

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union
September 10, 1996

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Allen, Allison, Anderson, Bertholf, Boswell, Buchanan, Cole, Dawson, Farr, Finn, Gethner, Horn, Knobbe, Krenzer, Lau, Lawry, Marks, Moder, Moretti, Paustenbaugh, Richards, Robinson, Schwarz, Scott, Smith, Warde, White, Wilkinson, and Williams. Also present: Beverage, Birdwell, Collins, Cortez, Harrison, Johannes, E, Johnson, S. Johnson, Keener, Lacy, Manzelmann, Mounts, Pierce, Sim, Watkins, Weaver, and Yunker.

HIGHLIGHTS

Common and Final Exam Schedules	1
Distribution of \$71M Budget Allocation	2
Library Journal Subscriptions	3
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	5
Reports of Standing Committees.....	5
Academic Standards and Policy.....	5
Campus Facility, Safety and Security.....	5
Student Safety Training on the Internet.....	5
University Space Committee Report.....	6
Faculty.....	6
Summer Pay for Faculty	6
Grant Application Management	6
Promotion and Tenure Information.....	6
Adoption of OSU's Draft Smoking Policy Recommendation.....	6
Long-Range Planning.....	7
Retirement and Fringe Benefits.....	7
Liaison Representative Reports.....	8

Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the June 11, 1996, Minutes. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Allison moved acceptance of the September 10, 1996, Agenda. Dr. Warde seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

Peter Moretti announced that Ed Harris had resigned his position on the Faculty Council and nominated the runner up in the recent Group V election, Don Boswell, to replace him until the next regularly scheduled Faculty Council election. Dr. Warde moved the acceptance of Don Boswell to replace Ed Harris. Dr. Allison seconded. The motion passed. President Halligan welcomed Dr. Boswell to the group.

SPECIAL REPORT: Common and Final Exam Schedules — Robin Lacy

In the absence of Joe Weaver, Robin Lacy, Registrar, gave the first Special Report on the rules concerning common exams and the final examination schedule. Dr. Lacy said that common exams came into existence in the sixties by a resolution of the Faculty Council and to his knowledge has not been addressed since that time. For the most part the system has worked well with the cooperation of the faculty. However, some faculty are not informed about what the policy says. They have three documents in which the policy is presented to the faculty and department heads, but possibly some other method of communicating with the faculty should be considered. Possibly the department heads and deans should become more involved in the enforcement of the policy. Issues that the Registrar's Office see include:

- 1) common exams during the semester; 2) common exams during finals week; 3) Saturday

classes and finals; and 4) evening classes and final exams for evening classes. Options seen for this body to consider are: 1) abolish final exams; 2) keep the current policy and enforce it; or 3) let the Academic Standards and Policies Committee revisit the issue in conjunction with the people in the Registrar's Office who make out the schedule and bring forth a recommendation. Dr. Lacy recommended that option 3 be followed. Dr. Schwarz asked whether the rule that no night classes should be scheduled until 6:30 was in effect. Dr. Lacy replied that it was. He added that the Registrar's Office is many times asked to enforce policies that the faculty do not know exist. Dr. White asked who can have common exams and Dr. Lacy replied anyone with multiple sections in the same course, but that he did not know the faculty intent when the policy was first proposed. Joe Williams moved that this issue be referred back to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee which will form a subcommittee to work with the Registrar's Office staff to bring another recommendation to the Faculty Council. The motion was seconded by Dr. Warde. The motion passed.

SPECIAL REPORT: Distribution of \$71M Budget Allocation — Joe Weaver

Mr. Weaver, Director, Planning, Budget and Institutional Research, gave a summary of the presentation that Dr. Halligan gave to the Board of Regents in June. The full presentation can be found on the Internet on the Planning, Budget and Institutional Research's homepage. The total appropriation from the state was up 12.6% from 1995 but much of it was earmarked. Of the \$71.4M in new funds only \$38M were in new operating funds and of that \$12.6M went to OTR. Something new this year was that the State Regents took \$6.5M off the top to make "Base Equity Adjustments" for Colleges and Universities based on their growth over the last 5 years. They also took \$4.9M to fund new buildings across the system. They also funded some program adjustments, like the Teacher Education Program and the Food Processing Center, at \$12.7M. The remainder went into scholarships, OneNet user charges, Section 13 offset, and State Regents research matching grants. The base equity adjustments were determined by looking at peer institutions and figuring an average per student cost then multiplying that by a school's enrollment to determine its budget needs. By this method OSU was funded at 64% of what it should be. Only schools that were funded at 58.6% or lower participated in the \$6.5M adjustment money. This does not appear to be a one-time thing. The State Regents are committed to make similar adjustments in funding with any new funds until all schools are funded at the 58.6% rate. To put this in perspective for the OSU campus, from 1988 until 1995 OSU received about 16.5% of the state budget and OU received approximately the same. However, in the current budget OSU received only 14.5% and OU received 15%. This change cost OSU about \$820,000. There are two reasons for this drop. First, UCT was added to the formula, and second, OSU had a 1000 student drop in enrollment. OU's enrollment was about constant so they were only affected by the addition of UCT. OSU receives 42.6% of its funds from the state, 18.7% from auxiliary enterprises, 14% from student fees, 12.8% from sponsored programs and the rest from Federal appropriations, student aid and miscellaneous sources. OSU's total budget is \$389M. The summary of the OSRHE allocations to OSU-Agency 1 shows an increase of \$7.45M. Of this, \$4.5M went to the program budget and \$1.25M to OTRS. The other 23% was divided between the UCT Base Restoration, Facilities Operating Costs, Teacher Education, National Guard Scholarship Fund, and OneNet User Charges. The budget priorities that OSU showed the Board for the next two years included: 1) 5% raise program, \$4M; 2) OTRS, \$1.2M; 3) Fee Waivers, \$1.1M; 4) new faculty positions, \$1M; 5) facilities, \$0.6M; 6) Graduate stipends, \$0.4M; 7) new staff support positions, \$0.3M, 8) research/extension startup, \$0.3M; 9) Graduate programs, \$0.25M; 10) collegiate incentive funding, \$0.25M; 11) collegiate maintenance, \$0.2M; and 12) Library materials, \$0.1M. There are also several items listed as one-time commitments. Mr. Weaver also listed some of the 1996 strategies that are working. Included in that list are: sharing of indirect costs, minority incentive funds, technology fee, private gift program, targeted fee waivers, and Workers Compensation savings. He said that OSU had improved freshman retention by about 2%. He also shared some other trends that are positive, like a 10.7% increase in money to instruction and a 1.76% decrease in support costs. Dr. Ackerson asked if the

formula counts graduate students and undergraduate students differently. Mr. Weaver replied that the ratio was about 3 to 1, but varies a little according to program. Dr. Birdwell said that it varies some according to the level, masters or doctorate. Dr. Keener and Mr. Weaver pointed out that you can not sacrifice one to benefit the other. Dr. Ackerson pointed out that most of the discussion on enrollment loss was about undergraduate students but that the graduate program must also be maintained. Dr. Halligan replied that this was one reason for the 10 percent increase in graduate stipends. We felt that we had to be more competitive for the good graduate students and that good graduate students help produce good research which helps us to become a Carnegie 1 university. Dr. Birdwell said that it is widely believed that the Regents would hold us harmless for loss of enrollment. But all they were saying was that they would do that until there was new state revenue. They changed the rules, added in new institutions, and recognized 5 years of growth. The formula is now based on where your enrollment is with respect to the total state enrollment. OSU has benefited in the past from the advantage given to graduate student enrollment but as new graduate programs are started at other institutions this advantage is also being eroded. Dr. Horn asked what were the changes that brought about the 11% increase in the instruction budget. Mr. Weaver answered that the major factor was the salary program, but the computer tech fees and the No Rookies on Rookies Program were also instituted. Dr. Keener added that there are some new graduate programs. Dr. Halligan said some new positions were added, especially in the College of Education, and other positions added in some of the growth areas. The classic example is the Masters in Telecommunications Program which now has 200 students. Dr. Keener said that he could not recall a new undergraduate program. All the new programs have been at the graduate level. Dr. Collins added that the OSU graduate program grew 5% in enrollment last year. Dr. Lawry pointed out that in thinking about the strategy for the future there are two options. One is to follow the enrollment strategy and the other is to try to lobby the Regents to change their views. Dr. Halligan pointed out that we are only at the beginning of this equalization for past growth. Dr. Marks said it is going to be hard to move down on the needs list and Dr. Halligan replied that it is possible. If you grew enough, you could move down on the list.

SPECIAL REPORT: Library Journal Subscriptions — Ed Johnson

Dr. Johnson, Dean of Libraries, reported about monograph and serial costs. The annual rate of inflation at OSU over the last decade was 12%. The Library budget increased roughly 100% during that period. Nationally, the cost of journals has increased 138% in the last 10 years. Therefore, OSU is spending 100% more and buying less journals. Dr. Johnson handed out an article giving the University of Wisconsin's Faculty Senate resolutions pertaining to the problems they are having with acquisitions. Their main concerns were the academic communities control of its intellectual property, electronic publication and how it could be utilized, and faculty's knowledge of copyright issues. At their university the inflation in journal subscriptions was 14% over the last year. He also read a portion of the annual report of the University of Texas library. Over the last 10 years the purchase of monographs has declined from around 70,000 per year to about 40,000 per year. OSU's library has increased its purchase of monographs over this same period from about 20,000 per year to an average of 30 to 40 thousand per year. At Texas, journal subscriptions were cut by about 5,000 titles, which is about 20%. The 20% number seems to be a national average and is about what our cut will be over the last 10 year period. This year the increase in cost is the worst in the last 10 years. Over this period the OSU library has made many internal adjustments, has aggressively raised funds, has delayed capital improvements, and has cut staff development funding. Dr. Johnson reported that this year we will have about a \$600,000 shortfall and that the sustained rate of inflation has surpassed our ability to compensate by making internal changes. The administration gave the library a \$100,000 increase in the budget but that still leaves it \$500,000 short of being able to purchase the journals to which it currently subscribes. During the spring the staff launched a review of the journal subscriptions. They identified a large number of titles and asked the faculty to review this list and tell them which of these they use, which are essential, and which they would agree to let

the library cancel. They have now refined the first list to a second list and again are asking for faculty input. Dr. Johnson introduced Sheila Johnson who is coordinating the process for the library staff. She reported that it was unfortunate that the first list came out in the summer when many faculty were not present. But, all faculty should have the opportunity to review the present list which contains about 350 science titles and 85 social science titles. The list is posted on the Internet so is available to all faculty. There is a deadline of October 1 to notify the publishers of the intention to cancel. The comments on this list need to be sent to the library by September 26. Dean Johnson then reported that the current list would save about \$500,000. In summary, he said that he believes that the inflation rate will continue at about the same level for the next 10 years. So, even if the university could solve the problem this year, it would still have to double the budget again in seven years. It is very unlikely that the university could do that and other alternatives are going to have to be found. Some things that are already happening at the national level are: Interlibrary borrowing has increased 88%, volumes held is up modestly, the number of staff went down, number of journals purchased went down and the number of monograph volumes purchased went way down. He also reported that in meetings with students they have two complaints — they want more books purchased and the library to be open more hours. The library is: trying to reinvent interlibrary loans; expand reciprocal agreements; purchase computer technology to speed transactions; contract with delivery companies; upgrade PETE, hopefully to include on-line interlibrary loans; and work to establish an on-line document delivery system at no cost to the user. The Doc link has the potential for great expansion and computer linkages could be extended via statewide site licenses. Vendors have figured out that the end users are not libraries but are the faculty and students, so the libraries are going to be agents between you and the vendors. Dr. Lawry asked if OSU's current lists had been compared with OU and Tulsa. Sheila Johnson replied that they had not but that documents can be obtained from commercial suppliers faster than from OU. Dr. Moder said that if OSU is going to deal with other libraries around the state then we should come to an agreement like the one in North Carolina in the Research Triangle where each library houses special collections and have agreed to make loans. Dean Johnson replied that they were moving in that direction in the Greater Midwest Library Consortium which is a group of 16 institutions. Some of the libraries in the Dallas-Fort Worth area have an interest in expanding this consortium. This consortium could negotiate agreements with vendors to decrease the cost of document delivery. Sheila Johnson said that when the list is final they will be meeting with OU to work on an arrangement to share issues so that rather than just getting a copy of a paper we would borrow the issue for a period of time. Dr. Finn asked if the overall effect of these cuts across the nation will increase the inflation rate. Dean Johnson replied that he did not think so. Dr. Robinson said that she was having problems with the number of articles she can get from one volume. Dean Johnson said that if we ask for more than five copies of the same article from the same journal then we are in violation of the copyright laws. If we go to a document delivery service then they pay the copyright fee and we can get any number of copies. Dr. Boswell asked if a journal that increases 100% is more likely to be cancelled than one that increases only 6%. Sheila Johnson said that they were paying more attention to the comparison between the journal cost and the cost of getting the articles using a document delivery service. Some others were cut because they were not getting any use. She also reported that the gap between the science journal inflation rate and that for the social sciences journals is narrowing. Dr. Knobbe asked what percentage of the journals are on-line. Dean Johnson replied that if you define an on-line journal to mean a journal whose electronic version is equivalent to the print version then there are about 2 percent and very few of these are scholarly journals. The other problem with electronic journals is that they normally cost 110 percent of the print version. However, we are going to see a big expansion in the ways of getting the contents of these journals by electronic means.

**REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:
President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents**

1. 92-03-01-FAC **Fixed Terms for Administrators:** President and Executive VP are still studying this recommendation.
2. 94-12-01-SALR **Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:** VP Collins reported that they took the results from the Faculty Council committee response to the draft plan and are incorporating the suggestions into a write-up. The final product should be available in a few days and this report will be submitted to Faculty Council.
3. 96-02-01-ASP **Grades Earned by Students Studying Abroad:** Approved.
4. 96-02-02-ASP **Issues Relative to Extension Courses:** Dr. Keener reported a committee has been appointed and will be meeting soon.
5. 96-03-01-RFB **Accumulation of Annual Leave:** Dr. Birdwell reported there is a draft response that he and Anne Matoy will share with the Faculty Council Executive Committee before the next Faculty Council meeting.
6. 96-04-01-ASP **Computerized Student Enrollment and Degree Audit Program:** Dr. Keener reported the committee is meeting.
7. 96-04-02-ASP **University Calendars:** Dr. Keener reported this issue is in the discussion process. The Council of Presidents has decided they would like to have a say in this matter.
8. 96-04-05 **Adoption of Financial Conflict of Interest Policy:** Dr. Collins reported this is accepted pending final Board approval on 9/13/96.
9. 96-05-01-LRP **Strategic Management:** President Halligan reported this matter is under study and has been significantly discussed in Executive Group. Dave Buchanan and Marvin Keener are meeting to discuss this issue.
10. 96-05-02-BUDG **Faculty Salary Program:** Rejected. Dr. Halligan reported the administration cannot promise to reach parity within three year.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES: Joe Williams — Update

Dr. Williams gave a listing of the committee's current projects. They include: 1) academic accommodations for students with disabilities; 2) convocation/commencement attendance; 3) information reported on transcripts; 4) Bill Warde's survey of faculty about the plus/minus grading system and a survey of students on the same subject; 5) OSU finals policy; 6) graduation adornment items and graduation honors; 7) received a request to review class attendance policies; 8) look into how correspondence courses are listed and the possibility of including them in the class schedule book; and 9) received a request to try to expedite student grade appeals.

B. BUDGET: Nancy Wilkinson — No Report

C. CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY: Jeff Anderson — Update

Student Safety Training on the Internet. An effort has been underway to provide student safety training modules on the Internet. Information is available for instructors to use, at their discretion, to augment information in class. Leslie Miller at the Physical Plant has been doing an excellent job developing the safety modules. Bloodborne Pathogens, Fire Extinguishers, Compress Gas Cylinders, and Hazard Communications are up. Others, including laboratory personal protective equipment, are in the works. They are available for instructors to use as they see fit. Address: to check them out from the OSU homepage, choose Services-Environmental Health and Safety-Safety Training-Training Modules, or enter the location as <http://www.pp.okstate.edu/ehs/modules/home.htm>. They plan to have the programming worked out shortly to have an optional on-line quiz graded and sent to the instructor.

University Space Committee. The Geography Building is in very bad shape and will have to be razed. The Geography Department will be moving to the second and part of the third floor of Scott Hall during the fall semester 1996. The Geography faculty approved this move as an interim plan. In the long term, South Murray will be renovated and become home to Geography as well as several other departments from the College of Arts & Sciences. The Emeriti Center will be moved from the Geography Building to Bennett Hall.

D. FACULTY: Ed Lawry — Update

Dr. Lawry reported the committee is working on the issue of summer pay for faculty. This breaks down into two problems: First, people who are on 9 month contracts verses 10 month contracts getting one-ninth of their salary verses one-tenth of their salary for each summer month. The other is that many people who are not on salary in the summer are expected to continue with their graduate thesis advising duties without compensation. Another question is on the Grant Application Management System, GAMS, which is a new on-line system to enable grant applications to be processed quickly. The concern is that PI's will be asked to provide excessive information that will be stored in a data bank somewhere and they are worried about confidentiality. People that have concerns about these items are urged to communicate them to the committee. The committee will also be looking at A&D processes as they operate in the departments. They will be sending a letter to each department asking for copies of their personnel documents and job descriptions. Dr. Lawry passed out a summary of 1996 reappointment/promotion/tenure actions. The Faculty Committee advises the Executive Vice President in cases of promotion and tenure where the EVP wants further faculty input. There were 122 total cases, 87 on the Stillwater campus. At OSU-OKC and OSU-COM there were 15 reappointments, 3 reappointments with tenure, 13 promotions, and 4 promotions with tenure. At Stillwater, in cases where all parties in the process agreed, there were 12 reappointments, 4 reappointments with tenure, 4 non reappointments, 17 promotions, 30 promotions with tenure, and 1 promotion denied. In cases where there was disagreement at some level of the process there were 4 nonreappointments, 3 promotions, 3 promotions with tenure, and 9 promotions denied. The Faculty Committee was consulted on 15 cases, 14 of these came from the list where there was some disagreement.

Dr. Lawry presented the following recommendation: 96-09-01-FAC, Adoption of OSU's Draft Smoking Policy. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:** with two changes noted below, the University adopt the Draft of the Policy and Procedures Letter on Smoking Number 1-0530 and the date of August, 1996, as the official policy of the University on Smoking and the Use of Tobacco in University Buildings. The two changes are 1) that the words "during working hours" be eliminated from 1.03 and that 2) the first word of section 3.03 be changed to "Tobacco users." **Rationale:** 1) Questions and answers circulated with the Draft of the policy from Dr. Birdwell's office are persuasive. 2) There is little doubt that smoking is becoming increasingly annoying to a significant number of people. While some smokers may find it difficult to comply with the new policy and therefore may find new habits disturbing to their personal working conditions, many more people find the presence of smoke and tobacco disturbing to their working conditions. This policy, if adhered to, will improve working conditions for the majority of OSU employees. 3) Both changes in the wording were felt necessary by the committee to clarify the policy. In the case of 1.03, the concept of "working hours" was too vague, and in the case of 3.03 the sentence as written simply did not make sense. To obtain a copy of the Draft Policy and Procedures Letter on "Smoking and Use of Tobacco in University Buildings," call Diane LaFollette at x48790. In summary there were only two changes from the old policy. One is that there will be no smoking in the buildings except some specially designated areas of the residence halls and the Student Union. In particular there will be no smoking in faculty or staff offices. The other change is that there will be no smoking within 10 feet of the entrance to a building. Dr. Lawry asked to be first to discuss this motion and stated that even though the committee voted to bring this recommendation, he is personally opposed to the policy and urged the Council to

vote against it. He said he has three reasons for opposing the policy. First, he finds it to be intolerant of the problems that smokers have and the pleasures they get from smoking. It also lumps all kinds of smoking together. Secondly, one of the reasons that people are becoming more intolerant is related to the health issue involved with secondary smoke. He is convinced that the evidence about secondary smoke is "junk science." He did note, however, that he is not a smoker and does not enjoy people that smoke around him. His third reason is that he feels that the current policy is adequate. Dr. Johannes also spoke against the draft policy. He raised the issues of enforcement of the rule requiring smokers to be 10 feet from the entrance to any building, whether there was staff and student participation, and whether there were any smokers on the committee. Dr. Lau also spoke against the policy. His main concern was with the litter problem near the entrances to the buildings and feels that moving the smokers 10 feet away will increase the litter problem. He also raised the question of why smokeless tobacco was included in the policy. Dr. Boswell said, "I don't think anyone has died of second hand tobacco chewing." Dr. Finn said that the OSU medical school is a smokeless area and that they have adjusted. They have placed receptacles outside most buildings to solve the litter problem. Ms. Beverage said that the Staff Advisory Council reviewed the policy and approved it with the "during working hours" statement removed. Clay Allen, OSU-Okmulgee representative, said their campus is also totally smoke free. Dr. Marks said that the University Health Committee was in favor of removing "during working hours" from the policy and was also in favor of the Student Union being smoke free. Dr. White said she was against smoking. Dr. Williams said that he was tired of inappropriate spitting in drinking fountains, elevators, etc. It is an extremely bad public relations issue for this university. Dr. Warde asked if the students had seen the policy. Dr. Birdwell said that the students made the request in the first place and asked for the 10 foot rule because the smoke was gathering in the foyer areas of the buildings. The motion passed 21-6.

E. LONG-RANGE PLANNING: Dave Buchanan — Update

Dr. Buchanan said that the committee had met once and were discussing ways the administration could respond to the Faculty Council's recommendation regarding Strategic Planning. He will be meeting with Dr. Keener to discuss the administration's response to the long-range planning process.

F. RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS: Steve Marks — Update

Dr. Marks reported that they will have their first meeting Thursday afternoon and will be looking at OTRS. They will also be monitoring what is happening in the health issues area. Health costs have been rising at about 7 percent over the last few years. This means that our premiums will have to double about every 10 years. We restructured the policy, which resulted in a so-called surplus. We are now using the surplus to fund additional benefits. In about three or four years we will again need to revise our policy. If we do not raise our rate for two more years, when the surplus will be gone, then we will be in for some "sticker shock." The Health Care Committee has hired the consulting group, Buck Associates, to look at the industry and what the impact will be in Stillwater. They will be looking at what benefits the employees want and how much they are willing to pay for those benefits. The consultants will be holding some focus groups on September 17 and 18. They will be looking at current utilization and what will be needed in 3 or 4 years. The committee will then hold some town meetings that are open to all faculty and staff.

G. Rules and Procedures — Rich Paustenbaugh — No Report

H. STUDENT AFFAIRS & LEARNING RESOURCES: Gretchen Schwarz — No Report

Reports of Liaison Representatives

Emeriti Association — A. B. Harrison

Dr. Harrison reported that the Emeriti Center will be moving from the Geography Building to the northeast wing of Bennett Hall.

Staff Advisory Council — Tina Beverage

Ms. Beverage reported SAC is involved with the Homecoming Blood Drive and encouraged our participation. Staff Awards Day is November 6 and letters requesting nominations for outstanding staff will be going out soon. Next year Staff Awards Day will include the Benefits Fair to allow the staff to attend the fair. SAC has formed a Scholarship Committee to develop guidelines for a staff scholarship and look at ways to fund it. They also have passed the smoking policy and are developing a web page. They will post their minutes and recommendations and will highlight an outstanding staff member on the campus. They invite nominations for this honor.

Athletic Council — Margaret White

Dr. White reported that Athletic Council will meet next week and discuss the funding philosophy. They are waiting on Student Government Association input since SGA does not meet over the summer. They had a special meeting just before this meeting to deal with basketball scheduling during prefinals week. They will be sending a recommendation to the President and EVP asking for an exception to the prefinals week policy. The recommendation is that the team will go to Arizona State and that one or two faculty will accompany them. These faculty should be strong in areas in which the team is currently taking classes. Also, Steve Uryasz and one tutor will also travel with the team.

Old Business: None

New Business:

Peter Moretti asked if Council would want to move the October 8 meeting to October 15, since it will be during Fall Break. Dr. Allison moved that the October meeting be moved to October 15. Seconded by Margaret White. Ms. LaFollette said to be sure to watch the Agenda for a different meeting room since we may not be able to meet in 250 Council Room. Dr. Moretti said that Jim Trapp told him that problems always arise when you move a meeting and Dr. Halligan was not sure his calendar was clear for October 15. The motion failed 8-14.

Natalea Watkins reported that we have a new publication called @ OSU. It is 173,647 things to know about OSU. Faculty Council members should be getting a copy in their mail this week. It is everything from 13 free newspapers on the world wide web to the most romantic places on campus. They are interested in feedback since this is a first for the OSU campus.

Dr. White moved that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is October 8, 1996.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary