bud Walton Arena at the University of Arkansas, and many other facilities. Facilities are so expensive to build and maintain, OSU cannot do it piece-meal. A new 12,000 seat arena would cost about \$3,000/seat (about \$36,000,000) and would probably have to be placed off-campus, away from the students. The expansion of Gallagher-Iba is part of the plan, but what we are talking about is an athletic center that would put everything under one roof. There would be corporate suites that could be leased with views of the basketball court and the football stadium. Only one other

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

April 9, 1996

Page 2

university has that type of facility. The construction payback on those suites should be five to six years. Once those construction costs are paid, suite lease payments could go into a restricted fund to support the athletic program. The existing weight room can be moved to the basement of Gallagher-Iba and we can have the most unique strength and conditioning facility in America. There is 10,000-13,000 square feet available to work with, which would include an indoor track. The current weight room can be used for an academic center. The architects tell us this can be accomplished without missing any basketball games. They could begin work on the outside in July and then in March, when the basketball season is over, move inside and raise the roof. The plan includes a 43 foot wide concourse with restrooms and concession stands on the second level. There is nothing that can be done about the narrow seats on the first level. In the space between the Coaches Building and Gallagher-Iba, there will be a wide walkway that could be a Heritage Hall of Fame.

Steve Uryasz, Director of Academic Services for Student Athletes, discussed the need for the academic center. Since 1992, they have moved about four times. Right now the center is located in Bennett Hall and it is not an ideal location. When recruiting student athletes, one of the keys is facilities. The goal is to graduate the athletes. Right now, in the Big Eight Conference, we are really struggling with graduation rates. We feel that having an academic center can take us to a whole new level. Academic centers have become a selling point nationally for athletes. The budget for Academic Services for Student-Athletes is currently \$232,000. This includes everything from staff salaries to tutorial expenses. There are currently about 320 student athletes. When Soccer is added, the number will increase to about 350 student athletes. As Coach Simmons expands the walk-on program, that number will probably increase.

Dr. John Mowen is doing a comprehensive study, funded by private dollars, to see what the market is for new basketball season sales. Dr. Mowen expects to complete his analysis in early May. We have to work with a sense of urgency because our facilities are considerably behind other schools against which we have to compete in terms of recruiting student athletes and in terms of athletic competition. We have got to compete well. Our livelihood in the Athletic Department depends on our ticket sales, concessions, and other spin-offs as well as conference distributions. If you are not competitive on the field, you are going to struggle financially. They would like to begin to call on people this summer. This is a component of the capital campaign. What they do is hand in glove with the OSU Foundation. A.D. Phillips emphasized there are a lot of needs in OSU's departments and colleges. Athletics is just one need. He will speak to the athletic issues, but wherever they choose to commit their money has to be their choice.

There are a lot of issues that are nondiscretionary. When OSU joined the Big Twelve there was a requirement that another women's sport be added. Soccer was added. There are Title IX compliance issues which are not optional. OSU must and will comply. These are issues that are facing the Athletic Department over which we have no discretion.

Dr. Moretti suggested that an annualization rate of less than 20 percent in industry would be eliminated as ridiculous. Also, we need equal commitment by the university to human capital (academic student recruitment, faculty development, etc.) as we have to building expenditures. People do not just want to hear about buildings. Dr. Moretti also suggested that a focus should be placed on providing additional seating for students. President Halligan stated that they have a goal of adding a substantial number of additional student seats in the arena. Going to the contests is an exciting part of being a student at the university. It also helps develop greater affiliation with the university so that maybe, in the future, they will be willing to become donors to academic programs. The economics will, of course, be a challenge. A.D. Phillips said that he is an advocate of putting students on the floor. They are the best seats in the house. He is going to have to try to negotiate with people sitting on the floor to see if they can move them to other good seats.

A.D. Phillips requested that people call him if issues come up. He wants to run a program that this university can be proud of. He does return his phone calls.

The funding philosophy (discussed below) is not coming from the Athletic Department. This draft philosophy began development a couple of years ago. A.D. Phillips believes that the university needs to have a funding philosophy but debate on what is or is not appropriate needs to continue. It is not workable unless people can come to agreement as to what they believe is appropriate for this campus. He is not part of the funding philosophy debate. Their goal is to put the Athletic Department in a position where they can become strong financially.

Athletic Council Liaison Report: Margaret White

The NCAA has requested that the university have a statement of funding philosophy. The Fiscal Integrity Committee of the Athletic Council developed a draft statement. A copy is attached. They are looking for input. If you have comments, contact Dr. White. It will come back to Faculty Council eventually for discussion. The Athletic Council reports directly to the President, so he will decide whether to seek additional input before approval. Dr. Wilkerson asked whether the proposed statement was consistent with state law. Dr. Bosserman has chaired this effort so Dr. White said she assumed it would comply with state law. Dr. Peters cited Title 70, Sec. 3901 O.S. which requires that "regular maintenance and utility costs and other operating expenses of auxiliary enterprises not be paid from education and general purpose funds without documented adequate reimbursement and that the use of fees and other charges be restricted to the purpose for which collected." Under the "Farley Agreement" funds are transferred to the Athletic Department for use of athletic facilities for basketball camps, graduation, etc. Dr. Peters suggested that there needs to be better documentation of such transfers and their reimbursement. Peat Marwick also suggested the need for better documentation. The faculty are concerned about the dispensing of E&G funds. The philosophy statement does say "consistent with the statutes of the State of Oklahoma." Dr. Lawry noted that he did not like the statement. It reads like an attempt on the part of athletic supporters to say we are going to do what we want to do because everybody loves us. Other auxiliary enterprises on campus are not allowed to accumulate the types of debt that the athletic departments at OSU and OU have been allowed to accumulate. Dr. Lawry moved that a copy of the proposed philosophy be attached to the minutes. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one dissent. Dr. Peters requested that Dr. White report again on this issue at a later date.

Special Report: Research Park — James Harmon

In January a feasibility study was authorized. This study was funded by the ERF (Educational Research Foundation). Research Parks stimulate technology transfer and stimulate research/scholarships to benefit the community. Reasons that universities affiliate with research parks include attracting and retaining entrepreneurial faculty, attracting excellent graduate students, increasing collaboration with private industry, facilitating technology transfer and commercialization of inventions, enhancing quality and stature of the university, contributing to economic development and generating alternative revenue streams as federal and state funding sources decline. A survey was conducted of faculty at Duke, Chapel Hill, North Carolina State and Stanford. Approximately 70 percent felt their research park improved the quality of the university, helped to recruit and retain faculty, and increased professional opportunities for graduates. Approximately 60 percent felt they helped recruit top graduate students. Approximately 80 percent of respondents from companies said the parks provided access to a quality workforce and about 70 percent cited access to faculty expertise, courses and training, cultural milieu and opportunities to subcontract as advantages of such parks. Other benefits that were cited included use of university facilities and availability of adjunct appointments. About 25 percent of the existing parks are run by public or private universities, 23 percent by nonprofit firms, 16 percent by state or municipal government, 15 percent by for-profit corporations, and 21 percent by public-private ventures. Typical types of businesses include technology and R&D, locally owned businesses, startups, branches of US/foreign organizations, light manufacturing and incubator firms. The study will take into consideration issues such as: 1) how do we let faculty work in the park and at the university, 2) how do we let faculty be mobile in the short-term, 3) ownership of intellectual property, 4) conflict of interest and commitment, 5) faculty perception of source of funds (not E&G funds), 6) ordinances, covenants, zoning and land use restrictions, 7) provision of utilities, 8) limitations of 501(c)(3), 9) are equity positions an acceptable form of compensation, 10) startups in/out of the university/ERF setting, 11) availability of federal grants/programs, state agencies, 12) location of government labs/offices, 13) subsidies and assistance, 14) management structure, 15) level of university support (is there administrative and faculty buy-in, what facilities are available, what support from ERF). Potential sources of funding include not-for-profits, federal or state government subsidies, government labs and universities, and private companies. Dr. Harmon has visited research parks in Kansas and will be travelling to Iowa State and Purdue to see how their parks are run. They are looking at similar institutions (size, location, emphasis on agriculture, engineering and veterinary medicine). CITD and the Food Processing Center might be components of this as well as the Agricultural Experiment Station. The base study should be completed in June or July and then they will come back to E-Group and ERF.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS: President Halligan

1. 92-03-01-FAC **Fixed Terms for Administrators:** Under study, pending appointment of Executive Vice President.
2. 94-12-01-SALR **Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:** Draft proposal to be reviewed by Faculty Council Executive Committee.
3. 95-03-02-FAC **Selection and Appointment of University Ombudsperson:** It is approved to expand the duties of the Affirmative Action Director to include the duties of ombudsperson, as described in the March 14, 1996, report to the President from the Faculty Council Chair. This approval is effective beginning with the Fall, 1996 semester.
4. 96-02-01-AS&P **Grades Earned by Students Studying Abroad:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
5. 96-02-02-AS&P **Issues Relative to Extension Courses:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
6. 96-02-03-FAC **Reporting Of Faculty Participation In Undergraduate Program:** The administration approves this recommendation that the self-reporting of undergraduate participation should be a part of the annual A&D process. This will be effective for Fall, 1996. Dr. Keener will communicate this decision to the academic deans and department heads requesting that all faculty be informed of this change and appropriate reference will be made in the A&D materials distributed in the Fall.
7. 96-03-01-RFB **Accumulation of Annual Leave for Faculty:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review with Deans Council.
8. 96-04-01-AS&P **Computerized Student Enrollment and Degree Audit Program:** To President Halligan
9. 96-04-02-AS&P **University Calendars:** To President Halligan
10. 96-04-03-AS&P **Transcript Information:** To President Halligan
11. 96-04-04-AS&P **Policy Concerning Awarding of Honorary Degrees:** To President Halligan

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES: Joe Williams — Update

Dr. Williams and Dr. Warde brought four recommendations to the Council on behalf of the committee.

96-04-01-AS&P — Computerized Student Enrollment and Degree Audit Program

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: 1. the computerized enrollment system be enhanced and that access procedures be simplified for students and advisers by developing one user friendly enrollment system that is available to all students (incoming freshman, re-admit, transfer, and continuing) and to all advisers during enrollment and add/drop periods. This system should fully utilize the power of the computer to simplify and improve the enrollment process.

2. the administration aggressively continue to pursue the development and adoption of a computerized degree audit system that is easily accessible and user friendly to students and advisers and which interfaces with the enrollment system.

Rationale:

1. Computerized Enrollment System

Enhancements: The computerized enrollment system should check prerequisites before allowing a student to enroll in a course. It would also be helpful if the advisor had the option of limiting the student's enrollment to a certain set of courses. Currently, a student can enroll in anything they choose once their enrollment is released whether their advisor has approved it or not and even if they have not completed the prerequisites for the course. Another enhancement would notify the instructor and the Dean's Office when a student had, in the just completed semester, failed a course which is a prerequisite for a course in which they are currently enrolled. Students enroll in such courses while they are enrolled in the prerequisite course, not knowing that they are going to fail the course and not be eligible for the following course. These enhancements should all contribute to increasing retention. It would also be possible to have the computer assist the students in building their course schedules. The students could list the courses they want, and the computer could list possible schedule options using the available open sections. This would assist

students in selecting the best possible schedule and increase student satisfaction as well as retention.

Access: Currently two methods exist for accessing the current enrollment system. The IDS system is designed for student use while the SES system is designed for adviser use. The systems are not consistent with respect to access, periods of access, functions, and/or capabilities. Continuing students can use the IDS system to enroll and change enrollment during the add/drop period. Advisers can only enroll transfer students and new freshman using the SES system during a specified period prior to commencement of classes. Advisers are shut out of making schedule modifications in student schedules via the computer after classes start. It is important that advisers have the capability to assist students with schedule modification using the computer. Students (IDS users) are not prevented from making schedule modifications during add/drop periods. This forces advisers to pose as students to assist students with schedule modifications. The enrollment system should provide information with respect to class scheduling options, open/closed sections, and course prerequisites.

2. Graduation checks are currently completed by hand in most Colleges. The Degree Audit System that is being implemented needs additional development. Users have indicated that it is easier to enter the data by hand than to use the new system. This process typically occurs during the senior year of study. The degree audit system should be designed to assist in the decision/information process as students progress through their academic careers showing courses completed and yet to be completed to fulfill graduation requirements. Additional resources should be used to speed up the development and implementation.

Dr. Williams received comments from advisors concerning problems with the computerized enrollment and degree audit systems. There are four systems for enrollment (phone, IDS, SES and sectioning). The systems are not consistent. Different codes are used to perform the same functions on the IDS and SES systems. Not all codes are listed on the screen. There are different capabilities within the systems and they are not user-friendly. Advisors often have to ask advisees for their PIN number in order to get into the IDS systems to help assist students with enrollment. Many times advisors are denied access to the SES system during times when students do have access to the IDS system. Dr. Williams introduced the recommendation on behalf of the committee. The motion passed unanimously.

96-04-02-AS&P — University Calendars

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:

1. Oklahoma State University pursue the adoption, by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, of a common education calendar for all State institutions of higher education.
2. Oklahoma State University work to adopt a common calendar with the University of Oklahoma, Langston University and Northeastern State University to facilitate the functioning of the University Center at Tulsa.

Rationale:

Semester beginning and ending dates vary greatly as do the Spring and Fall break schedules. This creates problems for distance learning faculty who have students in 2 to 3 locations who are all on different schedules and consequently drives up the cost of delivery to remote students. When students are not at a far-site classroom due to calendar differences, we must send videotapes of lectures missed. Instructors are required to make special arrangements to accommodate these differences.

The calendar difference with the University of Oklahoma in Spring 1996 caused a number of problems. We were forced to make decisions whether or not a course would make before the OU enrollment in that course was available. Likewise, at the University Center at Tulsa, for students enrolled in courses at OSU the calendar differences created the problem that OSU grades were due before final exams were scheduled. Solutions suggested involved taking the exam earlier (a violation of the OSU Dead Week policy) and turning in the grades late which caused students considerable inconvenience with the Financial Aid Office. Late grades result in students with financial aid being notified that they are ineligible to continue receiving financial aid.

All of the compromises and problems created by the different calendars result in additional expense for the University and inconvenience for the faculty, students, and administrators involved.

The College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology is currently working with a statewide consortium of junior/community colleges and regional universities to make available the freshman and sophomore level engineering science courses in order to improve the numbers and quality of transfer students to OSU. With the implementation of the ONENET system, educational institutions around Oklahoma will be involved more and more in the delivery or reception of televised instruction. The success of these initiatives requires a uniform calendar.

Dr. Warde brought the recommendation on behalf of the committee. Dr. Keener responded that we could have a calendar that matches UCAT if we do not have May intercession or if we go one week into August. Approximately 600 to 700 students enroll in May intercession classes. If the week off between finals and May intercession were eliminated, this problem might be avoided. Coordination with local school districts may also be a problem since each university coordinates with its own local school system. President Halligan noted that there is some advantage to our students finishing their semester before students from other universities when it comes to obtaining summer employment. The motion passed with one dissent.

96-04-03-AS&P — Transcript Information

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the University goes on record as OPPOSING the Higher Regent's recent policy requiring that probations and suspensions be recorded as a part of the official transcript for students of higher education. We request that the administration communicate the Faculty Council's opposition to the Higher Regent's policy. We request that OSU be exempt if, in fact, the policy is implemented.

Rationale:

The current transcript contains merely a record of the courses attempted, grades obtained in those courses, and degrees earned. The Regent's policy adds the negative information but fails to compensate by adding the positive.

Dr. Warde introduced the recommendation on behalf of the committee. Dr. Trapp observed that you open Pandora's Box once you start adding things to the transcript. The question was asked concerning whether the Higher Board's recommendation included behavioral suspensions as well as academic suspensions. No one knew the answer. Dr. White said that the transcript is an academic record, not a behavioral record. According to Dr. White, court cases in the 1970's indicated that behavioral suspensions should not appear on transcripts. V.P. Beer said he felt we were not being very honest with the public when we did not put academic suspensions and probations on the transcript. Most members of the public would not be able to tell from the current transcript whether a person has ever been placed on probation or suspension. He believes we should also put behavioral suspensions on the transcript. Dr. Mayer said putting nonacademic suspensions on the transcript makes it a record of the student's life and that is not what the purpose should be. Notice of academic suspensions is superfluous because anyone looking at a transcript can see the grades which determine whether there is an academic suspension. The motion passed unanimously.

96-04-04-AS&P — Policy Concerning Awarding of Honorary Degrees

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the statement "or anyone currently employed by Oklahoma State University" be deleted from Section 2.01, Part H, because Part E already addresses the nomination of OSU employees.

Rationale:

Part E states that there must be a break in service of "two or more academic semesters" before an honorary degree may be conferred on a former OSU employee. However, Part H states that anyone currently employed at OSU would be eligible for consideration "two years or more" after terminating employment. The time frame for eligibility in these two criteria appear to be in conflict, so it would be advisable to modify Part H as recommended.

Dr. Williams brought the recommendation on behalf of the committee. The recommendation passed with one negative vote.

B. BUDGET: Don Peters — Update

The Budget Committee is working on a recommendation to bring to Council at the May meeting concerning the importance of improving faculty salaries to bring them on parity with Big Twelve salaries. It is believed that investment in human capital is critical and should be addressed soon. Rumors have indicated that raises will be delayed until November. That may create a real morale problem.

C. CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY: Lynne Richards — Update

The committee met with Everett Eaton to discuss parking issues. Dr. Richards introduced Ernest Tye to discuss some of these issues. It may be that the long-term solution to parking problems will be a high rise parking facility, but that will take at least four years. They have been investigating shorter-term solutions. It would take about \$500,000 to run a bus service ourselves, but the Trolley Company of Guthrie has proposed that for an investment of about \$100,000, they will help OSU start a shuttle service. They have offered to do a one-day trial on April 17th. The service would run every 15 minutes to important points on campus. If approved, the Trolley Company will buy three new buses for the OSU campus service. They are prepared to do it on a 45-day notice. Gates on Hester are operated by a device like a garage door opener, so the buses will be able to go through the gates. Dr. Allison asked whether the proposed \$5 increased fee for parking would be removed if the system does not work. Capt. Tye said he did not know. Dr. White asked whether there would be any incentive offered for people to use the service. None is proposed. Dr. Lawry asked whether consideration had been given to construction of an underground facility. Capt. Tye said he was not aware of consideration of such a proposal. Many other universities have shuttle services (i.e. Texas A&M, Texas, Florida, Kansas, Florida State, OU, Iowa State). The current plan is to run the service from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. They hope to use the third bus on an on-call basis for special purposes.

D. FACULTY: Ed Lawry — Update

They have been reviewing use of temporary appointments and have not found any major abuses. The research did not really extend beyond this campus. Approximately 15 percent of faculty at OSU are on temporary appointments and that is fairly consistent with AAUP standards. They did discover that department heads are not as aware as they should be of possibilities for temporary appointments. Appendix D does cover these but not everyone reads Appendix D. It appears that temporary faculty can serve as PI's, even sole PI's, on grants and contracts as long as we do not mislead anyone into thinking that an appointment will be extended beyond its planned termination date. A course for new department heads and a refresher course for current department heads will be held by ADHAC in the fall. The spirit of Appendix D is that, as far as possible, all regular activities of teaching, research and extension should be done by permanent faculty and temporary faculty should be used for extraordinary reasons.

E. LONG-RANGE PLANNING: Peter Moretti — Update

The committee is trying to develop a process they would recommend to the administration for implementing long-range planning. We have a great interest in having long-range planning take place.

That was supported by the accreditation report. In some cases the Higher Regents have done long-range planning for us that might not be what we would necessarily have chosen. A copy of the draft proposal was distributed for consideration. We would like to have a process that would have opportunities for faculty input in development of strategies. A specific example of one way in which this might take place was included.

F. RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS: Steve Marks — No Report**G. RULES AND PROCEDURES: Glen Dolezal — Update**

Dr. Dolezal announced the election results. He expressed appreciation to all of the candidates and said he hopes that unsuccessful candidates will consider running again in the future. He also expressed appreciation to the Rules and Procedures Committee for conducting the mailings, and to Diane LaFollette and Margaret White who assisted in counting the ballots. The newly elected Council members are:

Vice-Chair — David Buchanan

Secretary — Dennis Bertholf
Group I, Biological Sciences — Janet Cole
Group II, Humanities — Carol Moder
Group III, Physical Sciences — Bill Warde
Group IV, Social Sciences — Linda Robinson
Group V, Teacher Education — Margaret Scott
College of Agriculture — Eugene Krenzer
College of Arts & Sciences (1 year term) — Perry Gethner
College of Human Environmental Sciences — Cheryl Farr
College of Veterinary Medicine —Lionel Dawson

H. STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES: Dennis Bertholf — No Report

LIAISON REPORT:

Emeriti Association: J. O. Grantham

Mr. Grantham announced that the emeriti faculty officer elections will be held April 10. The Golden Oaks operation is beginning construction.

Announcements:

Dr. Trapp announced that he and Drs. Moretti, Williams, and Bertholf, visited the legislature about two weeks ago and distributed a letter signed by members of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council. President Halligan said he also made a visit to the legislature with some OSU students. The students represented us very well. They gave away O-State T-shirts and should have taken more of them. President Halligan said he was pleased by the Tulsa World Editorial "It's Higher Ed's Turn."

Natalea Watkins announced that Friday is the first ever Parent's Day at OSU and students will be bringing their parents to class. Freshman Representative Council organized this activity. Also, Tuesday at 7:00 p.m. there will be a Technology Fee Forum. There is also a website that deals with the technology fee and how the money has been spent. On Friday, April 19th, there will be a moment of silence observed on campus at 9:02 a.m. in commemoration of the OKC bombing. At 9:03 a.m., the Library campus bell will toll one time for each victim. Also, KOSU will have a special broadcast that day.

Dr. Trapp reminded everyone that Tuesday, April 16, is the Spring General Faculty meeting. OSU Regent Chair Doug Tippens will speak. He encouraged everyone to come and bring a friend.

Old Business: James Trapp

Dr. Trapp moved that the revised Conflict of Interest Policy be accepted on a permanent basis. Dr. Warde seconded the motion. Dr. Peters moved that the motion be tabled to the next meeting so that Council members could have more time to review the revised policy. The policy was presented to Executive Group only one week before the Council meeting. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. The motion to table passed with two objections.

The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is May 14, 1996.