

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, Warde, White, Wilkinson, and Williams. Also present: Birdwell, Blakley, Bradley, Branson, Cortez, Duer, Keener, Kruse, Manzelmann, Matoy, Mitchell, Mowen, Oehrtman, Reniker, Watkins, Wells and Yunker. Absent: Smith.

HIGHLIGHTS

Health Care.....	1
Freshman Recruitment	2
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Reports of Standing Committees.....	3
Academic Standards and Policies	3
Budget	4
Long-Range Planning	4
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	4
Liaison Representative Reports.....	4
Resolution on Raising Student Fees for Athletic Facilities	5

Dr. Allison moved acceptance of the October 8, 1996, Minutes. Dr. Warde seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the November 12, 1996, Agenda. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: HEALTH CARE — Mike Branson

Dr. Mike Branson, Chair of the Health Care and Medical Insurance Committee, introduced Leo Blakley and Bob Oehrtman whom he had invited to attend because of their involvement with the committee. Dr. Branson distributed a document giving the definition of HMO, PPO, and managed care. An HMO is an organization that, for a prepaid fee, provides, offers, or arranges comprehensive health care service to a voluntarily enrolled membership. A PPO is a grouping of participating providers that have agreed to furnish services to a payer's covered persons at negotiated fees in return for prompt payment and hopes of increased patient volume. Managed care imposes some controls on the utilization of health care services, the providers who offer such care, and/or the fees charged for such services. All HMOs have managed care. Most PPOs have some managed care. Our current system has some managed care, e.g., elective surgery which requires prior approval through Health International. The committee has been concerned only with PPOs since there is not an HMO that can serve all OSU employees. Dr. Branson also distributed the committee charge and membership. The membership of the committee includes: Three faculty members - Michael Branson, Steven Marks, and Robert Hunger; three emeriti faculty members - Helen Jordan, Helmer Sorenson, and Leo Blakley; three staff members - Kent Sampson, Sharon Whitney, and Carol Bradley; an A&M Universities representative, Dewey Clapp; and two ex officio members - Anne Matoy and Jim Rogers. There are two major reasons to be in a PPO. One is that many doctors will not bill OSU's insurance company and want you to pay up front and file for reimbursement. The second reason is that doctors do some cost shifting and balance billing. Instead of charging the PPO rate of \$40 for an office call, they charge \$50. You pay up front and apply for reimbursement. The insurance company says that is a \$40 call and pays 80% or \$32. You have to make up the difference, \$8 and pay the \$10 balance between the \$40 and \$50. That totals \$18 which is 45% of the \$40, not 20%. Under a PPO arrangement the doctor would charge you \$8 and bill the PPO for \$32. You would not be restricted to using doctors in the PPO, but if you use a doctor not in the PPO, you will be reimbursed at the current rate. We are probably the only large employer in the state that is not a member of some PPO. At this point the committee is using a consulting firm hired through American Fidelity, Buck Consultants, to study the feasibility of joining a PPO. If Buck's decision is that it is feasible, we will pursue it and if not, we will not proceed. The big problem

with PPOs is that there is one that gives very good coverage in Stillwater but not very good coverage in other parts of the state and another that has good coverage in the state, as a whole, but not very good coverage in Stillwater. Whatever contract we enter into has to serve the entire A&M system. Dr. Boswell asked if there was a possibility of a conflict of interest in using a consultant associated with American Fidelity. Dr. Branson replied that we needed help to study the problem and that we could move faster if we went through American Fidelity on a subcontract basis than if we put the job out to bids. The Health Care Committee interviewed the candidates and recommended which one to use. Even if we had gone out on bids we could not be sure there was not a connection between the consultant and some PPO. Also, American Fidelity is a Third Party Administrator (TPA) and is not in the PPO business itself. Dr. Knobbe asked which PPOs they are examining. Dr. Branson replied that anyone operating in the state is a candidate. Dr. Moretti asked if the management would also be put up for bids so that American Fidelity would be one bidder. Dr. Branson replied that if a PPO is feasible then we have two options. We could put out a RFP for a provider and a PPO or one for just a PPO through American Fidelity. This last option would allow for a PPO in a timely manner and would be similar to the changes made when the prescription plan was added and the managed care portion. Dr. Finn asked if they had evidence that there is price shifting going on or that doctors were misusing codes. Dr. Branson replied that it was not the misuse of codes. The doctors were simply charging a higher rate for non-PPO customers. Dr. Oehrtman added that they had gotten detailed billing records from American Fidelity and that Dr. Blakley had found indication of some potential cost shifting in those records. Dr. Moretti asked if this would end the current managed care system. Dr. Branson said that it would not and added that our current managed care system is at an extremely low level.

SPECIAL REPORT: FRESHMEN RECRUITMENT — Larry Kruse

Dr. Kruse began by commending the faculty for their concern and caring in this year's recruiting program. He also commended Dr. Moretti for his letter to the *NewsPress* concerning admission standards. This was a watershed year in that the ACT cutoff went from 21 to 22 and this could have cost OSU 300 students. It ended up costing only 7 students from the state. Dr. Kruse then shared some demographic data that showed we have passed the low point in high school graduates in the state and that the number is projected to increase until 2001. The pool for OSU consists of those making 22 or better on the ACT. This year that amounted to 8695 students. OSU handled about 38 to 40 thousand inquiries, about 14,000 prospects, about 5,000 applicants and about 25 to 26 hundred enrollees. Dr. Kruse shared the type of information that they keep on prospective students and said that interested faculty could access the data. The data can involve 13 different computer screens and includes information such as test dates, scholarship information, and contacts that the office had with the student. Dr. Ackerson asked if they could tell him which students were interested in Physics. Dr. Kruse said they could. Such lists are provided by way of the colleges and could generally be provided within two days. Even with the smaller pool of eligible freshmen due to the increase in the ACT cutoff from 21 to 22 this year OSU was only down 7 in freshmen enrollment and this was offset by an increase of 8 in transfers so we had a net gain of 1 in new students. Dr. Kruse then shared some information on why students choose a college. The top 5 reasons listed for private colleges were: 1. Quality of the faculty, 2. Availability of majors, 3. Campus safety, 4. Quality of the facilities, and 5. scholarships. The top 5 reasons for attending public universities were: 1. Safety, 2. Availability of scholarships, 3. Cost after financial aid, 4. Availability of majors, 5. Cost before financial aid. The parents were the most influential in the students choice and the list of parental concerns were: 1. Safety, 2. Financial aid, 3. Quality of the faculty, 4. Curriculum, and 5. Advising. Dr. Ackerson asked what they meant by curriculum. Dr. Kruse replied, "Can you get a job?" Dr. Horn asked how good are our numbers in that regard. Dr. Kruse replied it varies. Some disciplines have very good information and others do not. When we do not know the numbers, we tell them that we will get the information and we call the department and get back to the prospect with the information. Campus visits are an effective recruiting tool. When the prospect sees the buildings, meets some students, meet the staff, attends a class, and talks to the faculty, they come back pleased. Dr. Kruse closed with some comments on what faculty can do. As the students move through the process, they are first provided with a lot of information about the university, housing and financial aid, but the prospect still has not made a commitment. As we get past this into orientation sessions and advising, that is what sells it. It is what happens in the classroom that keeps the kids here. He again thanked the faculty for their contributions. The conversion rate (number enrolled divided by the number admitted) for OSU has been very good. Last year our rate was 59.1% and this year it was 57.4%. This compares very favorably with the national rate of 50.1%. Another thing that faculty can do is to make connections with high schools and junior colleges. Two colleges with excellent connections with high schools are Agriculture and Human Environmental Sciences. It is much

easier to recruit students from these high schools. Dr. Lawry asked about the article in a recent paper that showed data about all schools in the state. This article claimed that it costs \$400 more to go to OSU than to OU. Natalea Watkins replied that the data came from a couple of sources, the State Regents Office and a report in *Time Magazine*. The average of these two numbers was reported. Dr. Kruse said that it costs \$6910, tuition is \$2020, room and board is \$4080, and books are \$810. OU is about \$82 less. Dr. Horn asked if we have any formal linkages with the Alumni Association. Dr. Kruse said that they work very closely with the Alumni Association. Dr. Moretti asked how it is decided who gets direct mail. Dr. Kruse said that it is determined by the interest shown on the ACT. We work Oklahoma and the contiguous states. In Texas we purchase lists of names in 7 areas. We spent two weeks in Dallas and will go back one more week. The alumni did 67 programs in the State of Texas. Dr. Moretti said that many private colleges are going to early admissions and early financial aid commitments and asked if we could do this. Dr. Kruse said this is a problem because to be admitted a student has to be a graduate. We might be able to go to early admission based on ACT. Dr. White asked if they had taken faculty who had graduated from the high school when they visited the high school or if such faculty had been identified and Dr. Kruse replied there are five representatives throughout the state plus an office in Tulsa and OKC. These offices have responsibility for specific schools and have goals for each of these schools based on history and other information on this school. They try to take students from the area but this is sometimes difficult because many times the recruiters are gone for several days at a time. The same holds for faculty. Dr. Finn said that OU had been targeting the private schools in Tulsa, especially Holland Hall and asked if we also work these schools. Dr. Kruse replied that we do and in fact that Bishop Kelly is our fourth largest school in the Tulsa area. Dr. Lau asked if we had enough international students. Dr. Kruse replied that he would like to see more international students but that the charge of his office is to recruit domestic students and that the Office of International Programs does the recruiting of international students. We were up 5 in international freshman this year. Dr. Lau asked how successful we were with minority students. Dr. Kruse said we have been up in minority students the last 3 years but are down 17 black students this year. Dr. Boswell asked what is being done to increase the diversity on campus. Dr. Kruse said that the 22 ACT works against the recruitment of minority students. The average ACT score for black students in Oklahoma is 17.7. We had more contacts from black students this year than ever before but we ended up with fewer enrollees because of admissibility criteria and because of dollars. A black student with a 24 ACT can get a full ride at Harvard and we give \$1000. OU has a program funded through Phillips where they give a minority student with a 25 ACT a full ride. Our largest scholarship outside of national merit and athletics is \$1500.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

1. 92-03-01-FAC *Fixed Terms for Administrators:* Pending.
2. 94-12-01-SALR *Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:* Pending
3. 96-03-01-RFB *Accumulation of Annual Leave:* Dr. Keener has interacted with the committee chair and executive chair regarding this issue and has sent a letter to President Halligan.
4. 96-04-01-ASP *Computerized Student Enrollment and Degree Audit Program:* Accepted.
5. 96-04-02-ASP *University Calendars:* At the State Regent's Office.
6. 96-05-01-LRP *Strategic Management:* Under study. President Halligan has reviewed several plans from other universities and ask for input from anyone in regard to examples from other universities.
7. 96-09-01-FAC *Adoption of OSU's Draft Smoking Policy:* This policy is expected to be presented to the Executive Committee by December 1, 1996.
8. 96-10-01(1)-FAC *On Summer Compensation (1):* Under study.
9. 96-10-01(2)-FAC *On Summer Compensation (2):* Under study.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES: Joe Williams — Update

Next meeting the committee will bring forward at least two recommendations. One will involve the academic appeals process for students with disabilities, and the other will be a grade appeal recommendation. A possible third recommendation could concern late drops.

B. BUDGET: Nancy Wilkinson — Update

A report titled "New Building Construction Impact on University Budget" was attached to the November agenda and was a response to the following two questions raised by faculty constituents: 1. Besides private money, how are the new buildings on campus being funded? And, 2. To what extent will future maintenance costs impact the university budget? Willard Hall was financed by \$9.8M in HERO Bonds which are state bonds. The Food Processing Center was financed by a \$0.6M Planning and Design Development Grant from the state, \$14M in HERO Bonds, and \$1.6M in State General Obligation Bonds. The Advanced Technology Research Center was financed by \$12.5M in HERO Bonds, \$7.3M Department of Energy grant, \$1.2M from College/University Carry-Forward balances and \$10M OSU General Revenue Bonds. The \$10M General Revenue Bonds are being serviced by the College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology over a 20-year period with payments of approximately \$800K per year. Private gifts to the college will be used to help offset the cost of the bonds. The annual maintenance costs for the buildings will be: Willard Hall \$380K, Food Processing Center \$400K, and ATRC \$600K. The funds for Willard Hall have already been appropriated, as have 25% of the funds for the Food Processing Center since it opens this year. It is expected, by OSU administration, that the remainder of the funds necessary for the Food Processing Center and the ATRC will be allocated next year so that there will be no adverse effects on the operating budget.

C. LONG-RANGE PLANNING: Dave Buchanan — Update

The committee continues to be interested in the status of the recommendation to establish a "Strategic Management" process with an appropriate committee and an "Assistant to the President (or Executive Vice-President)." They began discussion and review of the "Halligan" Vision Statement (OSU-The University of Choice in Oklahoma) and believe it to be a good document with many important points. Many points probably need further clarity in months and years to come. Some areas (not intended to be all-inclusive) that deserve further study might be: faculty enhancement, graduate education, the cooperative nature of emphases on teaching, research and public service and the future of delivery of higher education. In future meetings they will proceed to selection of an issue (or issues) to study in more detail for submission to the Strategic Management process. Input from other councilors on appropriate issues for consideration would be appreciated. Dr. Halligan commented that the vision statement was done after he had been here for 100 days and was not meant to be a document for all time. It is very appropriate for others to look at it and give their comments.

D. STUDENT AFFAIRS & LEARNING RESOURCES: Gretchen Schwarz — Update

They were engaged at their last meeting with the information Dr. Ron Beer shared with them on Student Affairs. He mentioned a number of topics from the center for student services (coming soon in the newly renovated Student Union) to scholarships and financial aid. Most of the time was spent on substance abuse and issues of student health. They were interested in the new "rape drug" making its way on campuses. Dr. Beer suggests that we must confront young people with these problems, but he also said that studies have shown that education is not the problem among university students. They know the information, but they do what they see others doing and what the media encourages. He emphasized the importance of offering things students can do for fun without alcohol or other substances, like more fields for intramural sports. In addition, he suggests that the faculty can write to local bars and discourage them from promoting alcohol as they do (Thursday Ladies Night, etc.). Furthermore, there are plans for students to work with other students on these issues, doing some peer health education. Another area that caught their attention was working with learning disabled students. They would like more educational opportunities for faculty to learn how to help special students.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES

Campus Space Committee — Jeff Anderson

This committee is exploring the establishment of a comprehensive Campus Facilities Planning Committee that would be responsible for the development and use of all university physical resources. This would be an opportunity to consolidate the activities of several committees. Members of the Campus Facilities, Safety & Security and Long-Range Planning Committees of Faculty Council will be invited to the next Campus Space Committee meeting in December to learn more about the proposal and provide input.

Student Publications Committee — Rich Paustenbaugh

The Student Publications Committee has selected the *O'Colly* editor for the spring semester. Also Charles Edgley was selected as Chair of the Student Publications Committee.

Faculty Advisory Committee for the State Regents for Higher Education — Dave Buchanan

Gretchen Schwarz, Dennis Bertholf and Dave Buchanan attended the meeting of the FAC for the OSRHE. This committee is a seven person committee (2 from comprehensive universities, 2 from regional universities, 2 from two-year colleges and 1 from an independent college) that meets regularly with the Chancellor. Once per year the format is expanded to include representatives from any institution so that new committee members may be elected. OSU's representative, Gary Foutch, has been replaced by Jim Trapp for a two-year term. The Chancellor made several comments about issues concerning funding, state politics, articulation, preparedness of students for college and other pertinent issues. Each person in attendance identified some issues that are important at their institution. Cross cutting issues seemed to be articulation, retirement, use of technology, libraries, general funding and faculty governance. The meeting itself was not terribly informative but did convey the message that the Chancellor values the input received from the formal committee.

Athletic Council — Margaret White

The committee met the morning of November 2, 1996, to interview the internal candidate, Tom Holliday, for the position of Head Baseball Coach. The committee is looking forward to interviewing the other candidates on Saturday mornings.

Staff Advisory Council — Carol Bradley

The most recent major project had been the Distinguished Service Awards. The Staff Advisory Council would like to thank the faculty for their nominations and for allowing staff to take time off to attend the awards ceremony and council activities. Please remember to nominate deserving staff for next years awards.

OSU's Women's Council — Helen Duer

They would like to thank faculty for their support of the first Cultural Awareness Day. They also had an ad in the paper about women's studies and the courses that are offered toward a certificate.

NEW BUSINESS:

Ed Lawry announced that Dr. Halligan would be speaking Wednesday, November 13, at 3:30, to the "Friends of the Forum" about the impact of family income on higher education opportunity.

Dr. Lawry presented a resolution titled "Resolution on Raising Student Fees for Athletic Facilities." Before reading the rationale he commented that he brought this forward as a representative of Group II — Humanities, who he represents, since he was certain that the faculty of Group II were strongly opposed to this activity and that this opposition was not well known on the campus. He is not aware of any faculty member in Group II that opposed this recommendation. Some people thought that the recommendation could be interpreted as a statement of no confidence in the President. That was not the intention of the recommendation and if the recommendation passed he planned to bring forth another recommendation stating that the faculty believes the President is doing a good job and has their confidence. A second point is that the recommendation does not ask the President for action. It is merely a "sense of the faculty" resolution which is an expression of faculty opinion on a certain issue. The benefit of having a resolution on this matter is not in getting the decision overturned but to let the entire university, from students, to faculty, to the Athletic Department, to Regents, know how the faculty feels about this in order to provide a different environment for future decisions. Lastly, as he listened to comments about the draft version of this document, he became aware that people were rejecting the recommendation on the basis of not agreeing with one of the arguments put forth for the recommendation. You can still agree with the conclusion of an argument even if you do not agree with part of the argument. That is, you can vote for the recommendation even if you do not agree with part of the rationale.

The proposed recommendation stated:

It is the sense of the Faculty that the proposed fee increase on students for new building for Athletics is inappropriate. The Faculty opposes it.

Rationale:

1. The University has a long list of academic needs central to its mission of teaching, research and extension that it has itself identified as its priorities. That it can seek new revenue from a fee assessed in proportion to student credit hours and spend it on athletic building contradicts those priorities. While there may be some benefit to a winning athletic program as an image-making factor for the University, there are great risks associated with a “do whatever it takes” commitment to compete nationally in the major intercollegiate sports. But overriding that, there are simply many more important substantive needs that ought to be targeted even in a temporary raising of student fees.
2. While on the one hand there has been an attempt to justify the increased fees as in the long term academic interests of the University, there has been no attempt to even substantively discuss the issue with representative faculty. The plan seems to have appeared, been lobbied with the students, and brought to completion in a special meeting with the Regents in a few brief weeks. Surely anything of such magnitude that supposedly involved the academic reputation of the University should be discussed and deliberated on thoroughly in the Faculty as well as the other sections of the University. That the Athletic Department can negotiate such ambitious plans with almost no check from the Faculty of the University is a measure of the inappropriate power of an agency that has no essential role in what a University is.

Discussion followed:

Dr. White had polled 22 faculty in her college (Business) and 20 faculty thought the resolution was a bad idea. The reasons given were: 1. SGA voted 30-3 to accept it and they should be supported. 2. The statement is still in the rationale that the athletic building contradicts the priorities of the university. There are many things that are learned outside of the classroom. 3. The “do whatever it takes” mentality referred to in the document. She did not think this would put OSU in a position of leadership in any major sport. There is evidence to support the conclusion that universities that put major money into their athletic programs have enhanced giving and their reputation. It has helped to enhance the alumni giving at both Colorado and Kansas State. There are also several dissertations that show a strong correlation between athletics and academic reputation. 4. The totality of the university’s reputation does not depend on athletics but it is part of the picture. 5. The Regents were meeting to approve a Dean of Agriculture and the \$2 fee was added to that meeting. There was not a special meeting of the Regents to approve the fee. Dr. Lau pointed out that all Business faculty were not in favor of the fee, do not share her view of the athletic program and that her poll was biased by her connection with the Athletic Council. Elaina Cortez, SGA President said that they had been looking at this issue for about a month. The senators went back to their constituents and there was some opposition but the majority were for it. Faculty have a lot invested in the university but when it comes to student fees the students know what they want to pay. Students know that there are many needs on campus but athletics is a need that they want to support. The students ask that faculty respect their vote on this which was 30-3 in favor of the fee increase. It will go to the State Regents with the students support. Bryan Reniker, Senate President, said this was one of the most researched bills ever in the Student Senate. They discussed many issues related to this program but the discussion always returned to the fee. The students are aware that academics is a large part of the college experience but so are athletics, living groups, etc. The students are aware of anything that improves the quality of life on this campus. Everyone agreed that the athletic facilities need improvement. The students are really for this. Jacob Yunker, SGA Vice President, said that this is one issue that the students are excited about. They tried to contact as many people as possible and most agreed with it. Dr. Paustenbaugh said that he agrees with much of the rationale, in the recommendation, but the athletic facilities do need improvement. The students voted for this and we should support them. Gallagher-Iba Arena is used for more than just athletic events. They are going to improve the Academic Athletic Center and this should help to avoid some of the problems of the past. Dr. Schwarz said she appreciates the fact that this recommendation attempts to express the frustration that academics do not matter as much as athletics. Dr. Wilkinson said that she is concerned that the university is building up this big debt on athletic facilities when there are major needs in the academic areas. Dr. Williams pointed out the Bringing Dreams to Life Campaign and all the money it has raised for academics. One of the hardest days for him was graduation a couple of years ago when it rained and parents had no place to go. He likes to show the campus to prospective students and see their eyes light up as they look at the facilities. Dr. Boswell said his primary concern was with the process — the faculty was not asked. If it has a relationship with academics then why not talk to us about it. Dr. Lau said that if the students are for it then we have no

business being against it, but from what he is seeing, the SGA is for it but the students are against it. He thought the senators had been shown only one side of the argument. And added, that none of the college ranking programs include athletic performance. Ms. Cortez replied that SGA had an open forum and the students supported it. There will always be those who will not get involved but who will complain about the decisions being made. Mr. Reniker said he thought the senators studied both sides of the question and that the student body was not totally for this but that most students supported the fee. No one but senators actually attended the open forum. Dr. Warde reported that only 12 Group III — Physical Sciences faculty responded and all but 1 of them were from A&S. Of those, 6 supported the resolution, 3 opposed it and 3 were in between. The overlying concern was the lack of faculty input. Dr. Moretti said that he did not want the Faculty Council to be in a position of either attacking or defending athletics. The Faculty Council should be looking for positive initiatives. Just as this is part of an effort to bring great athletics to OSU, we need to find initiatives to bring great teachers to OSU, initiatives to bring the best researchers to OSU, and initiatives to bring the best expertise for the State of Oklahoma to OSU. This is harder. However, we need to find some strong proposal to push the academic side and develop the human resources here in staff and faculty. He added that he resented the hour spent discussing this when we could have been brain storming for ideas to improve the academic side. Dr. Robinson stated that she had some problems with the balance between athletics and academics. Yet, we must keep in mind the balance of life. Being a student can be very stressful and this is one outlet for them to find this balance. She also stated that she did not want to be left out in the rain when her daughter graduated. Dr. Buchanan said that before the SGA vote he would have said that there should not be fees to support this. However, it is dangerous for one representative body to accuse another of not being representative. Dr. Ackerson asked what the rationale was for having SGA vote on the fee and not having Faculty Council vote. Dr. Halligan replied that it was a tax on the students. Also, that when a fee increase is taken to the State Regents they ask if the students have expressed their opinion about this fee and the best way to get student opinion is to go to student government. This is the same procedure that was used for the technology fee. Dr. Williams said we did not second guess the student's vote for the technology fee so why second guess them now. Dr. Farr said that what the students are saying with this vote is that they want this to be a great university and they are willing to cough up some of the money for it. Dr. Boswell asked what percentage of the total cost of this project is being supported by student fees, where the other money is coming from, and will that take away from academics. Dr. Halligan replied that the total project is \$45M. The City of Stillwater has been approached to help fund the project, since the city benefits significantly from having OSU here. Historically, the city did sell bonds to buy land so that the university would be located here. They should come forward again and be major supporters of this. The university is trying to get donors to support this and once we get a few major donors it will be easier to get other donors to come forward. There will probably be some bonds sold to supplement the funding. Some of the funding will come from increased revenue from the increased seating capacity. The studies that have been conducted indicate, "build it and they will come." With the support of the city and the students, OSU can raise the funds to complete this project. Dr. Lawry responded by saying the recommendation is a "sense of the faculty" recommendation. The faculty believe this recommendation. It does not say that the students were wrong. The university has listed their academic priorities and undergraduate education came out number one. Those that disagreed that undergraduate education should be number one probably thought that research should be number one. These are the kinds of issues that should be focused on as being important for the university. The recommendation does not attack athletics. This university has a terrific athletic program and the athletic facilities need refurbished. What we want to do is move ahead academically. You may believe that moving ahead academically depends on winning at athletics. Dr. Lawry does not believe that is the case. He also does not believe that winning athletic programs bring money to academics. There are studies that show both sides of this issue. The state refuses to allow us to take tuition money and spend it on athletics. Why do they have this restriction? Because the state recognizes that athletic success does not lead to academic success. I think the faculty should say what the faculty believes. This is a mistake. Dr. Horn said that this issue is much broader than athletics vs. academics. The students are saying that a sense of place, a sense of pride, a sense of nostalgia is important in their lives. These things do carry over to many other areas. Dr. Knobbe said that voting in favor of this recommendation sends the wrong message. The administration is not going to change its recommendation regardless of how this vote goes. If you meant this as an indictment of the process then he would concur. The SGA should be commended since they saw what they consider to be a \$15M quality of life problem and they have taken steps to solve it. Dr. Moder said that she polled the faculty that she represents after the student vote and that they were more concerned about the process than about the fee. They did not support the recommendation as it is currently worded. Dr. White said she did not understand what

the process should have been. When the Athletic Director made a presentation to this body and to the Athletic Council no one said this idea stinks. The students have voted in favor of the fee. Dr. Moder replied that it was presented to us that the Athletic Department had great needs, but other areas have great needs also. We did not address how they were going to get their money opposed to how other people were going to get their money. Dr. Moder then moved to amend the recommendation to read, "The faculty opposes the process by which the athletic fee was brought to a vote." Dr. Warde seconded the motion. Dr. Wilkinson asked if the idea of a fee was brought to the students or if the students came up with the idea. Ms. Cortez replied that the fee was brought to the students by the Athletic Department. Mr. Reniker added that the original proposal of the Athletic Department was studied and revised by the students before the vote. Dr. Wilkinson asked if the proposal came directly from the Athletic Department or if it came through the administration. Dr. Halligan replied that the administration was aware of it. Dr. Lawry said that the amendment should be defeated since this is more than a process matter. A substantial amount of money is being raised by the university without any discussion with the faculty about which of the needs of the university should be funded. Mr. Yunker, SGA, asked how the other fees, technology fee, speakers fee, etc., were initiated. Dr. Halligan said he felt it was the same process. Students told him at an informal lunch that they wanted more computers and out of that conversation came the technology fee. Students were also telling him that they wanted to go to the basketball games and wanted concerts. They would like to have larger facilities. Dr. Moder said the problem was that the faculty thought this was a defacto priority setting and that the faculty wants to be part of setting priorities. After a sequence of comments that were not addressing the amendment, Dr. Keener said that they had instituted a budget process that allows for faculty input in the priorities of the university. A few years ago, the administration just decided how the money was to be spent. Does this process involve all money that comes to the university? No. Some money comes earmarked for a particular purpose. Student fees are such money. There are a lot of fees. The administration knows about the fees and if it does not approve of a particular fee then it does not send it forward. If a group comes to the administration and says we need money to do "x," the administration then tries to find money to do "x." The administration has talked to the legislature and to the students about tuition increases. If the university had raised tuition and taken the money to improve the athletic facilities then that would have been a completely different notion and would have engendered a discussion with the faculty. But this was a segment of the university that needed to improve its facilities, doing a study, identifying a funding plan, going to the students with the plan and getting the students approval for the plan. When it comes to spending university money there is a process and it is well defined and the Faculty Council is represented in the process. After further discussion of the budget process Dr. Moder withdrew the amendment and the original recommendation failed with a vote of 6 for, 21 against and 1 abstention. Dr. Moder moved a recommendation that the faculty opposes a fee setting priority in which they are not consulted or informed. Dr. Warde seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 12 for, 14 against, and 2 abstentions. Dr. Halligan said that he thought the value of the student's degree is greatly enhanced if they graduate from a Big 12 university. He thinks that the prestige of our academic program will be enhanced by being in the Big 12 and if we do not improve our athletic facilities we will be out of the Big 12. Our facilities are in such a shape that we must have a major renovation. One of the reasons they are as they are is that this is such a difficult issue. It is much easier not to address the problem.

OTHER NEW BUSINESS:

Ms. LaFollette announced that the Faculty Council is in charge of coordinating the next Red Cross Blood Drive on Friday, December 6, 8 a.m. to 3 p.m., 4th floor, Student Union. Volunteers are needed to help for at least one hour. Also, the Fall General Faculty Meeting has been moved from November 19 to November 26, 1996, 3:30 p.m., Student Union Theatre.

The meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is December 10, 1996.