

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Allen, Allison, Anderson, Bertholf, Buchanan, Cole, Dawson, Farr, Finn, Gethner, Horn, Knobbe, Lau, Lawry, Marks, Moder, Moretti, Paustenbaugh, Richards, Robinson, Schwarz, Scott, Smith, Warde, White, Wilkinson, and Williams. Also present: Beer, Birdwell, Bosserman, Collins, Duer, Eastman, Harrison, Hays, Keener, Matoy, and Watkins. Absent: Boswell and Krenzer.

HIGHLIGHTS

The University's Debt and Debt Service Plans	1
Big 12 Provost's Meeting on Academic Cooperation	2
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Reports of Standing Committees.....	4
Academic Standards and Policies	4
Late Course Drop Requests Recommendation	4
Guidelines for Priority Academic Appeals and Establishment of an Emergency Academic Appeals Board Recommendation	4
Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities Recommendation	4
Faculty	6
Changes in Appendix D Recommendation.....	6
Long-Range Planning	7
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	7
Rules and Procedures.....	7
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	7
Liaison Representative Reports.....	8
Athletic Council.....	8
Emeriti Association	8
Women's Council	8

Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the November 12, 1996, Minutes. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Allison moved acceptance of the December 10, 1996, Agenda. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved. Due to the absence of Dr. Keener, the order of the Agenda was changed to allow Dr. Bosserman to go first.

SPECIAL REPORT: THE UNIVERSITY'S DEBT AND DEBT SERVICE PLANS — David Bosserman

OSU looks at bonds as a way to do long term financing to build new facilities, to do major repairs or maintenance of existing facilities, to consolidate existing debt or to refinance existing debt. The process is started when someone approaches the Executive Group with an institutional need. The Executive Group must agree to go forward with the process. There are two types of needs: those that involve appropriated funds and those that involve auxiliary enterprises. If the need involves appropriated funds then the institution can not issue the bonds. The state issues those bonds. This is the type of bond that was used to finance the remodeling of Willard. These do not appear on our books. The bonds that involve auxiliary enterprises are handled by OSU. The next step is to get A&M Regents approval. After Board approval, we must go to the Legislature and get a resolution authorizing us to go forward with the bond issue. A statement of essential facts is then put together telling what it is for, how is it going to be repaid, the institutions history on repaying bonds, and a large amount of information about the university. The statement of essential facts goes back to our Board then to the OSRHE. It then goes to the Bond Oversight Commission which consists of the Governor and the heads of the Senate and the House. After their approval the bonds are ready to be sold. Unless they are general obligation bonds sold by the state, the debt belongs to the Board of Regents. They are generally paid off by the revenue stream from the auxiliary. In the case of the ARTC building we have pledged some section 13 funds but are planning to make the payments from auxiliary sources. OSU carries a small debt compared to some other institutions. For example, Univ. of Michigan, 667M; Univ. of California at San Diego, 343M; Univ. of Southern California, 258M; Univ. of Illinois, 238M; Univ. of Tulsa, 75M; Univ. of Oklahoma, 54M excluding the Health Sciences Center; OSU, 32M, only 28M for the Stillwater campus. OSU's current bonds are:

Bond	Amount	Outstanding	Retirement	Annual Payment
1. Athletic System	7M	6.4M	2012	661K
2. Swimming Pool	1M	.85M	2010	94K
3. Health, PE & Rec. Fac.	2.8M	2.0M	2009	244K
4. Housing, Bonds of '64	3M	.45M	2004	171K
5. Housing, Bonds of '65	6.6M	1.2M	2005	340K
6. Housing, Bonds of '66	4.4M	1.4M	2006	236K
7. Housing, Series '94	2.7M	2.0M	2014	289K
8. ATRC	10M	10M	2016	837K
9. Student Union	6.9M	3.9M	2019	463K

Dr. Wilkinson asked when Bond 1 was refinanced. Dr. Bosserman said it was in February of this year. Dr. Birdwell added that this was originally issued in 1974 to remodel the football stadium. It was refinanced in 1987 and joined with the bond to remodel Iba. It was refinanced again in 1996 at a lower interest rate with a savings of 1.6M. These savings are now being used to repaint the football stadium. Bonds 4, 5 and 6 were 40 year bonds. Our total debt service payment is 3.34M which is less than 6% of the revenue from the auxiliaries. Dr. Ackerson asked how much of the money goes to the project and how much to interest. Dr. Bosserman replied that about 50% goes to interest. Dr. Wilkinson asked if the Athletic Department is planning to sell bonds for the renovations this time. Dr. Bosserman replied that it was unless we get a very large donation. Dr. Wilkinson asked if there are other bonds currently in the works. Dr. Bosserman said that Residential Life has a current RFP for someone to do a study of the housing needs. At that time they will be looking at a bond sale. This would not happen until 1999 or 2000. Dr. Anderson asked what are Section 13 funds. Dr. Bosserman replied that every 13th section of land in the state was set aside for educational purposes. This money must be spent on facilities. Dr. Knobbe asked what is the source of this money. Dr. Bosserman said that it is the revenue generated by the rental of this land or if the land is sold, it is the income generated from the investments. Dr. Birdwell added that this is land owned by the State School Land Commission. The OSU system gets about \$3.5M as its share of this money, but we are maintaining \$750M worth of facilities with this money. Dr. Moretti asked how debt service compared with utilities and other expenses. Dr. Bosserman replied that it is the lowest of the major expenditures like utilities or maintenance. Every time we go forward with a bond issue the bonding services give us the best ratings. Dr. Halligan added that we must do something to upgrade our Residence Halls in order to attract students. They just will not use "gang" bathrooms anymore.

SPECIAL REPORT: BIG 12 PROVOST'S MEETING ON ACADEMIC COOPERATION — Marvin Keener

The Big 12 academic vice presidents have met several times. At the last meeting the Faculty Council Chairs were invited. The first item discussed was faculty and student exchanges. Ed Sheridan, Univ. of Missouri, gave a report on the Big Ten's Committee on Instructional Cooperation. This committee is currently supported by all the Big 10 institutions and has a staff of its own. The Big 12 is not ready for that kind of commitment but has instituted the "Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program." The objective of this program is to develop a meaningful faculty exchange of a short duration, two weeks, which would benefit both institutions. The time limit was chosen because there are already means available to fund shorter visits, "seminar talks," and longer visits, sabbaticals. The mechanics will involve a short application, one to two pages, describing what is to be done, a letter from the receiving department indicating that he/she is welcome, a description of how the duties at the sending institution will be handled, and a report after the visit telling what was accomplished. The sending institution will provide about \$2500 to cover the expenses. The receiving institution would provide no funding. Each institution will be sending about six people with a starting date of February 1, 1997. Dr. Keener will be sending a description of the program to the college deans in the next few weeks. The second topic of the meeting was international education. The idea was to increase the number of available students in order to make some study abroad programs financially feasible. They also discussed using an existing organization, Mid-America Universities International, of which 11 Big 12 universities are members to coordinate some international study programs. A third topic discussed was library cooperation. The Big 12 librarians have been meeting and Ed Johnson, OSU's Dean of Libraries, is the Chair of Big 12 libraries group. The last topic discussed was post-tenure review. Half of the Big 12 institutions are in the process of developing some sort of post-tenure review activity. These developments are being driven by the State Legislatures or the local boards. There were not many details given about the reviews. They are all going to involve both qualitative and quantitative measures of faculty performance. They are enhanced A&D's. There would be some time period in which each tenured faculty member would have to go through this enhanced A&D. A negative review would involve some warning and a time period to correct the problem. If no corrections are made then most of the procedure for termination of a faculty member listed in Appendix D would be bypassed and termination would

occur rather rapidly. There seems to be a lot of variety in how the different schools are approaching the topic. Dr. Halligan asked if there was some time given for when post-tenure review would take place. Dr. Keener said that it varied from 3 years upward but that 6 was mentioned most often. Dr. Moretti said we can already fire a tenured person for cause, but what these causes are is not precisely defined. Years ago there was a half page of small print detailing causes. There is no longer a consensus list and that is what needs to be worked on. Dr. Keener said his feeling was that this process would generate a lot of paper work. Dr. Wilkinson asked about what is meant by one warning. Dr. Keener replied that if in your review you were found to be deficient in some area then you would be given a warning about the deficiency and given a time period, 1 to 3 years, to correct the deficiency or you would be let go. Dr. Ackerson ask how academic freedom was being protected in this process. Dr. Keener said they did not get much detail in that area.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

1. 92-03-01-FAC **Fixed Terms for Administrators:** Under study. Executive Vice President Keener is coordinating the review with President Halligan and soliciting input from Deans.
2. 94-12-01-SALR **Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:** Under study. September, 1996, draft currently under review by Executive Group. Dr. Keener also reported that he had met with Moretti, Collins, and Birdwell to discuss this committee. One issue is that the recommendation says that any committee that advises the administration have as its nucleus the Advisory Committee for Academic Computing. They discussed whether or not the current proposal meets this criteria. They decided to draft an alternative measure which involves the people most responsible for the acquisition and maintenance of the equipment and that it be enhanced by faculty that represent various committees and the Faculty Council. This committee will be a vehicle for bringing strategic initiatives for technology to the E-Group. This idea seemed to allow input from the other committees without driving up administrative costs.
3. 96-03-01-RFB **Accumulation of Annual Leave:** The administrative review of the current leave policies reveals that faculty and staff have equivalent benefits, although the accounting methods differ. Since a change in the accounting method of either group would lead to additional administrative costs, it has been determined more feasible to retain the current policies. In follow-up, Executive Vice President Marvin Keener will initiate an effort to inform the faculty, department heads, and deans of the current policies and will work individually with any unit in which Faculty Council believes some injustice may exist. There was debate over whether the recommendation was accepted or rejected. It would be expensive and possibly antiproductive to change the accounting system for annual leave for faculty, staff and administration to be the same. However it is possible for faculty to carry over more than 22 days of annual leave if there is a reason why they could not take the leave and they ask their department head for permission to do so. The outcome is essentially the same for all groups even though the accounting process is different. Drs. Marks and Lawry contend that the outcomes are not the same since the faculty have to ask for permission to do so and it is automatic for the other groups. Dr. Halligan said they wish to meet what they see as the intent of the recommendation without adding administrative cost. Dr. Dawson said that Dr. Keener should communicate the policy to the department heads and faculty.
4. 96-05-01-LRP **Strategic Management:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review including discussions with faculty.
5. 96-09-01-FAC **Adoption of OSU's Draft Smoking Policy:** Under study. Vice President Birdwell is coordinating review and will present input from faculty, staff, and students to the Executive Group. Dr. Halligan commented that he did not agree with the rule that stipulates that smokers should stay at least 10 feet from the building.
6. 96-10-01(1)-FAC **On Summer Compensation (1):** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
7. 96-10-01(2)-FAC **On Summer Compensation (2):** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
8. 96-12-01-ASP **Late Course Drop Requests:** To President Halligan
9. 96-12-02-ASP **Guidelines for Priority Academic Appeals and Establishment of an Emergency Academic Appeals Board Recommendation:** To President Halligan
10. 96-12-03-ASP **Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:** To President Halligan
11. 96-12-04-FAC **Changes in Appendix D:** To President Halligan

Dr. Warde asked about the progress on the University Calendar question (96-04-02-ASP) that was forwarded to the State Regents. Dr. Halligan said that there is some progress on the UCT calendar but not on the state-wide calendar. Dr. Keener replied that the calendar means different things to different people. At UCT next year OSU and OU will start their semesters at the same time, but NSU and Langston are starting at different times. After that all the institutions will be on the same start date. Things that will not be the same are drop and add periods and certain kinds of holidays. We are trying to match our holidays with OU. To change Drop/Add deadlines would require action by the Faculty Council. The drop and add deadlines at OSU and OU are similar and more restrictive than the others.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES: Joe Williams — Three Recommendations

The committee had three recommendations to bring before Council. All of these were suggested by Dean Becky Johnson.

96-12-01-ASP - Late Course Drop Requests

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:

1. A statement be added specifying a maximum time period for completion of the petition to drop a course after the deadline form. The statement would be an addition to the current guidelines. The statement is "The maximum time period for requesting to drop a course after the drop deadline is: within the next semester of enrollment or within a year, whichever comes first."

2. The guidelines for petitions to drop a course after the deadline become a university policy.

Rationale:

1. Extenuating circumstances arise often with regards to drops after the drop deadline. A mechanism to handle such drop requests is needed.

2. The guidelines* ought to become a policy to enhance their implementation.

Dr. Schwarz said that she had a problem with making the guidelines university policy. This makes it harder to handle the exceptions that sometimes arise in student teaching. Some reasons that student teachers need exceptions are: 1. They are not placed into the schools until four weeks into the semester. 2. The university has no control over the participating teacher or the school in which the student is placed. 3. Feedback to the student teacher and/or the supervisor may not occur in a timely fashion. 4. This is a nine-hour course. Dr. Schwarz said she had no problem with failing a student but does not want to fail a student that is caught in circumstances beyond their control late in the semester. Dr. Scott said they had gone to the committee to withdraw a student after the deadline and the committee said that they had to give an incomplete which is completely inappropriate since student teaching needs to be completely repeated. If the guidelines are made policy then it would be even harder to get exceptions. Dr. Eastman said that if it is left as a guideline then the one year time limit also is just a guideline. Dr. Schwarz moved that number 4 of the guidelines be amended to read, "Circumstances beyond the student's control that have arisen after the deadline." Deleting "which prevent the student from allocating an appropriate amount of time to the course." The amendment was seconded by Dr. Buchanan. The amendment passed. Dr. Gethner asked if the faculty member is totally left out of the process. Dr. Buchanan replied that step 3 of the process is for the student to take a drop card to the professor to have a grade of "W" or "F" assigned. Motion passed.

96-12-02-ASP - Guidelines for Priority Academic Appeals and Establishment of an Emergency Academic Appeals Board

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:

the university accept the attached* guidelines which allow the Academic Appeals Board to prioritize the cases it must adjudicate.

the university accept the attached* guidelines which permit the creation of an Emergency Academic Appeals Board.

Rationale:

1. Priority Academic Appeals Guidelines

In most cases a "first-come-first-serve" approach to reviewing appeals is adequate. In other instances, however, some appeals are more critical (in terms of the importance of the timeliness of the review) than others. A student's acceptance into a graduate program, job offer, financial aid, or academic status may be affected by the appeal decision. These contingencies would appear to pose a more immediate concern to a student than a case in which the student is just disputing a grade received in a course. Under the present system, a student may have to forgo an opportunity simply because their appeal was not heard in a timely manner.

Currently no guidelines exist which allow the Academic Appeals Board to decide the order in which it hears cases. Board members will in an ad hoc manner rearrange the docket of cases in an attempt to address the time pressures students face. Board members should be commended for their attention to student needs but they should be afforded a formal guideline which legitimizes their prioritization decisions.

Under this proposal, students would be able to request a priority appeal. A student applying for a priority appeal would have to meet the listed eligibility requirements in order for the Board to consider their request. The Board would then verify their claim and if it is legitimate, may then decide to hear that student's appeal before others. By allowing the Board to consider the urgency of a student's appeal, this proposal will institute greater fairness and due process into the academic appeal process.

2. Emergency Academic Appeals Board

This proposal is closely related to the first proposal. As stated above some students' academic appeals are more urgent than others. In some cases a student's appeal may be so urgent that it needs to be heard as quickly as possible. The immediacy issue is particularly relevant for appeals filed after the Spring semester. In the past it has been difficult to convene the Appeals Board during the Summer months. With faculty and students being away from campus, it can often be difficult to secure a quorum. The lack of a quorum means appeals cannot be heard, thus delaying important decisions.

This proposal would allow an Emergency Academic Appeals Board to be convened, when the regular Board is unable to meet. By relying on faculty who are or have been members of the Appeals Board, the members of the Emergency Board should have the experience necessary to handle appeals in an expeditious manner. Additionally, having a graduate rather than an undergraduate member should increase the likelihood of student representation on the Emergency Board.

This proposal along with the first proposal should help ensure that academic appeals are heard in a timely manner. These proposals would be of great benefit to those students who have urgent appeals.

Proposal 1: Priority Academic Appeals

Consideration of Priority Academic Appeals depends on the student meeting one of the following criteria:

A student whose graduation depends on the grade in question

A student whose admission to an academic or professional program or whose employment status is contingent on the grade in question

A student who faces the loss of financial aid, suspension or other severe penalty due to the grade in question.

These claims must be verified by the Academic Appeals Board before priority appeal status is granted.

Proposal 2: Emergency Academic Appeals Board

Three faculty who are or have been members of the Academic Appeals Board, plus a graduate student shall constitute the membership of an Emergency Academic Appeals Board. This Emergency Board will be convened in the event the standing Appeals Board is unable to meet. The Emergency Board will be an option only during the Summer months or the time between the Fall and Spring semesters.

Dr. Williams said that two years ago the size of the Academic Appeals Board was doubled to help handle the load but there are still problems and this recommendation will solve some of those problems. Dr. Moder asked if a student would have the option of having their case heard by this emergency board. Dr. Williams replied "yes." In fact the student needs to ask to have his/her case heard by the emergency board. Recommendation 2 was moved by Dr. Williams and passed.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Ken Eastman to present the third recommendation. Dr. Eastman said this deals with our compliance with the American Disabilities Act, ADA. There is one correction the penciled in "and" on page 2 needs to be deleted since the definition is taken directly from the ADA. All of part one is just parroted from the ADA. Part 2 is what has been added as an appeals process. See the flow chart on the last page of the policy for an explanation of the appeals process. Dr. Moretti pointed out that it is clearly expressed in the document that students can not ask for retroactive accommodation. Dr. Williams said that the committee has been working on this policy for several years and that we are to a point where we have no flexibility and we need to have a policy in place for the university's benefit. Dr. Lawry said that if the requirement is too onerous then we could choose to vote it down. We would still have to conform to it but not endorse it. Dr. Marks said that many accreditation reviews ask if a policy has been reviewed and approved by the faculty. Dr. Moretti asked about recent disputes about this act in medical schools, e.g., would you make a curricular change for a blind medical student? Dr. Finn replied that they had had a deaf medical student at OSU/COM. All syllabuses have a statement about accommodation for disability so that all students are aware of the process. But that the faculty have not worked out all the problems. Motion passed. Dr. Halligan added that he had told our delegation in Washington that he did not want any more unfunded mandates.

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:

The attached* policy* governing academic accommodations for students with disabilities be adopted and implemented.

The appeal process for academic accommodations for students with disabilities be adopted and implemented.

Rationale:

1. Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities Policy

OSU needs to ensure that its policies are in compliance with the recently passed Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The attached policy draft has been reviewed by the Office of Legal Counsel, the Director for ADA Compliance, and the Coordinator for the Office of Student Disability Services and they believe it is consistent with the federal statute.

While there may be some elements of the statement that some individuals dislike, there really is not much latitude in this matter. The proposed policy is based on the ADA, to change a portion of the statement would require a change in the law. The proposal just makes formal OSU's implementation of ADA guidelines. The policy needs to be adopted to recognize the law's requirements and to affirm OSU's commitment to the education of disabled students.

2. Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities Appeal Process

The policy requires that reasonable and necessary accommodations be made to allow disabled students equal opportunity to educational activities and services. Undoubtedly, disagreements between faculty and students will arise as to what is reasonable and necessary. No policy can identify every contingency and every remedy, thus an appeals process is needed to resolve disagreements.

In all cases a student requests accommodation from the Office of Student Disability Services. The two available types of accommodations are classroom and curricular. If either the student or faculty disagrees with that office's decision, an appeal must be filed with the Office of Student Disability Services within five working days. A decision will be rendered within five working days of the filing of an appeal. For classroom accommodations, the second and final appeal decision is made by the Provost. For curriculum appeals the second appeal decision is made by the affected college's dean and the third and final appeal is made by the Provost. Before making a decision the dean may consult with the faculty member involved, his/her department head, and other relevant parties. The Provost may consult with the University's Academic Standards and Policies committee, the Office of ADA Compliance, and the Office of Legal Counsel before making a decision. To expedite the process, the college dean has 10 working days and the Provost has 15 working days to render a decision after an appeal has been filed.

The appeal process will allow for a fair and timely hearing on the accommodation decision. The process also affords both faculty and students adequate due process.

B. FACULTY: Ed Lawry — Recommendation

The committee is working on a number of items including an attempted study of the A&D process. Several members of the committee are trying to gather information about the process. Do not become alarmed if people start asking you questions about the A&D process or how it might be improved. The committee is also bringing a recommendation in two parts suggesting changes in Appendix D. These changes are brought about by the appointment of an Ombuds and the endorsement of a mediation system and the increasing number of grievances filed that were putting too heavy a load on the past chairs.

96-12-04-FAC - Changes in Appendix D

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:

1) APPENDIX D, Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University, be changed on pp. D-22 and D-23 according to the hand out (Dispute Resolution Policy)

2) APPENDIX D, Section E, Dispute Resolution Procedure, 2. Initial Review and Recommendations, be changed on p. D-39 according to the hand out (Dispute Resolution Review Committee)

Rationale:

The appointment of an Ombuds and the endorsement of a mediation system needs to be reflected in the official policies of the University.

Dr. Moretti proposed the following amendment: Delete the statement "All members of the committee must be currently on campus or residing in the Stillwater, Oklahoma area," which appears as the fifth from last line of part 2 of the recommendation. Part 2 of the amendment is to replace the word "chairman" in the next to last line of part 2 of the recommendation with the phrase "chair of the committee." Part 3 of the amendment is to replace chairperson of the faculty council with chair of the faculty council in 4 places in part 2. The reason for part 1 is that the chair is not going to appoint a committee that contains people who are not available and the phrase "Stillwater, Oklahoma area" is ambiguous. The reason for part 2 is to make it explicit which chair it means. Ed Lawry accepted this as a friendly amendment. Motion passed.

*To obtain copies of all attachments to the four above mentioned recommendations, contact Diane LaFollette, in the Faculty Council Office, at x48790.

C. LONG-RANGE PLANNING: Dave Buchanan — Update

The committee is waiting on a decision concerning strategic management. The committee also reviewed several suggestions of issues to be considered in the spring concerning strategic management. The committee will ask for Council input on some of these items in future meetings.

D. RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS: Steve Marks — Update

The management of the fringe benefits program is contracted out to vendors. Dr. Birdwell, who is in charge of managing these programs, has sent a letter to the Chair of Faculty Council, Chair of the Staff Advisory Council, Chair of the Health Care and Medical Insurance Committee, and Chair of the Emeriti Association, indicating their plan to put the entire benefits package out to bids. This package includes the long-term disability insurance, dental insurance, flexible benefits, life insurance and health care. It is important to note that the program benefits stay the same. Only the management of the plans is being bid. Also, the above mentioned people have been asked to submit names for a review committee for these bids. The new management should start July 1, 1997. Anne Matoy said that at the end of the fall each year a review is made of the contracts that are expiring or due for renegotiation. This year the 5 contracts Steve listed are all due to be re-bid on July 1. A major part of the decision is the service that our employees are receiving. There have been a larger than average number of complaints on the health care. American Fidelity has outsourced the payment of claims to a separate vendor. At one point in February it was taking 13 days to pay claims instead of 5. Claims are now being paid in 8 days which is still too slow a response. Service was a big issue that arose out of the focus groups that were run by Buck Associates. Some of these contracts had not been bid for 6 or 7 years. It is a good opportunity to see if we can get a better deal. Dr. Halligan pointed out that we could reject all bids and conduct a negotiation. Ms. Matoy said that all the current vendors are expected to bid on the new contracts. Dr. Birdwell said he wanted to emphasize 3 points that Ms. Matoy made: 1. The intention is not to change any of our benefits. 2. The effort is to test the market and to improve the service. 3. The hope is that we can save some money. OSU took the initiative a year and a half ago to contract workers compensation outside the state system and is saving about \$1M dollars per year on a contract which provides exactly the same coverage with better service.

E. RULES AND PROCEDURES: Rich Paustenbaugh — Update

The committee is looking into the possibility of including a faculty member with a law degree on the committee. Elections will be coming up next semester and approximately one third of the positions will be open. The committee will ask the outgoing counselors to help in preparing a slate from the area which they represent. Dr. Buchanan added that we will also be electing a vice chair.

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

Ron Payne, Director of the Audio Visual Center, talked with the committee because of some complaints that the committee had received. The good news is that the center is doing more in the way of training both students and faculty to use the high tech equipment, production of CD's, how to use presentation software, etc. The bad news is they have committed all their resources to converting some of the classrooms, like the new room in the basement of Willard, to high tech. AV has not purchased any new overheads or slide projectors for several years. Natalea Watkins added some of the oldest overheads were purchased in the early 70's. Thirty-six were purchased 2 years ago. The most recent ones are dual lens projectors so they are able to project close spaced type. Mr. Payne is going to develop a 3 to 5 year plan to upgrade the basic AV equipment and make it a part of this years budget meetings. Only 75 of the 457 projectors owned by AV are dual lens projectors. Dr. Horn pointed out that many of the projectors are not bright enough for use with computer projection screens. Dr. Schwarz said that some of us would just like new bulbs. Ms. Watkins pointed that there are two ways that overheads are allocated. Some are assigned to teaching stations. These units are checked periodically and bulbs changed on a schedule. Others are on extended loan to a department. AV does not check on these unless the department calls them. An experiment was run a few years ago on how long it took from the time a call was placed until someone got there with a new bulb. It took two-and-one-half minutes. It would take longer if it was on extended loan since they need to find out where it is located, what type of bulb it uses etc. Dr. White asked if it would be possible to designate offices in each building where a faculty member could get a new bulb. Dr. Horn asked if comments should be sent to Ron Payne or to Ms. Watkins. Ms. Watkins replied that she would forward any comments sent to her on to AV. Dr. White said that the AV Center was able to alter a film for her to use in her class in a way that the OU History Library said was impossible. AV does some things very well.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES

Athletic Council — Margaret White

The Council met on November 21. 1. Baseball schedule was approved. Problem with Friday p.m. definition. The Academic Integrity Committee will look at this. Coach Holliday indicated that since none of the baseball players had Friday classes, it should not be counted as half day of missed class if the game on Friday starts in the afternoon. That may be true in other sports as well. 2. North side of Lewis Field renovation has begun. 3. U of TX and U of NE are in "big Alliance bowls". This bodes well for conference revenues. However, contingency budget plans have been put into effect to protect revenue stream. 4. President Halligan received a letter from a loyal OSU supporter who wished there could be an invocation at football games. The AC discussed this and sent back recommendations to the President. 5. There has been some concern about the inconsistencies in the handling of missed class for University sponsored activities. Maryanne Mowen will ask Joe Williams of FC to consider clarifying this issue. This is not just a problem for athletes, but for a number of students. 6. The AC members were given a chance to tour the athletic facilities on 12/5. It was very informative. 7. Hope all of you can make it to the women's BB game on 12/15.

Emeriti Association — A. B. Harrison

The association has no place to meet since the Geography Building has been closed and their space in Bennett Hall is not ready.

OSU's Women's Council — Helen Duer

The Women's Council consists of faculty, staff and students. They have four standing committees, Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, Curriculum and Research, Communications and Public Relations, and Programs and Services. They will be bringing back the Women to Watch Program. They will be sending three women to the Women in Science and Engineering Research Day at the University of Iowa. They are starting a liaison with women's athletics. They are also considering a women's study certificate for elementary teachers.

Dr. Allison moved for adjournment. Dr. White seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is January 14, 1997.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary