

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
May 12, 1998

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Arquitt, Bertholf, Bierman, Buchanan, Cole, Dawson, Finn, Gedra, Horn, Hsu, Kimbrell, Lawry, Locy, Martin, Miller, Moder, Montgomery, Schwarz, Sisson, and Wilkinson. Also present: Bost, Carlozzi, Dahl, Daugherty, Gregson, Hallgren, Johannes, Jones, Lavoie, Lingelbach, Matoy, Najd, Oaks, Rhoten, Sanders, Tilley, Vitek, M. J. Warde, Watkins, Webb, Young. Absent: Bice, Edgley, Krenzer, Richards, Robinson, Scott, Smith, and B. Warde

HIGHLIGHTS

Student Perceptions of the Quality of Instruction from the Student Satisfaction Inventory.....	1
Strategic Enrollment Initiative Task Force Report.....	2
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	3
Reports of Standing Committees.....	4
Academic Standards and Policies.....	4
Changes in Academic Regulation 5.4 (Dropping Courses) Recommendation.....	4
Budget ..	6
Increase in Promotion Raises Recommendation.....	6
Retirement and Fringe Benefits.....	6
Rules and Procedures.....	7
Reports of Liaison Representatives.....	7
Athletic Council.....	7
Student Publications.....	7
Emeriti Association.....	7
Staff Advisory Council.....	7
Graduate Student Association.....	7
Student Government Association.....	7
New Business.....	8

Dr. Horn moved acceptance of the April 14, 1998, Minutes. Dr. Schwarz seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Schwarz moved acceptance of the, May 12, 1998, Agenda. Dr. Horn seconded. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Student Perceptions of the Quality of Instruction from the Student Satisfaction Inventory — **Mary Jane Warde** said that it was made clear at the meeting of the NCA in Chicago that in addition to taking assessment seriously colleges should also be establishing feedback loops to put the data to use. A Student Satisfaction Inventory is given each spring semester. It is a standardized instrument published by the Noel-Levitz company which has been used at OSU since 1994. The instrument has been administered in several different ways. During the first two years it was mailed to a stratified random sample of approximately 1500 students. The response rate was not very good. In 1997 the survey was administered in several classes. The target audience was 2000 students. The response rate was 74% in 1997 and 76% in 1998. The rate was this low because some students were enrolled in two of the sample sections or were absent. (NOTE: Do not survey on Fridays!) The faculty have been very cooperative. In 1997 thirty-four faculty cooperated and in 1998 there were forty cooperating teachers who were for the most part different than those the previous year. Sampling in class not only improved the response rate but also removed a bias in the mail-out survey which occurs when the respondents with a complaint in some area return the surveys at a higher rate than students who have no complaints. In 1998 there were a large number of Juniors

and Seniors who responded. This reflects the bias of departments to have students in their capstone courses participate in the survey. There was good representation from all the colleges, however the greatest number were from the College of Business, because they asked to have all sections of a particular course surveyed. The Assessment Office is willing to work with departments or colleges to get the information that they need. The survey asks for their degree of satisfaction on a seven point Likert scale in eleven areas. Over the last 5 years the responses have been fairly consistent. One area that has gotten consistently high responses is academic advising. The area with the highest ratings this year was student centeredness. The section that usually gets the worst rating is Safety and Security. This area has low ratings because of dissatisfaction with parking. The area of Instructional Effectiveness has held steady over the past 5 years. In this area the students are asked a number of questions that are specific to instruction. During 1994 and 1995 students rated several areas of instruction below the national average for the area. In 1996 there was enough areas rated below the national average that a follow-up survey was conducted amongst the same population that had answered the original survey. This follow-up survey is in the Library and contains detailed information about students attitudes toward instruction. In 1997 and 1998 students at OSU rated all the areas under instruction higher than the national norm for those areas. Some areas like "instruction in my major field," and "variety of courses," have been rated above the national norms each year. Commitment to academic excellence is a half point above the national norm in 1998. In overall satisfaction the national norm has remained roughly constant over the five year period whereas the OSU satisfaction score has risen consistently over the same period. When students were asked if they would re-enroll in their university, the national norms have declined slightly whereas OSU's scores have improved slightly each year. All the reports generated by the Assessment Office are on reserve in the Library and on the server. Dr. Ackerson asked what the uncertainty estimates were on of the results. It is hard to determine if there is an increase or decrease if the numbers are in the noise range of the data. Dr. Warde replied that they were provided along with the scores and are available in the report. Dr. Moder asked what population was used in norming the data. Dr. Warde replied that the survey is nationally normed and OSU is in the group of public four year universities. The number of students participating this year is 108,000. Dr. Buchanan asked if there were schools that scored very high on the survey or were most of them about average. Dr. Warde said that no other schools results are provided. Dr. Halligan asked if national statistics were provided. Dr. Warde said that OSU is provided a national normative report. Ms. Watkins said that the students are also asked the importance of the different areas. Has there been any change in the importance ratings over the five years? Dr. Warde said that for the last two years the importance ratings of the different broad areas were within about one hundredth of a point. Dr. Lawry asked if we knew what was happening with the retention rate in view of the increased satisfaction results. Dr. Warde said that this instrument does not answer that. Dr. Halligan said that we were at 48% four years ago. The comparable number for our peer institutions was 61%. The latest data showed a retention of 80% from freshman to sophomore. OSU should have the best retention it has had at the next reporting period and is on the path to 62%. Dr. Warde said the Assessment Office has a data base containing all the responses for OSU students. The responses can be accessed by major code and can be used for program reviews or other research. Dr. Halligan asked if there was any other area besides parking that was bad news. Dr. Warde replied that there was not.

SPECIAL REPORT: Strategic Enrollment Initiative Task Force Report — Randall Dahl said that Dr. Halligan appointed a Strategic Enrollment Task Force to focus on retention. The task force involved both faculty and staff and met with faculty groups from every college. The three highest priorities in undergraduate enrollment at OSU are retention, coordination and organization. This is designed as a low cost high return project. The current OSU enrollment is made up of about 18% new freshman, 10% transfers, 68% continuing and 4% re-admissions. Through selective admissions OSU is getting the best prepared students in Oklahoma. As far as graduation rates we are doing better than any other comprehensive university in Oklahoma. However, we are 9th in the Big 12. These are 1996 figures and we are doing better. For the last three years an average of 981 freshman did not return the following fall and of those 443 were in good academic standing. An average of 644 seniors (16%) did not return and 576 (89%) of

those were in good academic standing. The most common features of prior studies of enrollment, recruitment, and retention are twofold. First, few of the recommendations were implemented and second, none of the studies provided for a mechanism to implement or monitor the recommendations. Good students are scarce resources that are critical to the success of the university. Degree completion is not the only measure of institutional success, but it is the most important single measure. Retention to graduation must be a significant institutional value. Admission standards at OSU are appropriate to the institutional role, mission and enrollment environment and are sufficient for a conclusion that all students admitted are capable of succeeding here academically. The leading academic task is to facilitate the success of the students who are enrolled. The primary marginal factors in retention are internal and subject to institutional influence while those of recruitment are external and subject to only limited institutional influence. This is the reason that the task force placed such a high priority on retention. The five major recommendations are: 1. Immediately mount a continuing major institutional initiative to substantially increase and sustain retention to graduation. 2. Develop, implement, evaluate, refine, and maintain a comprehensive and strategic enrollment marketing and new student recruitment plan and related action programs. 3. Improve the coordination and management of the academic scholarship programs, and secure increased funding for scholarships and financial aid. 4. Improve academic advising and management of the transition to college. 5. Create an Enrollment Management organization at OSU charged to promote, manage, and facilitate primary undergraduate enrollment functions, and provide leadership, coordination, and support in achieving institutional enrollment objectives and implementation of the recommendations of this report. Each recommendation was followed by several sub-points. Mr. Najd asked if a similar task force could look at graduate education. Dr. Halligan said he liked that idea. Dr. Johannes asked if money was the main reason that seniors did not return. Dr. Dahl replied that we do not know. There are lots of reasons. However, when asked many students will say it is financial or personal. It may be how the students are allocating their money. Dr. Halligan said that financial aid is \$108M per year and if we have 20K students and two thirds are getting financial aid then, on average, each student that qualifies for financial aid gets about \$7500. The total cost of attendance is \$10K or less so for the majority of these people it should not be money. Dr. Sanders asked if there is enough information available to tell which colleges are doing better. This might help determine which factors, advising, lack of scholarships, etc. are causing this. Dr. Dahl said there are many reasons. In some cases a person may have a job and it is more attractive than completing the last hours. Dr. Daugherty asked if we knew about gender and age of drop outs. Dr. Dahl said again we do not know. One of the recommendations under the retention initiative is to launch research efforts to study these types of questions. Dr. Ackerson pointed out that the data looks at four years but many students actually take longer. Dr. Dahl replied that the average time to graduation is 4.7 to 4.8 years. Dr. Ackerson asked if they could get funding the last year. Dr. Dahl said that some can. Efforts have been made to make more scholarships extend for multiple years. Also it is not clear whether students are choosing to go longer or whether our programs are forcing that. Ms. Jones said that many girls are getting married before their senior year. She will be attending 17 weddings this summer. Dr. Dahl said that we are not capturing the long-term picture in all of this data. Dr. Halligan added that the goal of this is not to have anyone change their academic standards. We are only trying to understand why that many students in good academic standing are leaving.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

- 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.
- 97-02-02-ADHOC *Patent Policy I-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. Special review group met 3/27/98 and following up on possible revisions. (See Halligan memo dated 3-31-98.) Revised draft prepared and under review by Dean's Council.
- 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.
- 98-02-03-FAC ***Timing of the A&D Process:*** Under review. Currently being reviewed through Academic Affairs.
- 98-02-05-SALR ***Course Syllabi Availability:*** Under review. Currently being reviewed through Academic Affairs.
- 98-03-01-FAC ***Personal Profit on Required Materials:*** Under review by Academic Affairs.
- 98-04-02-BUDG ***Faculty Computer Allocation:*** To be reviewed with the University Budget Committee as FY99 budget plans are finalized.
- 98-04-03-RES ***Research Scientist Positions be Added to the Faculty Handbook:*** To be reviewed with the Research Committee.
- 98-05-01-ASP ***Changes in Academic Regulation 5.4 (Dropping Courses):***
To President Hallligan.
- 98-05-02-BUDG ***Increase in Promotion Raises:*** To President Hallligan.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Gerald Horn

Dr. Horn introduced Brant Adams who is a member of the ASP Committee and thanked Bill Ivy for his assistance with the development of this recommendation. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:** 1) Paragraph 2 be revised as follows: After the deadline for dropping with no record, but prior to the end of the twelfth week of classes of regular semester or the 6th week of the eight week summer session, or proportionate periods for block or short courses, a student may drop a course and the grade of "W" (dropped) will be recorded on the student's academic record. 2) Paragraph 3 be omitted, and 3) that paragraph 4 be revised as follows: After the twelfth week of classes of regular semester, or the 6th week of the eight week summer session, or proportionate periods for block or short courses, a student may not drop a course...[no further changes]. There are a number of traps set for both faculty and students in paragraph 3 of Academic Regulation 5.4. The committee feels that students are not given enough feedback early enough in the semester to make good decisions with regard to dropping a course. Many courses have a significant portion of testing and/or assignments after the 10th week. In some cases the exams or assignments have

been completed but the results have not been returned to the students. A student may be encouraged by the instructor to remain in a class because there is plenty of opportunity left to bring up a low grade and end up not doing so. Or, a student may drop prematurely from a course s/he would have eventually completed successfully. A key reason for this recommendation is that it will allow students to be better informed and make better decisions. Paragraph 3 in the current regulation requires that a student be assigned a "W" or "F" during the 7th to 10th week period. The "F" is counted in the GPA. There was faculty concern about the fact that many faculty are currently assigning students the grade of "W" even though the student was failing at the time of the drop. So the current policy is not being applied consistently by the faculty. This recommendation will result in a policy that will more accurately and honestly reflect what is already occurring. The recommendation is less punitive to students and should encourage student success and retention. Dr. Horn responded to a budget concern of President Halligan by stating that the recommendation is revenue neutral since no tuition or fees are refunded after the second week. Dr. Halligan said that the students pay only 25% of the total cost. When does the state count enrollment? Dr. Dahl said that the state count occurs at the end of an academic year. It appears that this change would be negligible with respect to state funding since the state uses a three year rolling average or actual enrollment whichever is higher. The expectation would be that students who withdrew would come back and be counted as completers later on. Dr. Johannes said he liked the proposal but is there a chance for abuse by athletes or some other group. Dr. Vitek said that any athlete must complete the semester with 12 hours during any season of participation so they can not drop many classes. Dr. Ackerson asked what was the underlying purpose of the drop policy — grade enhancement? Dr. Horn said the purpose of this recommendation is to provide more information to the students. Dr. Moder said there are two parts to the recommendation. The first is the question of the "WF" and the "W" and the second is the change from 10th to 12th week. The first is a good idea since that is what is currently happening. But there does not seem to be a good reason to allow the drop period to extend through 80% of the course. If they do not have enough information at the end of 10 weeks then the next two should not make that much difference. Dr. Adams said that at the end of the 12th week the student is far more likely to be legitimately qualified to take an "I" in the course. This is a more positive incentive for the student to ultimately complete the work. The current rules allows the assignment of an "F" for as little as 25% of the work. Dr. Moder said that the longer they are given the less responsibility they take for their actions. Why not give them to the end of the semester? Dr. Adams replied that the state does not allow it. Dr. Moder asked if it should not also be an academic standard concern. Dr. Adams replied that academic standards have to do with what goes on in the classroom. Dr. Moder added that it also has to do with the way the students interact with what goes on in the classroom. Dr. Adams said that we have to account for the many things that come up in different students situations. This recommendation will allow us the flexibility to deal with many of the situations that arise. Dr. Moder said that even now a student can petition. Dr. Adams replied that the petition process has been primarily a rubber-stamp process but is very cumbersome and this recommendation would provide some relief. Dr. Lawry said that several years ago we loosened the drop policy then a few years later the policy was tightened again. In a few years we will probably tighten the policy again. To give a different approach Dr. Lawry proposed an amendment. **Replace paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 in regulation 5.4 by the statement, "After the deadline for dropping with no record, but prior to the last day of class, a student may drop a class and the grade of "W(week number)" will be recorded on the students academic record.** Dr. Ackerson seconded. Dr. Lawry said that there would be no impact on the students GPA. There are two kinds of "F" being given, an academic "F" and a character "F". The academic "F" is given to a student who completes the course but can not learn the material and the character "F" is given to students who do not do the work or stop attending class. In this way it would appear on the transcript that the students had made a habit of dropping late in the semester. This method would just describe the situation. Dr. Vitek asked if SIS would handle the weeks on the transcript. Dr. Dahl said that it would not without a gargantuan modification of the system. Dr. Lawry said if a student withdraws "WF" it appears on the transcript so why not "W9". Dr. Dahl said that the state limits the withdraws to the 12th week. The appeals committee that considers drops after the deadline hear about 100 cases each semester. About 70% of these appeals say instructors have

encouraged them to stay in the course or that they did not get relevant information. The modification to the SIS system would be large and very expensive to make the system accommodate this amendment. **Amendment failed.** Dr. Moder said that if there are currently 100 cases it does not seem to merit extending the drop period. Dr. Moder moved to amend the motion by **replacing the 12th week by the 10th week.** Dr. Lawry seconded. Dr. Horn said that the extension was to allow the student to have more information before making the drop decision. It is true that 80% of the course is completed but the students do not have 80% of the information. Dr. Moder said that we should pass a resolution urging faculty to make sure students have some information before the withdraw date. Dr. Vitek said some faculty have exams 4 to 6 weeks with out returning them. We have no hook on the faculty. Dr. Schwarz said that if you want a transcript that reflects character as well as academic achievement then that information should already be there when you see a student has taken 10 years to finish and has a dozen W's. Dr. Sanders said that as chair of the Academic Appeals Board it is a fallacy to equate the proportion of the course completed with the proportion of the grade evaluation returned. There are a variety of reasons besides bad instructors that students do not have 80% of their grade evaluation at that time. Dr. Moder said she would be surprised if they had 80% of their grade determined but do they need 80% of their grade to make a decision on whether to drop. Dr. Sanders said that many do not have 50% of their grades back. Dr. Moder said that she has students do group projects that are to be done at the end of the semester and it is very unfair to the remaining students if they do not know until week 12 that one of their group members will not be there to complete the project. Dr. Adams said he can see that in this case it could cause a problem but the recommendation was not to lower standards but to simplify a process that is sort of happening defacto. Ms. Jones said that she would probably have 10 "W's" by the time she graduates. Probably half of the students that drop do not do so because they do not like their instructor, are failing, or do not like the class, but drop because they changed their major or do not need the course. Some courses are dropped because of a misunderstanding of what the course is about. There are a lot more reasons than "I flunked my first test and the second test is not until week 11 and then I have a final." Dr. Moder asked how many universities have a drop policy of at least 12 weeks that are peer institutions. Dr. Horn said that in the Big 12 only the University of Nebraska. Three other institutions, Texas, Texas A&M, and Iowa State, allow drops to the end of the semester but limit the total number of drops in an academic career. The remaining schools are more in line with the 10th week deadline. **Amendment failed. Original motion passed.**

BUDGET — Carol Moder

Dr. Moder brought the following recommendation from the Budget Committee. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the university raise the amount of promotion raises to \$2000 for promotion to Associate Professor and \$4000 for promotion to Full Professor.** The current promotion raise is \$1000 for Assistant to Associate and \$1500 for Associate to Full. The main justification is in a comparison with Big 12 schools. For Assistant Professors OSU is slightly over the Big 12 average but at only 95% of the Big 12 average for Associate Professors and only 91% of the Big 12 average for Professors. By increasing promotion raises salary compression will be addressed. These are the amounts that are currently used by OU. The cost of this for this year would be approximately \$98K or an increase of \$68K over the current system. Dr. Lawry asked if this money will come from raise money or if the committee had a plan to get it somewhere else like buying fewer computers. Dr. Moder replied that it would come from the raise money. Dr. Horn asked if the committee discussed possible cases where an Associate Professor was already making a salary equivalent to the average Full Professor salary then after promotion the new Full Professor would be well above the mean for Full Professors. Dr. Moder replied that the concern was not entirely to make this an equity raise which could be addressed in a different way but to recognize the accomplishments of a faculty member for his/her achievements. The committee felt the promotion raises should not be less for a person who makes a large salary. **Motion passed.**

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Ed Arquitt

Dr. Arquitt reported the health care proposal that was supported by the Faculty Council last month was accepted by the Regents. There will be a consultant hired to look at health care and the other benefits packages. The consultant will have a recommendation, hopefully, in September to the Health Care Committee. The current plan is outlined in the OSU employee *News Flash* and is based on the State Plan and will continue until Jan. '99 or at the latest July '99. The mail order prescription plan has now been finalized. A 90 day supply of a maintenance drug can be purchased by mail order for \$15 for generic or \$30 for brand name. Three meetings are scheduled to learn about the program, May 13, 14, and 15. Remember to consider the possibility of a change in the health plan in January when you make your decision on flex. Dr. Moder asked why we can get a 90 day supply by mail order but not locally. Ms. Matoy said you can get a 90 day supply locally but it is considered three prescriptions and you pay three minimum rates. The reason is that mail order is primarily intended for 90 day supplies. Maintenance drugs account for the largest part of the drug cost. By moving these to mail order, which is more cost effective, the plan saves. The local pharmacist does not give the same level of discount for 90 day purchases. The plan should be available by June 1. The benefits section of the Web Site will have a link to PCS which contains more information on what is coming.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Janet Kimbrell

Dr. Kimbrell presented the following resolution: *Whereas Diane LaFollette has provided extraordinary service to Oklahoma State University Faculty Council and specifically the Rules and Procedures Committee of Faculty Council by generously and cheerfully contributing above and beyond the expected duty in conducting the Faculty Council elections, Be it resolved that OSU Faculty Council recognizes Diane's many contributions and expresses thanks to her with deep appreciation.* Diane has spent many hours verifying rosters, color coordinating nomination forms and rosters, sticking mailing labels, folding rosters, stuffing envelopes, receiving nominations and ballots, and opening envelopes and segregating ballots. We are sure many of these hours were spent at home after 5 p.m. Thank you Diane. Your efforts are greatly appreciated. Resolution passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

ATHLETIC COUNCIL — Dennis Bertholf reported that the AC met April 19. The Fiscal Integrity Committee reported that they expect \$210K to go toward debit reduction. The first phase of the softball field construction will cost \$1.1M out of a total cost of \$1.4M. The Student Athlete Welfare and Gender Equity Committee is discussing the marketing of sports at OSU, the status of progress toward the Title IX plan, and are investigating the addition of one new sport. The ones under consideration are women's equestrian or crew. Under new business there was a discussion of excused absences for OSU sponsored events. Some athletes have been forced to drop classes because they were not allowed to make up missed work.

STUDENT PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE — Steve Locy reported there will be co-editors for the Summer O'Colly, Allison Warden and Matt Clayton and Jason Collington will be the editor for the fall.

EMERITI ASSOCIATION — Dan Lingelbach said that Don Holmes will be the new chair and the liaison representative to Faculty Council. The association is still looking for a place to have their dinners since the current quarters hold only about 35 people and there were 70 present for the last meeting. Fortunately Friday nights in Bennett are quiet so they spread into the halls. Dr. Halligan thanked the association for his and Ann's invitation to the dinner. He is now well aware of their seating problems.

STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL — Suzette Lavoie reported that SAC is interested in the health care problems. The council is currently working on the OTRS rule of 26. There has been a committee formed to look into the Sick Leave Bank. There are 3 faculty on that committee.

GRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION — **Nizam Najd** reported that the association is working on a proposal to provide health care benefits for TA's and RA's. Jennifer Webb is the President Elect and is a Doctoral Student in Design, Housing and Merchandising and will be President starting August 1. Dr. Halligan thanked Mr. Najd for his work.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION — **Kristen Jones** reported that SGA is currently planning Lights on Stillwater for the first Wednesday of school in the fall. There will be a couple of live bands. The new offices in 004 Student Union are very nice. They want to get some rooms in which to put beds for some of the members that stay night after night. President Halligan said he did not know about the beds! (much laughter). The week of Dead Week 15 students went to the Capitol to talk to legislators and Capital Cowboys about higher education. The SGA is looking at forming a more formal group of students that would follow all legislation that would affect OSU and lobby for or against it. Ms. Jones said that she had found her best excuse for missing class, "I'm lobbying for OSU at the Capitol." Dr. Halligan said that the Capitol Cowboys are members of the legislature that attended OSU and they are presented pictures of the Library. The honorary Capital Cowboys are people that wanted to be Capital Cowboys but who God did not show the light earlier in their life.

NEW BUSINESS:

Dr. Buchanan thanked the administration and President Halligan for their support of the Special Olympics. It has been a privilege to serve the faculty for the past two years. This is a special organization and one that is important to the welfare of the institution. He has come to realize how important it is to have President Halligan with us. Many times people ask what the Faculty Council does. Just looking at the minutes it does not appear that much happened. Sometimes the minutes do not fully show what really happened. Several times sitting next to President Halligan you can sense that the interest level jumps up and a month or so later something changes. The President does listen to the discussions and it makes a difference. Dr. Buchanan thanked the other officers and Diane for their support. Dr. Buchanan passed the gavel to Dr. Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson presented the following resolutions:

Whereas the following Faculty Councilors have completed their terms with distinction: Bruce Ackerson, Kenneth Bierman, Garry Bice Cheryl Farr, Warren Finn, Gerald Horn, Paul Hsu, Janet Kimbrell, Ed Lawry, Lynne Richards, Linda Robinson, Gretchen Schwarz, Hilda Crane Smith, Be it therefore resolved that , on behalf of the OSU faculty, the Faculty Council recognizes their commitment of time and effort and expresses thanks for their outstanding service. The resolution passed.

Whereas Dr. David Buchanan has served as the Chair of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council during the 1997-1998 academic year with honor, distinction, forcefulness, concern, humor, and great fairness, and whereas he has led the faculty by representing their needs with clarity and decisiveness, and whereas he has served as an outstanding liaison between faculty and administration, Be it therefore resolved that on behalf of the OSU faculty, the Faculty Council recognizes his many accomplishments and expresses its thanks with deep appreciation. The resolution passed.

Natalea Watkins reported four OSU students presented projects during the Oklahoma EPSCoR Research Day at the Capitol. Anna Forsberg, a student in the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Inna Akselrod, a Microbiology major, received two of the OSRHE/Oklahoma EPSCoR Undergraduate Research Fellowship Awards for projects they presented. They both received \$1,000 to further pursue another research project and will prepare a written report on their work to turn over to EPSCoR.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is June9, 1998.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary