

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, E. Arquitt, Bertholf, Buchanan, Dawson, Edgley, Finn, Horn, Hsu, Kimbrell, Krenzer, Lawry, Locy, Martin, Miller, Montgomery, Robinson, Schwarz, Scott, Sisson, Smith, Warde, and Wilkinson. Also present: A. Arquitt, Beer, Birdwell, Harp, Hays, Knottnerus, Leonard, Najd, Pierce, Presnal, Watkins, and Weaver. Absent: Bice, Cole, Farr, Gasem, Gedra, Moder, and Richards.

HIGHLIGHTS

Telecommunications Report	1
New Budget Year Report	2
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	4
Reports of Standing Committees	4
Academic Standards and Policies	4
Budget	4
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security.....	5
Faculty	5
Reports of Liaison Representatives.....	7
Athletic Council	7
Staff Advisory Council	7
Graduate Student Association.....	7
Old Business	7
Martin Luther King Day	7

Bertholf amended the May 13, 1997, Minutes by changing the Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendation 94-12-01-SALR to read, "Keener has sent a draft of the committee charge to the Dean's and has asked for a response." Warde moved acceptance of the May 13, 1997, Minutes. Horn seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Warde moved acceptance of the, June 10, 1997, Agenda. Horn seconded. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Telecommunications — Glade Presnal

The Institute for Telecommunications was established in 1991 under the umbrella of the Educational Television Services. It is a catalyst for distance learning, applied research, testing, and applications. It is advised by a board of senior leaders from business, industry, government and education as well as eight representatives from OSU, one from each college and one appointed by the Faculty Council. Last years committee members were Jim Choike, Kevin Hayes, Lee Manzer, Ray Martinez, Linda Robinson, George Sheets, Ramesh Sharda, and Grant Turnwald. The primary purpose is to assist the faculty to meet the university's mission. The Institute supports the A&S teleconferencing services which consists of AP Calculus, Physics, and German by Satellite. Nine MS degree programs are offered through the compressed video facilities to other educational institutions and to industrial sites. The institute also does beta testing of equipment. It assisted in the new Masters Degree Program in Telecommunications by getting the initial funding and the equipment for the lab. The institute also does surveys for clients. For example, it did a survey of higher education institutions as to what equipment they were using. The client allowed the institute to add three questions of their own to the survey at no cost. They learned that 437 institutions did not add a technology fee to credit hour charges for courses taken at a distance. Of those that did, (137), the range of charges was from \$3 to over \$100 per credit hour. Most institutions (455) provided training to faculty teaching at a distance and the method used was evenly distributed among technical, facilitator, and instructor training. The majority (359) indicated that faculty were assigned to teach at a distance as an inload responsibility with 232 responses indicating faculty were compensated on an overload basis. The Data Processing Telecommunications committee of the State Legislature asked

the institute to develop a plan for Oklahoma telecommunications and they did that by obtaining \$250,000 from the Department of Commerce to conduct this study. They also received \$1.5M from the Department of Commerce and \$1.5M from Southwestern Bell to establish 33 electronic community centers throughout rural OK. The institute has a program of annual executive briefings for senior leaders in industry. Future challenges include changing from analog equipment to digital equipment. The institute currently has two proposals pending to pay the \$2.5M dollar cost. A second challenge is the merging of voice, video and data and helping the faculty to use the technology needed for electronically mediated learning. A handout was distributed that contained further details on several programs and listed four national awards won by OSU. Wilkinson asked for more information on the electronic community centers. Presnal said that the electronic community centers could involve up to five sites, a county extension office, an educational institution, a health care facility, a library, and/or a government office. There would be at least a computer with desktop video in each of those sites. Halligan asked for a sense of scale in terms of high school courses and college courses. Presnal replied that he did not have the exact figures but it involved about 300 high schools in 43 states and about 3 to 4 thousand students. Birdwell added that there were 355 students, excluding UCT, taking graduate level courses. Ackerson asked if they worked with Correspondence Study. Presnal replied they were separate and administratively reported to Birdwell. Ackerson asked if they used only OSU faculty and how people get involved with the program. Presnal replied that only OSU faculty were used except for a couple of engineering courses that are co-taught by a professor from OU and one from OSU. He added that they recruited people through the advisory committee and that over 100 faculty have taught at a distance through their program. Finn asked how tuition was shared between universities. Presnal replied the university has a position for Director of Distance Learning open at the current time. Part of his duties will be to work with the OSRHE to develop policies dealing with such issues. At the current time these things are decided on an individual basis. Halligan said that there is a possibility that Gov. Keating is considering having the state participate in the Western Governor's University. The state systems of Colorado, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, etc., would pool their programs through electronic means and not create any physical infrastructure but out of all their intellectual assets would create a university whereby individuals could get degrees. Presnal said he thought the idea was workable and that the person responsible for putting the program together was on our advisory board. If we have a chance to be involved we should do it. Industry seems to be excited about their program. Edgley asked if there was any downside to this. In particular are there any studies on the impact on traditional classes. Presnal said that you lose the face to face interaction and the social aspects of the traditional university. Edgley added that if we are serving people, disabled and place bound, who we could not reach before, then that is one thing; but, if this becomes a way to avoid a classroom experience then we need to think about it. If someone is granting degrees in our name using these kinds of experience then we need to take a really hard look at that. Halligan added that his understanding of the Western Governor's vision is that it will be competency based. A student will be given a proctored examination at the end of the course and will be certified on the basis of these competencies. Edgley said that this again is something that needs to be monitored carefully because it may be very suitable for courses that have real answers but what about courses where you are trying to generate creativity. What about the arts and humanities? It is not that these things cannot be done but only that they need to be watched. Birdwell pointed out that the courses are taught through the extension mechanism at OSU, by OSU faculty, approved by the Deans and that the Institute for Telecommunication is a facilitator that distributes the information and trains the faculty to use the technology.

SPECIAL REPORT: New Budget Year — Harry Birdwell

The legislature approved \$56.8M in new funds for higher education. They also approved a tuition increase of 5% for two year institutions, 4% for the four year institutions and 9% for the comprehensive universities. When this is all added together it amounts to an increase of about \$71M. This may be a better budget year than last year since last year \$13M was earmarked for OTRS. Because of increased oil gas tax revenue there was no requirement for OTRS this year. In addition, last year the State Regents had more new initiatives than they do this year. Consequently, more new money will be going into the formula than did last year. Birdwell handed out a chart showing the allocation of state appropriated

funds. OSU received \$5.4M of new money whereas OU received \$6.3M. This difference is because OU has grown more over the last five years than OSU. However, OSU did receive about \$300,000 of new money for the Food Processing Center and about \$700,000 of new money as tuition offset for the Ag Experiment Station and Ag Extension since they will not be receiving any of the new tuition increase money. The university also received \$1.1M in operating costs for the ARTC and the Food Processing Building and about \$238,000 in new money for Teacher Education programs. Birdwell shared the goals set by the University Budget Committee: 1) continue to provide increases in compensation for faculty and staff; 2) maintenance, operations and instructional technology; 3) technology for campus; 4) new positions, particularly as we grow; 5) graduate stipends (last year a commitment was made to provide all GAs a 10% increase); and 6) new programs. June 12 the administration will take their recommendations to the Budget Committee. On June 20 the budget will be taken to the OSU Regents. On June 27 the OSRHE will consider our budget and the new year will begin on July 1. The final form of the budget will not be known until the Regents act on it. The recommendation will contain a 5% merit salary program effective Oct. 1. However, this could depend upon two things: 1) will enrollment hold up and 2) since the legislature did not pass the emergency clause, the tuition increase cannot take effect until after the semester begins. The Attorney General has been asked for an opinion on whether the tuition for the fall can be prorated. If not OSU will receive about \$1.5M less new money this year. The budget will also include an amount of equity money in addition to the merit portion to be used to help solve salary equity problems amongst both faculty and staff. Administrative costs will decrease from 6.8% to 6.2% of the E&G budget. For each of the last six years OSU's administrative costs have gone down. The amount of money that goes toward the instructional part of the budget will be up. There will be additional money for faculty training in the use of technology. Research will show a significant increase. OSU has never budgeted the receipts from the endowed chairs and professorships, but will be doing so this year. There will also be an increase in start up funding. Student service will get some new money for University Placement Services. One of the worst things that can happen is to have people complete their degree and then not get a job. Halligan said "growth matters." This tuition issue is a very sensitive issue. It passed 52-48 in the House after a significant effort. To give a sense of the reluctance in the legislature to pass such measures, OSU had proposed a \$.75 per credit hour increase in the library fee to improve PETE and this failed 83-17 in the House. The final decisions on the budget will have to wait until after the Attorney General makes his decision and how the legislators react to his decision. Halligan added his support to the increase in the graduate stipends and for the salary program including the equity money. David Boren has said that OU will have a 5% salary program beginning Oct. 1. If OSU is able to give a 5% salary program and the rest of the Big 12 gives a 3% program then OSU faculty salaries will be at 95% of the Big 12 average. Edgley asked if a negative ruling by the Attorney General would mean the 5% program would not go into effect. Birdwell replied that the situation is being watched very carefully. The intention is to pursue the 5% program if at all possible. Halligan added that before a final decision is made he wants to know the Attorney General has ruled and what the fall enrollment is going to be. Salary increases are first on the list. Edgley asked if the program would possibly start later than Oct. 1. Halligan replied that a decision will be made about Aug. 15 on the salary program and it will go into effect Oct. 1. Lawry asked about the formula and its tie to enrollment. Weaver replied that the funding is based on the standard cost per student credit hour FTE. Halligan added that it depends on the program in which the student is enrolled. Every program has a cost. The algorithm that calculates the formula is about an inch thick and depends on level and program. They average our costs for a program with those of OU to get a standard peer cost. Lawry asked if there was a way to look at OU's numbers and see how much extra money they got because they grew more than we did. Weaver said it was possible but he had not done it because of the time restraints in putting OSU's budget together. Halligan said a very crude model would be to input the number of student credit hours at each level, lower division, upper division, or graduate, and these SCH's are also labeled with their program designation. You then turn the crank and out comes a justifiable budget need. Then they will give us 61% of the justifiable budget need. Lawry said he has always been baffled by how much new money OSU gets because of growth. Weaver said that it can be very complicated because a school could have a big growth in a year when there is no new money and there is no reallocation system wide. Halligan pointed out that in some years they make up for past growth if it had occurred during a year when there was no new money. They are now getting slices of

steak and we are getting slices of air. Birdwell said that OU got about \$460,000 this year for growth in years when there was no new money. Student credit hour costs are in the ratio of \$1 for lower division to \$1.90 for upper division to \$3.08 for graduate. In order to get a number that ties funding to enrollment Halligan said OSU teaches about 15,000 FTE and gets \$90M, so that means we get \$6,000 per FTE. However, this number will vary from \$3,000 for some lower division students to over \$10,000 for some graduate students. Lawry said that OSU has a built in incentive to get more Physics majors than Philosophy majors. Halligan said that never enters the thinking, since the increased revenue is offset by increased costs. Najd asked if the new PETE was going to be put on hold because of the loss of the new library fee. Halligan said that it is too important. However it does open us to the criticism that we did not really need the fee. Lawry said that since OSU is thinking of a 5% merit raise program does that mean that the salary budget line will be increased 5% and the actual average raise will be 5.1% because the raise was not paid in July-September or will it mean that the salary budget line will increase 4.8% and the average merit based salary increase will be 5%. Halligan replied that it is the latter. In fact a portion of the raise program will have to be funded out of next years budget.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

92-03-01-FAC	Fixed Terms for Administrators: Legal Counsel has reviewed and identified conflict with Board policy stating that there cannot be any tenure or property interest in these administrative positions. The recommendation as stated is not accepted; however a committee of two deans, two department heads and four faculty will be appointed to develop revised appraisal procedure for administrators, to be reviewed by Faculty Council before implementing.
94-12-01-SALR	Composition of Future Information Technology Committee: Under review.
96-12-04-FAC	Changes in Appendix D: Under review.
97-02-02-ADHOC	Patent Policy 1-0202: Under review.
97-03-02-FAC	Faculty Appointment Periods: Delayed, pending further discussion of summer compensation issues. Will have lunch with Buchanan to continue the discussion of the issue.
97-04-02-ASP	Recognizing Bachelor's Graduates who Have Achieved Academic Distinction: Accepted and referred to Keener for implementation.
97-04-03-ASP	Guidelines for Scheduling Common Evening and Final Exams: Under review by Jack Vitek and Robin Lacy who will report to Keener.
97-04-04-ASP	Guidelines for Requesting Common Evening and Final Exams: Under review by Jack Vitek and Robin Lacy who will report to Keener.
97-05-02-ASP	Convocation/Commencement Ceremonies: Accepted in principle. The Chair of the University Commencement Committee will appoint and coordinate an ad hoc committee, to include the specified representation and charge as noted.
97-05-03-ASP	Timely Reporting of Course Grades: Accepted and referred to Keener for implementation.
97-05-04-ASP	Missed Classes: Accepted and referred to Keener for implementation.
97-05-05-LRP	Transfer Student Programs: Accepted and referred to Keener for implementation.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY — Gerald Horn

The recommendation on honor roll designations that was brought to the Council in May will be on the agenda of the next meeting of the committee with the goal of rewriting the recommendation to simplify its language and more clearly explain its need. Please forward any ideas on this to Horn.

B. BUDGET — Nancy Wilkinson

The previous committee has prepared a report that was presented to the executive committee. The committee from last year still has the task of preparing a salary report that compares OSU salaries with those of national and regional peer groups. The reason for the delay is that the committee has traditionally gotten the national and regional data from the Spring issue of *Academe* which has not yet been distributed. This report will be given at the next meeting.

C. CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Linda Robinson

The committee is looking at the flow of pedestrian, bike and auto traffic on campus. The committee is interested in working with the city to develop a long-term plan that would be beneficial to both the city and the campus and improve the flow of bicycle traffic on and around campus. It is looking for administrative approval to join with the city in applying for a federal grant. Natalea Watkins said that the city is working on a master plan to improve traffic flow and will include a series of public hearings to seek such information. Robinson said the committee was interested in this process, but feels they need administrative approval before becoming involved. Halligan said that the landscape architecture students are sometimes looking for senior projects and might take this on. Watkins replied that the landscape architecture students are already participating with the city. Halligan said he would be happy to sign a letter approving such participation. Ackerson commented any committee looking at this problem should include people that bicycle. Robinson said the current committee does include some bicyclists.

D. FACULTY — Ed Lawry

The committee brought a recommendation to approve the revised Policy and Procedures Letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. In the Spring of 1996, a committee appointed by the EVPAA drafted a Policy and Procedures Letter describing the processes of reappointment, promotion and tenure. Though the charge of the committee was to describe the RPT process, it was impossible not to invent some norms if the process was going to be orderly as a university procedure. During the Summer and Fall, the Dean's Council and the Academic Department Heads Advisory Committee reviewed the document and suggested changes. In March of 1997, the document was sent to the Faculty Committee of FC for review and recommendation. The Faculty Committee made a number of additions and restorations, and felt it could not add its changes to the already altered document without engendering a great deal of confusion. So, it produced a "clean" document which was attached to the June 10 FC Agenda. However, in the haste to get this to FC there are some changes that need to be made. First, on page 3 under number 4 the word "statements" that is struckthrough needs to be removed. On page 2 of the Policy and Procedures Letter at the top of the page the words "Policy Statement" should be in italics. On page 4 of the Policy and Procedures Letter under "Identifying RPT Candidates" in the second paragraph, the phrase "along with a copy of the Policy and Procedures Letter" be inserted after the word "report" in the second line. This line is to be added to bring the document in line with the proposed Letter in Attachment 1. On page 9 in the fourth line of number 3 there should be a coma instead of a semicolon after the word "administrator" and in the last line of number 3 the word "form" should be "from." On page 15 in the second paragraph from the end strike the word "specify" in line 1. There are two major changes in this document from the one returned by the Dean's Council and the Academic Department Heads Advisory Committee. The Faculty Committee has restored a provision that the original committee had in the policy but which was removed by the Dean's Council. This provision is that the faculty member should be given the opportunity to read the statement of recommendation made at any stage (unit committee, unit administrator, Dean's committee, and Dean) and be given three working days to add a brief statement of clarification (no more than two pages) to the file. (See the third complete paragraph on page 10.) One reason for this is to prevent some of the frustration that some faculty members feel during the process when they know that at one stage in the evaluation process a negative recommendation has been made. It may be the case that the candidate could have something to add that is very much to the point of some part of a negative recommendation. Another reason is that the committee feels that this opportunity to make clarifying statements would decrease the chance that the faculty member would file a grievance. The second major change is harder to describe. An example, to get a sense of this, is the paragraph starting on page 2. This entire portion of the document is new. It was not in either of the previous documents and it talks about the roles of the reviewers in each stage of the process. The part on

page 2 is talking about the Dean's role. The Dean is responsible for reviewing the entire departmental process and considering it in line with the departmental role in the college and the departmental practices in the past. The Dean needs to be continually working with departments, making sure the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are consistent with the level of professionalism in the college and that the department's emphasis on differing aspects of faculty activity matches the role the department plays in the college and the university. Deans should not be judging professional performance but should be attentive to the question of whether the department has proper standards, has applied those standards, has done so without bias, and has done so with consistency. Lawry says that this statement says the units judge the candidate and the Deans judge the process that the department has used to judge the candidate. There is also a change in the time line in that the units are given one more week in the process and the Deans one less. There are several other changes in the document but they are not substantive. Wilkinson asked about the statement describing the Dean's role which says, "The Dean can also make judgements on the professionalism of the candidate insofar as that reflects standards adopted by the faculty of the College." It seems that the Dean could use this statement to justify making professional judgments on the candidate. Lawry said that the key part of this statement is that the standards have been approved by the faculty of the college as a whole. Wilkinson asked for an example. Lawry said that a faculty of a college could go on record as saying that no one can receive tenure unless they have merit in research as well as teaching. Buchanan said that the Dean could participate in the development of such a standard. So a new Dean could change the direction of a college by developing such standards. Lawry said that he had seen a Dean's statement that said this department has low standards. It is the Dean's responsibility to see that a department does not have low standards. But once the process has started for some candidate, it is not the responsibility of the Dean to deny tenure to a person because the department has low standards. Halligan asked if a department has low standards then the Dean would be tenuring people from that department who might be on the faculty for 30 years. Is not the greater good being done by the Dean stopping such candidates? Lawry said that he felt that the greater good was being done by having the decision being made at the departmental level, since a Dean might be making decisions on standards that he/she has and no one else knows about. If a department has low standards then the Dean needs to meet with the department and tell them that they need to raise their standards. Halligan asked what if they will not change. Lawry replied the administration has several powers; the power of persuasion, the power of the budget. Edgley said that the Dean has collective power over the department but should not be making decisions about individual faculty. The standards are approved by the Dean's office and the faculty of the department say that this person has met these standards and to have the Dean then say the individual is not performing adequately is not right. Lawry said that under these rules the department may take their role more seriously. Lawry pointed out that neither the old policy nor this proposed policy remove the human judgment from the process. The Dean and Department Head could have different opinions of whether a person meets the standard. Krenzer ask about the statement in the paragraph on the division committee that says, "This college/division committee shall then provide written advice to the Dean regarding the professionalism of the departmental process, and whether it supports the recommendation of the department." It seems that the statement under the Dean's responsibilities says that at this level the committee should be looking at the process and not whether or not they support the departments decision. Lawry said the second part of the statement was added so the committee would be forced to give the Dean input in each case. Lawry said the idea is that the committee takes the Dean's perspective but is made up of faculty members. Horn said the committee has done a good job but he has some concerns about this same paragraph. The general flow of the process is to have the decision made at the unit level, but this paragraph has the college/division committee review all the cases and make a decision on each of them. Many of the college committees have a different role than the one being described here. In some colleges the committee charge is to review the RPT procedures and documents of individual departments and review only the individual files of candidates for which there is a disagreement at some stage. If there is agreement amongst all parties there is no reason to have the committee review the files. They have reviewed the procedures and at least three different groups or individuals have agreed that the candidate either meets or does not meet these standards so there should be no need for another committee to review them. Also the greater number of people who see the files the harder it is to maintain confidentiality. This paragraph could possibly be fixed with a statement that made it apply to only RPT committees

whose bylaws gave it this role. Montgomery pointed out that the first phrase says, “where operating.” Buchanan said that there are colleges that have a committee with a quite different function than what is being described here. There seems to be agreement about the RPT committee up to the point where it states, “and whether it supports the recommendation of the department. It is not the responsibility of the college committee to assess departmental standards.” In some colleges it is the responsibility of the committee to assess departmental standards. Montgomery suggested the phrase, “within the context of any individual faculty review process” be added to the last sentence. Buchanan agreed this addition would correct the last sentence but he is still concerned with the second half of the previous sentence. Lawry said the original committee realized that many colleges had different policies for handling the RPT process and currently some colleges are not doing it in this way. However, the committee felt that this is the way the committee should be operating. This is an attempt on the part of the university to have Deans still relying in their judgments on RPT upon faculty wisdom. Lawry has no objection to the addition to the last line but does not want to remove the phrase, “and whether it supports the recommendation of the department.” Buchanan and Horn said that this will force all college committees to have their committees review all cases. Horn pointed out that the statement on page 12 explicitly says that the committee will review all documents on each candidate. Buchanan suggested that the paragraph on page 3 should begin with “Where charged” instead of “Where operating.” After further discussion about the implications of this paragraph on the college RPT committees, Krenzer moved the recommendation be tabled and that each counselor study the document and forward their suggestions to Lawry. Wilkinson seconded the motion. The motion passed (not unanimous). See the attachments to the June Agenda for the proposed RPT Policy at Web address http://www2.okstate.edu/fac_council/minutes/.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES

Athletic Council — Dennis Bertholf

The Athletic Integrity Committee will be meeting this week to review the Spring Semester Grades. At the May meeting the main subject of discussion was the report of the Gender Equity Committee that has been forwarded to Halligan. The Athletic Director requested that the Fiscal Integrity Committee study the document to determine the financial impact. The feeling is that the Athletic Department does not currently have the funds to bring us into full compliance with Title IX. The June meeting will again be devoted to a discussion of gender equity issues.

Staff Advisory Council — Marcia Hays

Applications for the first SAC scholarships are being accepted. There will be ten scholarships for the 97-98 academic year. A recipient will receive up to \$300. Any SAC member can get an application for you. New members will be seated at the next meeting and officers will be elected. The next Blood Drive will be June 30 and July 1 from 9 to 3 in 465 in the Student Union. Halligan thanked the Council for their scholarship effort. He also added that he had talked with representatives from the Red Cross after the last drive and they assured him that the procedure would be streamlined and a person should be able to complete the process in one hour.

Graduate Student Association — Troy Pierce

The GSA is opening a Foundation Account with a goal of raising \$1M to fund graduate student travel to professional meetings. Next week Pierce will go to Washington for a National Graduate Student Lobby Day for Congress and for the National Association of Graduate Professional Student’s Board Meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

Buchanan reminded the Council that representatives from the SGA had come to our meeting requesting our support for a resolution that they had passed requesting a Martin Luther King Day holiday from classes. At the last meeting Keener distributed a memo to the Council which among other things listed some options for adding a MLK holiday. He also stated in the memo that it is likely that OSU will add such a holiday. Buchanan has taken the input from the Council and drafted a response to Keener’s memo which was included with the Agenda. He then moved that the Council endorse this memo. Buchanan

accepted a friendly amendment to replace the first line of the last paragraph by, "We are sympathetic with the concerns of the students." Halligan said that if this is endorsed then in effect the Council is saying that they are not in favor of having a MLK break from classes and if the administration decides to go ahead with this then here are some options. Edgley said that most of the options are dreadful. The option of calling off classes is not a good idea. If we have to call off classes could we not have something associated with the general celebration of the spirit of MLK as opposed to a holiday. Just taking the day off does not celebrate King's legacy. Why not encourage the students to participate in some of the Black History Month activities or require them to do so. If we have to make up the day why not just add one minute to each class period. Lawry said that the point is that we think it is a bad idea and the memo says so but the memo from Keener seems to say that the administration has decided to do it. Now we have to decide what to do. Lawry amended the motion to add the Faculty opposes calling off classes as a way of celebrating MLK Day. Warde seconded the amendment. Halligan said that he shares the views of his colleagues. However, this is an emotional issue. Ten of the twelve Big 12 schools do not have classes on that day. The fact that OSU does shows that OSU does not honor MLK and what he did. Coming from a different cultural background it is hard for us to understand the depth of their feeling about this. Edgley asked if classes are called off then do we have to institute one of these dreadful options. Halligan said that for some people this is an overarching issue when they are thinking about whether or not we are an appropriate university for them. So OSU must take this into consideration. Lawry said, "saying nothing but dismissing classes will honor King," is just not thinking well. It is up to us as educators to say that to students. On the other hand we have the opportunity to do something so wonderful that it is clear that we honor King and his accomplishments. For example, we could sponsor a two or three day seminar on race relations or civil rights every year. This would be terrific. Halligan said that last year OSU had a superb speaker and the number of people in attendance was sorely disappointing. He had very good credentials and Halligan could not imagine that OSU could attract people more outstanding than him on a regular basis and yet most people did not come. Edgley said OSU could say students are released from classes in order to attend these events. Perhaps even have a mechanism whereby their presence could be monitored. Lawry said that he did not know if that would work but we need to find a way to make it better so that they will come. Pierce said how can we say this is what you have to do on this holiday. We do not do that for any other holiday. Halligan said that we cannot dictate what people do outside of classes. Amendment failed 13-6. Ackerson said that we could extend classes another week and sprinkle in a few more holidays since everyone seems to like holidays. The motion passed (not unanimous). Halligan added that if anyone has ideas on this issue he would be glad to consider them. See Buchanan's memo as an attachment to the June Agenda on the Web at address http://www2.okstate.edu/fac_council/minutes/.

The meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is Sept. 9, 1997.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary