

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Allen, Allison, Anderson, Bertholf, Boswell, Buchanan, Cole, Dawson, Farr, Finn, Gasem, Gethner, Horn, Kimbrell, Krenzer, Lau, Lawry, Marks, Moder, Moretti, Paustenbaugh, Richards, Robinson, Schwarz, Scott, Smith, Warde, Wilkinson, and Williams. Also present: Beer, Birdwell, Blakley, Branson, Carter, Cortez, Eastman, Harrison, Hunt, Keener, Knottnerus, Najd, Oehrtman, Pinkstaff, Watkins, Weaver, and White. Absent: None

HIGHLIGHTS

Progress Report on Bidding Process and PPO Progress.....	1
Transfer Students	2
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	3
Reports of Standing Committees	4
Academic Standards and Policies.....	4
University Academic Format Policy and Procedures Statement 2-0207 Recommendation.....	4
Recognizing Bachelor’s Graduates who Have Achieved Academic Distinction Recommendation	4
Guidelines for Scheduling Common Evening and Final Exams Recommendation.....	4
Guidelines for Requesting Common Evening and Final Exams Recommendation	4
Budget.	5
Compensation Guidelines for Faculty Within Ranks Recommendation.....	5
Faculty.	7
Rules and Procedures.....	7
Election Results	7
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	7
Liaison Representative Reports	8
Athletic Council	8
Staff Advisory Council	8
Graduate Student Association	8

Dr. Allison moved acceptance of the March 11, 1997, Minutes. Dr. Horn seconded the motion. Dr. Bertholf reported that there were some questions raised about the statement in the minutes concerning the Long-Term Disability Insurance. The statement was interpreted to mean that we changed from a guarantee of 66% to a guarantee of 60% in order for the benefit to be tax exempt. The question was referred to Anne Matoy who replied by letter. She says that the current rate of 66% could have been continued as tax exempt but at a much higher premium. We were able to lower the guarantee to 60%, which gave the recipient a higher after-tax benefit than the current plan and not incur the large increase in rates. The minutes were approved. Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the April 8, 1997, Agenda. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: PROGRESS REPORT ON BIDDING PROCESS AND PPO PROGRESS — Michael Branson

Dr. Branson reported there were two different bidding processes going on simultaneously. One was the bidding process the administration initiated for the total benefits package and the other was the bidding process initiated by the Health Care Committee for a PPO provider. The PPO bidding process was done by the Health Care Committee in consultation with Buck Consultants who did a feasibility study and recommended that OSU would be much better served by joining a PPO. With the help of Buck Consultants the committee reduced the list of bids to three, PPO Oklahoma, Preferred Community Choice, and Blue Links. Blue Links was a possibility if, and only if, Blue Cross was chosen as the third

party administrator for the OSU health care plan. When the administration chose American Fidelity as the third party administrator for the health care, that eliminated Blue Links. The Health Care Committee recommended that OSU affiliate with PPO Oklahoma. Through a subcontracting arrangement, PPO Oklahoma will contain 95% of the Stillwater doctors. Everyone in the A&M system will have access to the same benefits that they currently have. The PPO is not something that an individual faculty joins or does not join. OSU contracts with the PPO which in turn contracts with the individual doctors. If an OSU employee goes to a doctor in the PPO then they automatically get the PPO coverage. If the doctor is not in the PPO then they get the same coverage they currently have. Services rendered by a PPO provider will be 90% covered by insurance and only 10% is paid instead of the current 80-20 split. Most physicians will file the claims for PPO services. This makes the system work more like the prescription card service. All employees are to get a book listing all the doctors and hospitals that are in the PPO. In Tulsa and OKC about half of the hospitals and doctors participate in the PPO. OSU has gone about 6 years without an increase in premiums. A year-and-a-half ago a prescription card service was initiated. This service costs the system \$1M per year over the conventional service. This is in addition to inflation. Last summers estimates were that premiums would have to be increased 25-30% this year. With the PPO the premium increase should be about 10%. Dr. Ackerson presented a list of questions which Dr. Branson answered. 1. What physicians outside the immediate area will participate? Answer-64% statewide but it varies with the area. 2. How will coverage be affected outside the PPO service area, when traveling or on sabbatical? Answer-same as now. 3. Is there a "pre-approval" process? Answer-same as now. 4. What role will Stillwater Medical Center have? Answer-same as now. 5. What are the emergency care rules? Is there a penalty if someone seeks care (e.g. for chest pain) and the results are negative (indigestion). Answer-maybe. Our plan does not cover this completely now. It depends on how the physician codes the diagnosis. Same as current plan. 6. What will be an individual's aggregate total coverage? Answer-same as now, \$1M lifetime and \$250K annual. Dr. Oehrtman said the \$250K limit has been retained to give Health International the leverage to negotiate with the hospitals. Diane LaFollette asked if we will have a card. Dr. Branson replied that you will probably have a card but Stillwater doctors will know the plan when they learn you are with OSU. Dr. Gasem asked if there was any downside to a PPO. Dr. Branson replied that he did not know of any. Dr. Finn said that the only difference would be in the amount of time the doctor is willing to spend with the patient.

SPECIAL REPORT: TRANSFER STUDENTS — Joe Weaver

A transfer student is one who has at least 7 credit hours from another college or university before entering OSU. In the fall 1996 about 38% of the undergraduate students new to OSU were transfer students. Seventy percent of the transfers are from Oklahoma and about half of the instate transfers are from "Tulsa area" schools, TCC, NEO, NOC, NSU, and Rogers. On average, new transfer students have a somewhat lower first-year retention rate than new freshmen (68.4% vs. 75.5%), but slightly higher six-year graduation rates (51.4% vs. 48.2%). The last comparison is a little misleading since the six years start when the student enrolls at OSU and the transfer student has at least one semester somewhere else. In fall 1995 the difference between transfer GPA and first semester OSU GPA was .44. For comparison, new freshman students at OSU in fall 1995 saw their first-semester grades at OSU drop .5 points from their high school GPA. However, in a group of selected OSU courses chosen because of their high enrollment of both "native" and transfer students, only 71.64% of the transfer students received a "C" or better grade whereas 76.88% of the "native" students had a "C" or better. The number of transfer students is probably going to increase over the next few years since fewer students now qualify for freshman admission to the comprehensive universities. Between 1989 and 1993 the enrollment in the comprehensive universities dropped from 20.9% to 18.9% of total system enrollment while two-year college enrollment rose from 49% to 49.8% of the total. OSU does not collect the same kind of background data on transfer students as they do for new freshmen. (e.g. ACT scores and high school GPA are not collected for transfer students). This makes it much harder to compare transfer performance with that of native students. Dr. Lawry asked how OSU compares with other institutions in the state in the number of transfer students enrolling. Mr. Weaver replied that he did not know but could get that information.

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. Dr. Halligan anticipates administrative response by June '97.
2. 94-12-01-SALR **Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:** Under study. Dr. Keener to meet with Drs. Birdwell and Moretti regarding draft document.
3. 96-05-01-LRP **Strategic Management:** A meeting is scheduled on April 16 for administration to interact with Dr. Buchanan and others. This initial exchange of ideas will provide a base from which to further clarify and develop OSU's strategic management procedure. The essence is the question of whether strategic management is going to be "bottom up" or "top down". Dr. Halligan said he is in favor of "bottom up." Dr. Ackerson said that it needs to be "bottom up" but there needs to be enough administrative presence in order for things to get done.
4. 96-10-01(1)-FAC **On Summer Compensation (1):** Under study. Jack Vitek is interacting with the Deans regarding this recommendation.
5. 96-10-01(2)-FAC **On Summer Compensation (2):** Under study. Jack Vitek has initiated discussions on this issue and is currently reviewing the details.
6. 96-12-04-FAC **Changes in Appendix D:** Under study. Dr. Keener is interacting with Legal Counsel regarding these changes.
7. 97-02-01-ASP **Adding a Course:** Accepted
8. 97-03-02-FAC **Faculty Appointment Periods:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating the administrative review to include Deans Council.
9. 97-03-03-LRP **Revise the By-Laws of Faculty Council to Include a Research Committee:** Accepted
10. 97-04-01-ASP **University Academic Format Policy and Procedures Statement 2-0207:** To President Halligan
11. 97-04-02-ASP **Recognizing Bachelor's Graduates who Have Achieved Academic Distinction:** To President Halligan
12. 97-04-03-ASP **Guidelines for Scheduling Common Evening and Final Exams:** To President Halligan
13. 97-04-04-ASP **Guidelines for Requesting Common Evening and Final Exams:** To President Halligan

The following motion from the February 11, 1997, meeting is added:

14. 97-02-02-ADHOC **Patent Policy 1-0202:** To President Halligan

Dr. Lawry said that there was a motion passed by Faculty Council that did not appear on the list of recommendations. Ms. LaFollette said it did not come through a Faculty Council standing committee and therefore was not assigned a number. Dr. Bertholf said that the motion stated that the Faculty Council approves the Patent Policy and the approved policy was forwarded to Dr. Keener. Dr. Lawry moved that all recommendations approved by Faculty Council should go on the recommendation list until they are disposed of by the administration. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. Dr. Moretti said that there is a difference between items passed by Council. Some are recommendations that we want an action from the administration and these should go on the list. Others are in the form of another body asking the Faculty Council if it is all right for them to take some action and these should not go on the list. The confusion was over whether the item in question was an approval or an action item. The motion passed. It was agreed that the Patent Policy approval would be assigned a number followed by "ADHOC" instead of a standing committee abbreviation.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY — Joe Williams**

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

April 8, 1997

Page 4

Four recommendations were presented to Council from this committee. The first recommendation was to update the Oklahoma State University Policy and procedure 2-0207 to reflect current committee structure, committee names, and changes in administrator's titles. The statement "Faculty members accept the assignment for teaching class." was deleted from 1.03 and the statement "Faculty members are expected to adhere to the assigned class schedule." was added as 2.01. The motion passed. Dr. Williams asked Dr. Lau to present the next recommendation concerning recognizing Bachelor's Graduates who have Achieved Academic Distinction. The recommendation asks Dr. Halligan to implement a program to recognize graduates with 60 resident semester hours of OSU credit as graduating with distinction if their GPA is 3.7 or higher, with High Distinction if their GPA is 3.8 or higher, and with Highest Distinction if their GPA is 3.9 or higher. This recognition should appear on the qualified graduate's transcript and diploma. Dr. Schwarz asked why not put this into Latin. Dr. Lau replied that the committee had no objection to putting it into Latin, but chose English because many of the universities that use Latin for distinctions also have the entire diploma in Latin. Mr. Nizam added that his undergraduate university used Latin for distinctions but had the rest of the diploma in English. The committee accepted an amendment by Dr. Schwarz to use the Latin terms "cum laude," "magna cum laude" and "summa cum laude" for the distinctions as a friendly amendment. Dr. Williams added that the committee also considered using the Cherokee language to describe the distinctions. Dr. Ackerson asked why grade point was being recommended. Dr. Lau replied that some universities use percentages but the committee felt that the grade point would be easier to implement. It would also allow the university to tell the students before hand what it takes to graduate with distinction. Dr. Ackerson added that there are large differences between the GPA's of students in different colleges. Dr. Lau said that the range of percentages of students eligible for summa cum laude in the Spring of 1996 would be from 5% for the highest college to 0% for the lowest. Dr. Moretti said that we could adopt this method now and make adjustments in the future if need be. Dr. Williams said that the recommended GPA's are easily recognized by students that want to set this as a goal. Dr. Halligan said he gave a talk to honors high school students and told them to take all the difficult courses and they were paying no attention. A counselor told him that the students think that as soon as they get into the top third they should not take another difficult course so they can maintain their standing. The motion passed. Dr. Williams asked Ken Eastman to present the third and fourth recommendations. The Faculty Council recommends to President Halligan that: The blocks for final times be changed to: 7:30-9:20am, 9:30-11:20am, 11:30-1:20pm, 1:30-3:20pm, 3:30-5:20pm 5:30-7:20pm and 7:30-9:20pm. The common final exams scheduled in the 7-8:50pm block be moved to 7:30-9:20am and the 7:30-9:20pm block be reserved for evening classes only. Dr. Eastman also pointed out the new schedule removed the lunch break. Dr. Lawry asked if this schedule had been checked with the Registrar's Office. Dr. Eastman replied that there was a representative from the Registrar's Office at the committee meeting. He also added that the new schedule would go into affect when the next class schedule is printed. The motion passed. Dr. Eastman then presented the recommendation for changes in the guidelines for requesting common evening and final exams. Common hours for evening exams and final exams can be used provided that: 1) an instructor has two sections of the same course with at least 100 total students; or 2) an instructor has three sections of the same course with at least 90 total students; or 3) multiple sections of the same course taught by multiple instructors who use the same exam. Instructors with multiple sections of the same course who do meet the above requirements may still petition for an evening and/or common final exam. These requests must be routed through the appropriate channels and will only be approved if time and space are available. In the course schedule book, common finals should be listed in descending order according to total course enrollment. In case of student conflicts in common exams lower listed courses must cede to higher listed courses and the student allowed to take a make-up exam. Dr. Marks asked if multiple sections automatically appear as common exams. Dr. Eastman replied that they had to be requested. Dr. White asked about the problem of finals for Saturday classes possibly occurring during graduation and whether the common evening exams mentioned in the guidelines referred only to the exams during the semester. Dr. Eastman replied that this recommendation did not cover Saturday classes and that the common evening exams are only given

during the semester. The motion passed. See the attachments to the April Agenda for the full statement of the recommendations and rationale.

B. BUDGET — Nancy Wilkinson

Dr. Wilkinson presented a recommendation from the committee titled, "Compensation Guidelines for Faculty Within Ranks" and thanked Joe Weaver, Lee Tarrant and Bill Warde for their assistance with the data. Dr. Wilkinson asked Dr. Moder to present the recommendation and to lead the discussion. The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that the academic year salary (nine or ten months) of any tenured faculty member that falls below \$50,000 for the rank of Professor or \$40,000 for the rank of Associate Professor be subject to administrative review. Beginning at the time of the next salary raise program, all salaries below these levels should be raised to the levels given, unless a low salary can be justified by the supervising administrators on the basis of clearly documented low productivity. In future years, faculty members should be brought up to these guidelines, adjusted for inflation, when promoted. Dr. Moder pointed out that in the last few years the university has allocated approximately \$200,000 of new salary money as equity money. This money has been used to make adjustments in salary of faculty members within a given discipline if their salary was below the average salary of faculty in the same discipline in a set of peer institutions. The sole reliance on market value has led to inequities between departments for faculty with the same rank. The motion is concerned with the ranks of Associate and Full Professors since faculty with these ranks have been recognized by the university as being valued and productive faculty members by the promotion and tenure procedures. At OSU the salary range for Associate Professors is from \$27,730 to \$78,570 and the for Full Professors from \$38,097 to \$116,235. Both of these figures exclude administrators. Dr. Moder added that these low paid but productive faculty members are experiencing morale problems because the university is not recognizing their accomplishments. The recommendation is to use the equity money for a two year period to make the adjustments necessary to meet the recommendation. Instituting these compensation guidelines could affect 114 faculty members and cost \$360,960. For the full statement of the recommendation and rationale see the attachment to the April Agenda. Dr. Lawry asked if the low figure for Associate Professor was a tenured professor. Dr. Moder said the data given to the committee only contained rank and not-tenure status. Dr. Allison asked if the committee looked at the credentials of the low paid faculty and compare them with the credentials of the high paid faculty. Dr. Moder replied that they did not. However, anecdotal evidence indicates that some of the difference is not based on productivity. Dr. Allison asked if it was reasonable to assume that low paid faculty are more productive than higher paid faculty to justify a larger raise. Dr. Moder replied that in this situation the assumption is that productivity is independent of salary amount. Dr. Wilkinson said that productivity is so variable. Unless the university had some guidelines or ways of measuring workload, there is no way to make comparisons, so we have to assume that the faculty are equally productive. Dr. Marks asked if this recommendation is in contradiction with merit pay. Dr. Moder replied that it is not. Equity pay is not drawn from the merit pay base. We are only establishing a base and merit pay is independent of that. Dr. Lawry asked if the recommendation included the campuses outside of Stillwater. Dr. Moder said that they did not have the figures for any other campuses. Dr. Gasem said that society values certain professions more than others. If we had a school of medicine we could have people making a quarter of a million dollars. Dr. Moder replied that the recommendation does not ask that everyone make the same salary. It is just asking for minimum salary levels for a person with a given education level and workload. The market can set the salary ceiling but should not set the floor. There are other places where society believes that salaries are not set equitably and adjustments are made. Dr. Allison asked if there were other universities that have made such adjustments. Dr. Moder said there were a number of such universities like UMass, Univ. of Calif. and Univ. of Illinois. Dr. Moretti asked if in the long run this rule would have the affect of delaying promotions. Dr. Moder said probably not. Dr. Robinson said that this did not address the problem of low salaries for tenured assistant professors. Dr. Kimbrell asked if the market value of an associate professor was used in determining what a minimum salary level should be. Dr. Moder replied that most universities publish only average salaries not minimum salaries. Dr. Buchanan said that he would rather place the emphasis on the statement that the lowest paid faculty

have their salaries reviewed rather than on the numbers given as minimum salaries. The highest paid are generally carefully reviewed to be sure that their salaries are justified. Dr. Moretti asked if Dr. Buchanan was suggesting that the numbers be removed. Dr. Buchanan replied the numbers play a role in that they suggest which salaries should be carefully examined. There are a number of faculty that have low salaries for reasons beyond their control. Dr. Moder added that the \$360,960 needed assumed that everyone whose salary was below the minimum was found to be productive. Dr. Moretti said that the recommendation designates two groups of people that need help. But there are also very cogent arguments that we should have parity with the Big 12, or do something about salary compression, or help some nontenure track faculty to get decent pay, or increase the salaries of low paid staff. Dr. Moretti said that he is uncomfortable with discussing this issue in Faculty Council. It opens the Council up to petitions from all these groups and leads to great divisiveness. Dr. Moder replied that it may be divisive but that the current policy has been favoring the "equity in the Big 12" argument and it is also divisive. There are several other groups that should have their salaries examined but this is being presented as a starting point. Dr. Kimbrell asked if they had a percentage by colleges of the 114 faculty effected. Dr. Wilkinson replied that they were across the board. Dr. Lau said that there are more in some colleges than in others and Dr. Kimbrell added that it would be more appropriate to address the problem in those colleges. Dr. Boswell said that there are colleges where the average salary of their graduates has declined but the faculty still has their large salary. There are examples of faculty from the same discipline whose salaries differ greatly because of their home colleges. There is no way the colleges could solve these problems. Dr. Gasem suggested that we recommend that administrators look at their faculty and staff and address inequities wherever it occurs. Dr. Moder said that typically there have been separate pools of inequity money for staff and for faculty. Just telling administrators to address problems wherever they see them will have no affect. Dr. Boswell asked if the upper salaried people are willing to take a lower raise to fund this recommendation and if faculty are willing to take a cut in pay if the marketability of their graduates goes down. Dr. Gasem said the market has a feedback system. When the new Assistant Professor position salary declines then there is less pressure to increase the salaries at the upper level. Dr. Lau said that in many countries market value plays no role. The English professor gets the same salary as the Business professor. Different societies value different professions differently. We at OSU should decide what to pay professors. There is no justification behind the market. Dr. Horn said image is an issue that faces higher education. University professors are viewed by the public as being under worked and overpaid. So any minimum salary numbers are not going to help our image. Dr. Moder replied that *Time* magazine recently had an article that said the average salary of a faculty member was \$112,000. If this was accurate then there would be a problem but if the people knew what faculty really make and what they do then there would be no problem. The motion failed by a vote of 12 to 13.

C. FACULTY — Ed Lawry

The committee has decided not to bring a recommendation on A&D timing. There are some worries about how the process will work in the summer. There are some experiments being run in some colleges and the committee wanted to see how these worked before bringing a recommendation. There were also some concerns about the transition period where some nontenured people will not be evaluated for 18 months. The committee is also concerned about an item in the proposed policy and procedure letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. The original document contained a statement that the candidate for promotion or tenure would have an opportunity to review the recommendations written by P&T committees, Department Heads, Deans, and College committees and add a clarifying statement if desired. This statement was struck by the Deans Council. The committee would very much like faculty input on this item.

D. RULES AND PROCEDURES — Rich Paustenbaugh

Mr. Paustenbaugh thanked Diane LaFollette for her help with the election. There was a 16.6% increase in ballots cast from last year. The winners by group were: Group I, Biological Sciences, Bjorn Martin;

Group II, Humanities, Mark Sisson; Group III, Physical Sciences, Khaled Gasem; Group IV, Social Sciences, Ed Arquitt; Group V, Teacher Education (1-year term), Garry Bice; Group V, Teacher Education (3-year term), Diane Montgomery; Multicultural Group (1-year term), Paul Hsu, College of A&S, Charles Edgley; CEAT, Thomas Gedra; College of Business (1-year term), Janet Kimbrell; Library, Steven Locy; OSU Okmulgee, Alexandria Miller; Vice Chair, Nancy Wilkinson.

E. STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Gretchen Schwarz

Dr. Schwarz showed the committee one of the three rooms in the Library designed for disabled students. The largest problems are with the visually impaired. They have some screen enlargers and adjustable tables for the computers. A student must be recommended by Disabled Student Services in order to use this equipment. Also Shawn Henderson addressed the committee on the possibility of having Martin Luther King's birthday as a student holiday. The committee has no recommendation on this matter. Elaina Cortez, SGA president, and Brian Carter presented the faculty with a student proposal to cancel classes for Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday. The justification given was: 1) OSU is the only major public institution in Oklahoma that does not recognize the MLK holiday; 2) OSU is one of only two institutions in the Big 12 that does not recognize the MLK holiday; and 3) it portrays a negative image of OSU. Ms. Cortez said they are not asking for a University Holiday, only for classes to be dismissed. Dr. Warde asked if they had asked GSA their opinion. Ms. Cortez said that GSA currently has not given an opinion on the issue. Staff Advisory Council will discuss the item in their next meeting. Dr. Ackerson asked if the students were willing to trade the Monday out of Spring Break for the day. Ms. Cortez said there were several options. Spring semester could start a day early or 3 days early and distribute the extra days throughout the semester. Another option would be to have finals start on Saturday like OU does. Dr. Ackerson said that these did not solve the problem since the extra day needs to be a Monday. Dr. Moretti said that even if the extra day is defined to be a Monday then it has to be done in the correct way or lab courses do not work well. Dr. Boswell asked if there were any other State holidays that the university does not honor. Ms. Cortez said that the image of the university would be improved if we have this day off. Many students feel strongly about this day. Dr. Lawry said that personally canceling classes is a big problem. If classes are dismissed then many students will go off and never think about MLK. The whole week celebration is a very good idea. A very special celebration on that day would be much more meaningful than having everyone go home. Ms. Cortez said that this idea had been discussed but there is a march in OKC in which many students would like to participate and that is not possible if classes are in session. Dr. Lawry replied that many years ago there were a lot of civil rights activities and many students cut classes to participate in those marches. Dr. Schwarz said the problem is how do you make up the day. Dr. Moretti said the faculty could be for or against a complete proposal but this proposal is incomplete. Ms. Cortez said we could take a Saturday final after dead week or start the semester earlier. Dr. Moretti said that lab classes that meet only on Monday would lose one entire week. Dr. Buchanan said that the faculty would vote unanimously for a resolution to do something to honor MLK. The problem is that if we dismiss classes the students will not be here and you can not celebrate something if you are not here. None of the ideas given so far are satisfactory. Meeting the Monday of Spring Break will aggravate many people and none of the other recommendations make up the missed Monday. Dr. Halligan asked for a committee to work with the students on this problem. Drs. Buchanan, Lau, and Wilkinson will work with the students on this problem. Dr. Farr suggested that the holidays in the spring semester could be handled like those in the fall semester by giving one week of holidays distributed in one and two day periods.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES

Athletic Council: Dennis Bertholf

Dr. Bertholf reported that the Committee on Governance and Rules Compliance recommended the following audits: 1) Ticket Procedures, 2) Follow up on Team Travel Procedures, 3) Initial experiences with changing baseball camp, and 4) certification procedures for continuing eligibility. The last audit was prompted by Texas Tech's difficulties and number 3 by the change in baseball coaches. The Council

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

April 8, 1997

Page 8

approved the Funding Philosophy for Intercollegiate Athletics and sent it to the President. The Council approved an addition to the women's basketball schedule. A game will be scheduled against Southwest Texas State the last day of finals week, Dec. 19 after 7:00pm. Dr. Lawry asked about the confusing story on the resignation of a track coach. Dr. Bertholf replied that the Athletic Department was not commenting on the problem.

Staff Advisory Council — Duane Hunt

Duane Hunt reported that April 16 is Staff Appreciation Day. Staff Council is also working on Celebrate Students Day on May 2.

Graduate Student Association — Nizam Najd

The Phoenix Award winners are: Doctoral award, Indrajeet Chaubey, Biosystems & Agricultural Engineering, advisor C. T. Haan; and Master's award, Danette Goodyear, Physiological Sciences, advisor, Alastair Watson. For the graduate teaching award the finalists were Horacio Mottola and Doren Recker and the winner was Barry Moser, Department of Statistics. A reception for the winners will be on April 23 at 7:00pm.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Moretti announced that Wayne King will speak on academic uses of the "Bringing Dreams to Life" campaign at the Spring General Faculty meeting April 15, 1997.

Helen Duer was not present but has interest in working with a program to introduce fifth grade girls to careers in Science.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is May 13, 1997.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary