

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Bertholf, Bice, Bierman, Buchanan, Cole, Edgley, Finn, Gedra, Horn, Hsu, Kimbrell, Krenzer, Locy, Martin, Miller, Montgomery, Richards, Robinson, Schwarz, Scott, and Wilkinson. Also present: Birdwell, E. Johnson, S. Johnson, Jones, Lingelbach, Matoy, Najd, and Watkins. Absent: Ackerson, Arquitt, Dawson, Farr, Lawry, Moder, Sisson, Smith, and Warde

### HIGHLIGHTS

---

Library Issues with Speical Emphasis on Copyrights.....	1
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations .....	2
Reports of Standing Committees .....	
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security.....	
Faculty.....	
Personal Profit on Required Materials Recommendation.....	
Long-Range Planning .....	
“Research Makes It Happen” Recommendation.....	
Retirement and Fringe Benefits .....	
Rules and Procedures .....	
Reports of Liaison Representatives.....	
Student Publications.....	
Emeriti Association.....	
Graduate Student Association.....	
Student Government Association.....	
New Business.....	
Report on Meeting with OU Faculty Senate.....	

---

Dr. Horn moved acceptance of the February 10, 1998, Minutes. Dr. Krenzer seconded the motion. Dr. Bertholf pointed out a correction in the Graduate Student Association report. It should say that the GSA was asking that the university pay for a health insurance policy and the Student Health Center fee. The current amount is \$525. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Edgley moved acceptance of the, March 10, 1998, Agenda. Dr. Krenzer seconded. The Agenda was approved.

### **SPECIAL REPORT: Library Issues with Special Emphasis on Copyrights — Ed Johnson**

Dr. Johnson said he wanted to inform us about three negative trends in the publishing business that impact scholarly activity. The first is the consolidation of the journal publishing into the hands of a profit driven commercial industry. The second is the rapid escalation of prices beyond the requirements of reasonable profitability. The third is a sustained effort by publishers to extend their legal control over copyright protected works and to eliminate copyright provisions that benefit information users. On this third point the publishers are trying to do away with the concept of "fair use" granted in the 1976 copyright law. Under "fair use" teachers can make copies of copyrighted works for use in class. The biggest fear of the publisher is that an authors work will be digitized and made available on the web so the author and publisher will not get their share. The publishers have allied themselves with the entertainment industry and the software industry to try to remove some of the current privileges enjoyed under the copyright law. Most of the tries have been turned back with a modest degree of success but their efforts are continuing. This is a big problem for libraries since it could mean the end to free inter-library loan. So far the librarians have been working to block efforts to remove the fair use principle but seem to be losing the battle. However, there have been two bills introduced in the congress to help with this problem. One is H.R. 3048, The Digital Era Copyright Enhancement Act. The second is S. 1146, The Digital Copyright Clarification and Technology Education Act of 1997. Both of these bills, amongst other things, would expand the fair use of a copyrighted work to include uses by analog or digital transmission in connection with teaching, research, and other specified activities. Both these are in committee. Those of us who are

impacted by these need to let our representatives know. Dr. Johnson distributed a document prepared by the Committee on Libraries and Intellectual Property of the National Humanities Alliance (NHA) which gives some basic principles for managing intellectual property in the digital environment. The fundamental principle seemed to be; "Copyright law provisions for digital works should maintain a balance between the interest of creators and copyright owners and the public that is equivalent to that embodied in current statute." The Library Advisory Committee has recommended that a University wide committee with input from the Faculty Council and the Library Advisory Committee write such a white paper or at least give a formal endorsement to the NHA document. There are links on the library home page to other documents on these issues. Sheila Johnson added that faculty need to be aware of the rights that they give up when they sign away a copyright to a publisher. The university wide committee should inform faculty about what is lost once the copyright has been signed away. Many universities are reconsidering their copyright management policies and making an effort to inform faculty of their rights under the copyright laws. A good web page to learn about copyrights is the University of Texas page called a Crash Course for Copyright. There is also a policy statement put out by the UT system on how they plan to take a pro-active approach to handling copyrights. Dr. Ed Johnson said that the scholarly communication process is broken and before long it will be beyond repair unless we take some action. Dr. Halligan asked if both H.R. 3048 and S.1146 were passed would that grant substantial relief. Dr. Johnson said that it would. Both bills make an attempt to strike a balance between copyright owners and users. Dr. Halligan asked if the University wide committee should make a statement about these two bills. Dr. Johnson replied that he would like to have a policy statement on behalf of the University which would endorse the concept of managing intellectual property in a way that would follow some of the basic principles. For example the University could endorse the NHA document or they could develop an independent policy. Dr. Buchanan replied that the Student Affairs and Learning Resources Committee would look into this matter. Dr. Johnson said that it was important to act rather quickly. Dr. Vitek said that faculty can view a PBS program about copyrights from 1:30 - 3:00 p.m. on April 2. If a faculty member wants to see the program but is unable to attend at that time then tapes will be available. Dr. Edgley asked how this would affect ProQuest. Dr. Johnson replied that as part of our sight license, we pay the copyright fee. We have no problem with the copyright owner getting their fair share.

#### **REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:**

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

- 94-12-01-SALR     ***Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:*** Under review. Some input regarding committee charge and membership has been received from the Deans, and Drs. Moretti and Buchanan. Final draft is being prepared for final reviews. Hope to have this resolved by next time.
- 96-12-04-FAC     ***Changes in Appendix D:*** Under review. Dr. Keener will work with Legal Counsel to draft wording changes to more clearly delineate the role of Ombuds and provide additional specifics regarding membership to the Informal Review Committee. Requires Board approval. President Halligan will not add another position.
- 97-02-02-ADHOC   ***Patent Policy 1-0202:*** Pending review by Faculty Council committee. Draft including incorporated changes from initial reviews is currently being reviewed by Faculty Council committee. Following their review, document will pass to Research Council, Dean's Council and Legal Counsel. Requires Board approval.
- 97-04-03-ASP     ***Guidelines for Scheduling Common Evening and Final Exams:*** Administration agrees in principle, but defers decision awaiting new computer system. Dr. Vitek has coordinated this review with the Registrar and the Faculty Council committee. Draft revisions are being considered. Because of the extensive computer reprogramming involved, CIS must postpone until new computer system is operating.
- 97-09-01-FAC     ***Policy and Procedure Letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure:*** Under review. Dr. Keener is coordinating review of the draft P&P letter, to include Dean's

Council. Recommend referring to a special review group including representatives of Faculty Council, Deans, and Board of Regents. A memo from EVP Keener to President Halligan states that, "The deans are unanimously against the recommendations that: 1. reduce their voice and that of the EVP in the RPT process, and 2. provide the candidate the opportunity to rebut the recommendations made at various points in the review process. I also support the deans in their views. Since it is clear that members of the Faculty Committee of the Faculty Council feel very strongly about this matter, I suggest we consider asking the Council to identify a representative group of Council leaders (perhaps four individuals) who would meet with a group of deans and perhaps members of the Board to discuss this matter." President Halligan added that the Regents are interested and he will schedule a meeting at his home in the near future. Dr. Buchanan asked Faculty Council members who have a particular interest in this to tell him.

- 97-09-02-FAC *Return of Policy and Procedure Letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure to Faculty Council Before Action by the President:* Pending review of draft P&P Letter.
- 98-01-01-ASP *Change in University Academic Regulation 1.6 entitled "Scholastic Requirements for Continuing Enrollment of a Student Under Academic Probation in an Undergraduate College":* Approved as recommended. Dr. Keener will revise written policy and make appropriate notifications. Dean's Council and Student Academic Service Directors have approved this proposed modification.
- 98-02-01-ASP *OSU Alternative Admission (8%) Program:* To President Halligan.
- 98-02-02-FAC *"Faculty Perceptions of the Appraisal and Development Process" Recommendations:* To President Halligan.
- 98-02-03-FAC *Timing of the A&D Process:* To President Halligan.
- 98-02-05-SALR *Course Syllabi Availability:* To President Halligan.

#### **VICE CHAIR NOMINATIONS — Gene Krenzer**

Dr. Krenzer asked that no one nominate a person who was not in the room without prior approval from the person. Nominations were made by secret ballot and voting continued on these nominations until there were two names who had 75% approval of the members present. The faculty can also nominate other candidates by getting the signatures of 50 voting members on a petition. It took two nominating rounds to get three people, Marcia Tilley, Bill Warde, and Bruce Ackerson, willing to serve. Marcia Tilley and Bruce Ackerson were nominated on the next ballot.

#### **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

##### **A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICIES — Gerald Horn**

Dr. Horn introduced Diane Montgomery to present the recommendation. Dr. Montgomery said that the recommendation was brought to the committee by Dr. Dahl. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: The attached "Guidelines for the Administration of the OSRHE Policy on Alternative Criteria for Admission of First-Time Entering Students" with indicated revisions be adopted at OSU.** The changes in the policy are designed to do three things: 1) focus the criteria on success in college; 2) provide clarity in language; and 3) eliminate some redundancy in the statement. Admissions of first time entering students to OSU can occur in one of two ways, regular admission or under the 8% Alternate Admissions Program. Under regular admission a student must have 15 curricular units, and either a 22 ACT, or be in the top third of their graduating class and have a 3 point GPA. Under the alternate admissions a student should have: 1) a reasonable chance for academic success; 2) unusual talent or ability in art, drama, music sports and the like; or 3) promise of being able to succeed in a program or curriculum and be educationally or economically disadvantaged. The old policy was divided into five parts, A-E. Part A allowed the admission of students who met all the requirements except were one course short of the curricular units required. The only changes in this part are in language and the addition of the statement, "Space

permitting, individuals in this group will receive priority consideration.” The old parts B, C and D made reference to students who had a particular ACT or high school GPA. These were rolled together into a new part B which allows for the use of a combination of high school GPA, course work and ACT/SAT scores to indicate which students have a reasonable chance for academic success at OSU. This part also allows for the consideration of other factors such as the results of interviews, writing samples, high school principal's recommendation, or socioeconomic factors. The old part E would now become the new part C with a change in language to make it consistent with the unusual talent model. Dr. Lawry asked if the curricular deficiency mentioned has to do with particular courses or with the total number of courses taken. Dr. Montgomery replied it has to do with the particular courses taken. Dr. Wilkinson asked how the new policy would affect minority enrollment. Dr. Montgomery said that it should give greater access to minority students. Dr. Halligan said that the courts are being very sensitive to the use of minority status but are allowing the consideration of lower economic status. Dr. Lawry said that historically the supreme court had said that you could not use race as the sole criterion but you could use race as one of the criteria. Is that still the law of the land? President Halligan replied that at a recent meeting of presidents the presenter stated that affirmative action is dead. If you are not in court, it is because you are not in the right state. But that you can accomplish many of your affirmative action goals by using economic status. Dr. Moder asked who will be determining the priority between A, B, and C. This might be clearer if they could all be considered at the same time but since we have "rolling enrollment" these decisions have to be made on an individual basis. Dr. Dahl replied that decisions will be made individually with a focus on success. The criteria will be applied individually to each case. OSU is in a competitive situation for students and so a decision has to be reached quickly. One reason we want clear criteria is so it can be presented to the high school counselors so they do not put road blocks in the way of students who have a chance of success here but are missing one part of the admission criteria. President Halligan said that he wants to have diversity in our student body but he is not going to go to admissions and say “admit this particular student.” Dr. Moder said that with this change in the policy, who is making the admission decisions becomes more important. Dr. Dahl said that the new policy is much less clerical than the old system but that the decisions are being made by the senior staff in the Admissions Office. Dr. Lawry said that it is possible for an out-of-state student who was very strong and lacked only one curricular unit to not be admitted because s/he applied very late and there were no spaces remaining. Dr. Dahl replied that students in the 8% pool are asked to continue to try to become fully admissible so they can be removed from the pool. Opportunities continue to open in the 8% pool throughout the summer. Dr. Halligan said that at some point it is possible that there are no more openings available in the 8% pool. Dr. Lawry questioned the use of the word "greatest" in "2.03." The use of the word "greatest" implies that the individual is being compared with the rest of the pool in some way when in fact the policy is designed to make no comparisons but only look at likelihood of success. After some further discussion, **Dr. Lawry moved to amend the guidelines by removing "greatest" from line "2.03."** Dr. Horn said that the committee would accept this as a friendly amendment. Dr. Wilkinson asked when the 8% pool is normally full. Dr. Dahl replied it will normally be full by the end of May. President Halligan said that there is an OSU alum who could not afford to go to college so decided to get a Regents Scholarship by retaking the ACT until he got a 32. He started out at 19 and took it 18 times before getting a 32. Dr. Gedra asked if the subjectiveness of the criteria will leave OSU open to charges that the process is arbitrary. Dr. Dahl replied that the new process allows for the inclusion of other data which is more relevant to the success of the student in our program. A combination of ACT, SAT and high school GPA gives an objective measure with better predictive power than just an ACT or high school GPA alone. The other factors being considered all point toward a likelihood of success. Recommendation passed as amended.

## **B. FACULTY COMMITTEE — Ed Lawry**

The first recommendation brought by the Faculty Committee was motivated by the study of the A&D process that was distributed last meeting. Since the study indicates that there is general satisfaction with the process, this recommendation is not to make substantive changes in the process but to improve communication by providing information to people and reminding people of their duties. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan: 1) that the University distribute the executive summary of the study "Faculty Perceptions of the Appraisal and Development Process at Oklahoma State University" to all permanent faculty; 2) that the University distribute the full study to all academic administrators at the level of Department Head and above and ask that they make the document accessible to any faculty member who wishes to read it; 3) that the Executive Vice-President write a letter to all Deans insisting**

that they follow the policy for A&D of responding to disputes in a timely fashion and in written form; 4) that the Executive Vice-President write to all department Heads and School Directors reminding them that the Development part of the A&D process is just as important as the Appraisal process; 5) that the Executive Vice-President set up an on-going training program for new Department Heads and School Directors on skills necessary to conduct good A&D sessions and that veterans administrators of the process be invited to such a program to brush-up their skills. Dr. Lawry and the Faculty Council thanked Dr. Mills and Dr. Hyle for their work on the report. Recommendation passed. The next recommendation was discussed last year as part of the raise timing issue. Last year colleges were given the option of experimentally changing the timing of the A&D process from spring to summer and early fall. The committee contacted all the college offices that had participated and asked how it went. The results were mixed. People who are up for Promotion or Tenure have to be reviewed in the spring to meet the requirements of Appendix D. The main reason to move the process to late summer and fall is to make it closer to when raises take effect. However, the committee decided it might be an advantage to have the process removed from the raise process since the appraisal done in the spring must be based on the quality of the faculty members work and not on the amount of money available for raises. After the budget is known a supervisor could decide who get raises and make the appraisals match. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the timing of the A&D process not be changed, but should take place in the Spring for the previous calendar year as has been traditional.** Recommendation passed.

### C. RESEARCH — Bruce Ackerson

Bruce Ackerson said that he had asked Tim Greene, Jack Bantle, Dan Grischkowsky, and Dave Waits to speak to different parts of the recommendation. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the proposed addition (Research Professor Positions) be added to the current *Faculty Handbook* statement regarding Research Professional Positions (Appendix D: 1.7.6.3). *Proposed Addition: Research Professor Positions: Persons who hold an earned Ph.D. degree (or equivalent) in an academic discipline and have distinguished themselves by scholarship and research accomplishments may receive temporary appointments as Research Professor with the title of Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, or Research Professor. These ranks are considered parallel to professional titles. Research constitutes the primary activity. These appointments may require the parallel appointment as Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor to have teaching responsibilities or to serve on thesis and dissertation committees. Funds for compensation of Research Professor will normally originate from federal or private grants or contracts. The terms of appointment shall normally be one year, but reappointment may be made to allow fulfillment of University research obligations. The appointments do not lead to tenure. Appointment is contingent upon approval of the appropriate academic unit or department (e.g. the Graduate College and the University Centers are not academic units). Each college will develop its own procedures for the recruitment, selection, promotion and funding of candidates for these positions.***

Dr. Ackerson continued with the rationale for this resolution: 1) Research Professors contribute to departmental research productivity, as well as, faculty number, which adds to the departmental prestige in national rankings; 2) Federal granting agencies (by anecdotal evidence) understand what Research Professor title means and what the university commitment is. Other titles do not carry the same understanding. The Research Professor title is especially important for "independent" researchers, who are not working with or for a senior tenured professor but who are associated with a department as a whole; 3) the Research Professor title provides a promotional line for soft money supported faculty to advance and remain associated with OSU programs without having to go through an "open search" to change title/salary; and 4) the Research Professor faculty support themselves on soft money by maintaining high and competitive academic standards. Teaching responsibilities and graduate student advising are limited and will require approval and appointment to an Adjunct position. Dave Waits is an Assistant Professor in Geography, has a NASA grant which supports graduate students, has transitioned into private practice, would like to give up his teaching duties, and wants to continue to apply for grants. He has evidence that if he is called a Research Professional it will seriously impact his ability to get other grants. The department supports his move to a soft-money Research Professor position. Dan Grischkowsky, Professor in Electrical Engineering, brought \$1M in IBM laboratories to OSU, has a group of 8 undergraduates, 4 graduate students, some post docs, and a visiting Assistant Professor working in his program. The problem is to have a position to offer the key personnel in order to keep them at OSU. Dr. Grischkowsky said, "if we want to be a Research 1 institution this is part of the

admission ticket.” Jack Bantle, Associate Dean for Research in A&S, said OSU needs these positions to help the university grow, to utilize people whose skills are in research, and to hire people in a particular research areas. Currently in A&S all new positions are being filled because of teaching needs. Tim Greene, Associate Dean of Research in Engineering, said to grow research OSU not only needs funding but also needs to add highly trained professionals not just post docs and graduate students. We are competing with other universities for researchers. When it comes time to renew these contracts our chances will be better if our staff has the title of Research Professor. We can not staff up easily with tenure track people because of teaching requirements and the long-term salary commitment if the contract is not renewed. Dr. Buchanan asked how can we avoid moving toward a more transient faculty. Dr. Ackerson replied that the university has to have a permanent tenured faculty to establish curriculum, teach students and maintain research, but the environment is changing and we need some adaptation to the new environment. Dr. Grischkowsky added that this is the day of linkages with business, industry and government and in many cases titles are important. Dr. Edgley said the term "Professor" has traditionally meant something different than an army of soft money specialists that come here to do research. There are people who want to make us all like this. There are many other titles that could be used and other institutions like MIT, Indiana, Iowa, and Stanford are using these. OSU needs a title that will work in the national market but not the title of "Professor.” Dr. Lawry said the Research Committee brought this proposal to the Faculty Committee earlier. The Faculty Committee has discussed this issue many times over several years and at each discussion has become more adamant in their opposition to this proposal. The proposal could mean more grants to the university, but will it do anything to improve what it means to be a university? The Faculty Committee has always understood that one principle of being a university is that faculty work should be done, as far as possible, by permanent tenure track faculty. The Faculty Committee has taken the same stand in terms of clinical positions in Vet Med. If it is faculty work it should be done by someone within a faculty position. We also have in Appendix D titles such as Visiting Professor that could be used without adding new non-tenure track faculty positions that could lead to the end of tenure. Dr. Schwarz brought some concerns from Kay Bull. Dr. Bull says that the proposal violates AAUP guidelines since there is no protection for a person who is not eligible for tenure. It replaces potential faculty who are interested in the governance of the university and the training of students with researchers who have no interest in that direction. It could put students in the position of having no choice but to sign on with a person whose total interest is in a funded research in order to get support for his/her own research. The research faculty will not have full graduate faculty status and may not be around to complete projects when they can be fired at will. Dr. Moder asked about the comment that compensation will normally originate from grants and contracts and this might lead to such positions being totally funded by the university. Dr. Ackerson replied that this was included to allow for the person to also be appointed as an adjunct professor. Dr. Bantle said that it would not be wise to restrict Research Professors from teaching since the university sometime has a hard time finding people to teach certain courses. Dr. Bantle said that the assumption that these people are all temporary and have no commitment to the university is not fair. Many of these people will continue to get funding and spend many years at OSU. Also, even though there are several universities that do not use this title there are also several universities that do. The research directors are all having difficulty with the current system. Dr. Grischkowsky said he sensed a feeling in the group that a scholar who has distinguished him/herself in research, really did not merit the title of Professor and the committee’s point of view is that person does and that Research Professor is that designation. He thought the essence of a university was scholarship and in the Research Committee that is the binding ingredient that cuts across colleges. What they are trying to do is to show there is a particular type of scholar who creates knowledge and discovery and they think they should be called Research Professors. But, they do not necessarily come in with teaching rights. Dr. Hyle said a two-tiered system is being setup. The Research Professor line would not have the same rights, the same opportunities for development, or the same standards for promotion that the tenure-track line would have. A tenure-track professor is involved in extension, in teaching and in research and the professor gets better and OSU gets better because of the link between these areas. Dr. Lawry added that there is more chance for a Research Professor to be abused by the system but that it is also possible for them to be favored over a person in a tenure-track position. It is not fair for everybody. Dr. Ackerson replied that the Research Professor has to generate their own support. Dr. Lawry said that may not be the case. They are funded by soft money but someone else may be generating that money. Tim Greene asked if Faculty Council is willing to expand the vision of the university to a different model. Dr. Edgley said that he is concerned that if soft money becomes the norm then the rest of the faculty will be abused. Dr. Gedra asked why the worry over a two-tier system when we already have such a

system with the visiting titles and why not use the Visiting Professor title instead of Research Professor. Dr. Bantle answered that the Visiting Professor title implies a short-term association with the university whereas the Research Professor can stay as long as s/he continues to be funded. The university is not now growing and we need a model that will allow us to do so. Dr. Horn asked why they could not be called a Visiting Professor or Adjunct Professor. Dr. Bantle replied that the funding agencies want to put money on people who will be staying at the university. Dr. Sisson said that the committee had this item thrown in their laps and the discussion seems to be boiling down to semantics. There should be a different term that could be used that would solve the research problem. Dr. Lawry said there are really two questions. The first is the title and the second is the length of the appointment. Dr. Ackerson said that the time limit is a real problem for Dave Waits or someone in a similar position. In some cases the funding agency is interested in a long-term commitment. Dr. Moder said that we already have titles that can be used so the potential for a two-tiered system already exists, so is there a problem other than the granting agency recognizing the titles. Dr. Ackerson replied that is the major problem. Dr. Moder said that we could have 200 of these people tomorrow whether we vote on this or not. Dr. Gedra asked what the Faculty Committee and the Research Committee would think about the title of senior research scientist. Dr. Moder moved to table the recommendation. Dr. Gedra seconded. Motion passed, not unanimous.

#### **D. RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Bjorn Martin**

Dr. Martin said the committee had looked at the timeliness of the deposits going into TIAA-CREF. Anne Matoy told the committee that the deposits were being made according to legal limits and that the university had a self-imposed rule of making the deposits between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> days of the month. There are different rules covering these payments than those covering payroll checks so it would be very difficult to do them faster. Also, OSU is not slow compared to other institutions. The second item is from the Health Care Committee. New numbers from the first half of FY98 show that total charges against the health care plan just barely exceeded receipts, however the charges in the second half of the year are traditionally much higher. The estimated short fall for FY98 remains. Employees at OSU should expect to receive a questionnaire asking about two proposals, one with and one without the prescription drug component. Any new plan will involve a premium increase and a shift of cost from the plan to the employee.

#### **E. RULES AND PROCEDURES — Gene Krenzer**

Dr. Krenzer said the requests for nominations for the open Faculty Council positions will be mailed shortly to all 75% or greater FTE faculty. If you are rotating off Council please encourage faculty in your area to run for an open position. Two nominees are needed for each open position.

#### **F. STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Gretchen Schwarz**

Dr. Schwarz asked Dr. Scott to present the recommendation. Dr. Scott said the recommendation was motivated by an SGA resolution. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: teaching faculty be encouraged to place current syllabi on the Department's or individual's home page for viewing by all interested people before the semester begins.** The committee was sympathetic with student needs to determine work load and other expectations in a course. The committee also recognizes that some changes in course assignments and syllabi will occur. There are only a few departments that do not have a departmental web page. Dr. Ackerson said that he had not used the web until the day before classes started when he was assigned a new course to teach and he was able to put his syllabus on the web. A survey of his algebra-based physics course showed that 61% of the students had their own computer and web access. As of today his page has had 1050 "hits" from a class of 100 students. Dr. Moder said she had no problem with giving information but was concerned about having it available only on the web. Dr. Scott proposed the phrase **"or have the information available in the department" be inserted between "home page" and "for viewing."** Mr. Najd asked whether this applies to graduate assistants teaching courses. Dr. Scott replied that the SGA wanted the information prior to pre-enrollment and that is not possible. The requirement has to be flexible, but as soon as possible after an instructor knows her/his schedule the syllabus should be posted. Dr. Moder said it depends a little on what is meant by syllabus. A general description of the course is rather easy to get up whereas a four page document detailing all the rules or the course would take more time. Ms. Watkins said that a survey of what other universities are doing shows that some do have all syllabi listed. The students were also asked what they wanted and in general it had to do with workload requirements like how many tests, papers, or the number of books required. One college had the information displayed in a

table. A sample page has been developed to allow faculty to enter the basic details of the course without having to post their entire syllabus. If there is interest, this form could be expanded. It was hoped that there would be more than one way for faculty to do this. Dr. Moder asked if the students will view the "pre-course syllabus" on the web as an official contract with the same status as the one handed out in class. Dr. Edgley said that the article in the O'Colly, which said why would anyone want to take a course with a twenty-page term paper when they could get the same credit for one with only a two-page paper, changed his mind and he is now against this. If education is a consumer commodity then it is the only one where a person pays their money and then tries to get less. Motion passed as amended, not unanimous.

## **REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES**

### **EMERITI ASSOCIATION — Don Holmes**

Don Holmes thanked President and Mrs. Halligan for attending their dinner. The problem of parking for emeriti spouses has been resolved. President Halligan thanked the association for their invitation.

### **STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL — Diana Bateson**

SAC has passed two resolutions to be forwarded to the administration. The first asks that the signatures of both the supervisor and the staff member be required on the evaluation. The second asks that staff members be given the opportunity to anonymously and confidentially evaluate their supervisors, at all levels, on an annual basis.

### **GRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION — Nizam Najd**

The association will be hosting the Regional Conference of the National Association of Graduate and Professional Students on March 21 and 22 with major emphasis on diversity in education and the web publishing of dissertations. They are asking for \$525/year/graduate assistants from the university to pay for health insurance and the health center fee for graduate assistants. They are working on getting salaries for summer teaching in May and June paid in those months instead of holding them until July and August. The date for the grand opening of the new SGA/GSA offices in the Student Union will be announced at the next meeting. The Phoenix and Graduate Teaching Awards will be coming up soon, so get nominations submitted.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

Dr. Lawry moved that Faculty Council support the two resolutions reported above by the SAC. Seconded by Dr. Edgley. After some debate the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is March 10, 1998.

---

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary