

Nancy Wilkinson called the meeting to order with the following members present: Arquitt, Bertholf, Bost, Carlozzi, Cole, Daugherty, Dawson, Eastman, Edgley, Gedra, Hsu, Johannes, Kimbrell, Martin, Miller, Moder, Montgomery, Peck, Rhoten, Sanders, Scott, Sisson, Tilley, and Warde. Also present: Beer, Beverage, Birdwell, Carroll, Holmes, Keener, Nielsen, Tye, and Young. Absent: Gregson, Hallgren, Hoffer, Krenzer, and Locy

HIGHLIGHTS

OSU/OKC	1
Threats and Violence in the Workplace	1
Legislative Update	2
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Reports of Standing Committees	4
Academic Standards and Policies.....	4
Budget	5
Compensation Guidelines for Faculty Within Ranks:	
Program Completion and Revision Recommendation	5
Health Care Cost Offset Raise Recommendation.....	6
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security.....	6
Faculty	6
Long-Range Planning	7
Research	7
Retirement and Fringe Benefits.....	7
Rules and Procedures	7
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	7
Reports of Liaison Representatives	7
Athletic Council.....	7
Emeriti Association	8
Staff Advisory Council	8
New Business.....	8

Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the May 12, 1998, Minutes. Dr. Moder seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the, June 9, 1998, Agenda. Dr. Gedra seconded. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: OSU/OKC — Jerry Carroll and Jerry Nielsen

Dr. Carroll is the Provost at OSU/OKC. He thanked Faculty Council for inviting he and Dr. Nielsen to attend the meeting. He has been Provost at OSU/OKC since July 1997, and said they had made several changes during the year and one that he was proud of was the joint development of a Policy Manual. The manual was written by a faculty committee chaired by Dr. Nielsen. The document will be taken to the Regents next week. One reason for attending the meeting was to see how OSU's Faculty Council operates. Dr. Carroll invited the faculty to visit the OKC campus. Dr. Nielsen is chair of the OSU/OKC Faculty Council and was interested in seeing how OSU's council operated. Their Faculty Council is currently studying the committee structure.

SPECIAL REPORT: THREATS AND VIOLENCE IN THE WORKPLACE — Ernest Tye, OSU

Police/Public Safety Department, distributed a draft of a proposed policy concerning Workplace Threats and Violence. This draft has been reviewed by Legal Counsel and the Personnel Office on campus. Dr. Tye reported that the number one cause of death for women in the workplace and the number two cause of death of men in the workplace is homicide. Also, not all workplace violence is homicide but it gets the most publicity. This document is not bullet proof and will not protect against someone coming to work angry and committing an act of violence. It does help manage the situation and make our workplace

safer. OSU has been doing some of these things for several years but this document just formalizes the process. It makes it clear to all employees that no violence, no threats of violence, no intimidation, no innuendos of threats will be tolerated at OSU. The document defines some terms, points out that the policy applies to all faculty, staff, and students on the OSU campus. The document also states that all employees shall immediately report acts of violence and serious threats to a supervisor, the Office of University Personnel, Campus Police or any administrative unit management official. The university will not tolerate retaliation against employees making good faith reports and that supervisors etc., receiving reports of acts of violence or serious threats shall take appropriate steps to reduce or eliminate the immediate danger and send a written report to the Threat Assessment Team. OSU, through a group of administrators identified as the Campus Crisis Team, will provide debriefing teams, counseling, and support as needed. The Threat Assessment Team and Campus Crisis Team may include some of the same members but they have different purposes. The Threat Assessment Team seeks to recognize and avert violent acts while the Campus Crisis Team provides support services after a traumatic event. An important part of the policy is to mandate the availability of training for all levels of employees. We can do some things that will decrease the possibility for workplace violence, like not hiring people who are predisposed to violence. Personnel is already doing an excellent job of screening new hires. Dr. Tye asked that the faculty review the document and send any comments to him at 104 USDA Building. Dr. Sanders said that he appreciates this policy. There are many causes for violence but that some of it is caused by mental illness. In this case some people only use violence when they are not on their medication. Dr. Tye replied that there are services on campus that can address such cases in a confidential way. It may be that the supervisor just needs to know about such services. In many cases there may be no need for police intervention. If a person, once medicated, can be a productive member of our staff, then we do not want to destroy that persons career.

SPECIAL REPORT: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE — **Harry Birdwell** addressed several issues which occurred during this legislative session that impacted OSU. **1. Administrative Procedures Act:** The Administrative Procedures Act has been a problem for higher education institutions since it takes at least 14 months to make a rules change at the Board of Regents level. We are now exempted from section 1 of the act. **2. New Regent:** Larry Bump from Tulsa has been appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate as an OSU Regent replacing Ed Keller, whose term recently expired. **3. OTRS:** Dr. Birdwell served as the Governors representative on a panel to suggest changes to the teacher retirement system. The panel made several suggestions, some of which were accepted by the legislature, and some were not. One thing working against change has been the phenomenal performance of the stock market. The retirement system was funded at a 37% actuarial soundness two years ago and due to the increases in the market the assets are 44%. It still requires a radical overhaul. One of the recommendations that was accepted was a change from dependence on the natural gas tax to a percentage of the general fund. The gross production tax receipts fluctuate from year to year. They represent a diminishing resource whose value will decrease in the future. This year, the last year the gross production tax will be used to fund OTRS, the revenues are up. Consequently, the administrative fee that is paid into OTRS will not increase this year. **4. Funding:** When the legislative session began the House and Senate said Higher Education had two pretty good years and they had promised all additional funding to roads and prisons. The Governor has become an advocate of higher education. He has learned that higher education has to be well funded due to the link between the number of high technology companies willing to locate in Oklahoma and the proportion of the population who have a college degree. As long as a state is in the bottom third in terms of the number of people who have a college education it will be in the bottom third in terms of wages and average annual income. The Governor proposed that higher education be given \$70M in additional funding. The House and Senate were talking \$10M to \$30M. As the session drew to a close there were several issues not decided. In the end everyone agreed to make some compromises that would give everyone part of what they wanted. This worked to the benefit of higher education and OSU. Higher Education received \$63.9M in new money. This is about the third highest increase in the history of the state. (The administration also spent time lobbying the State Regents to have as much of the new money as possible come directly to the institutions.) Most institutions in the state intend to have a faculty and staff salary increase that will be about 3%. Dr. Keener and Dr. Birdwell will recommend to the regents a 4% increase effective October 1, 1998. **5. Tulsa:** There was a considerable amount of money put into the Tulsa solution. There were also accommodations made with Northeastern and Langston in order to get the legislation passed. Senate Bill 1426 makes Rogers University Tulsa a branch of OSU

effective January 1, 1999. Considerable credit goes to the President, the Regents, the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, and the Governor to get this passed. It is a very complex task to transition this new branch. A transition team is in place and each member of the team has met with their counterpart at Tulsa at least one time. **6. Bond Issue:** There was a \$300M bond issue passed by the legislature at the end of the session. The details of this are still being worked out but we think that higher education will get \$45M, of which \$10M will go to Tulsa and Rogers University in Claremore. Of what is left, we believe one-third will go to two year institutions, one-third to four year institutions and a one-third split between OSU and OU. OSU should get approximately \$6M. The OSU Budget Committee developed approximately \$25M in capital priorities. **7. Research:** OSU has also worked with the legislature and the Governor to improve funding for research in order to bring new economic opportunities to the state. It was research that led to the economic development of the Silicon Valley, Austin, Massachusetts and North Carolina. We proposed that OSU and OU each be given \$0.5M on a recurring basis to have an Office of Intellectual Property. This office would help to develop the intellectual properties produced on campus by getting investors and patents. At the same time OSU is working with the Economic Development Administration to get a high tech research park in Stillwater. The State Regents should have some additional funds to stimulate research in the state. The Offices of Intellectual Properties were funded and the State Regents for Higher Education received \$3M which will be available on a competitive basis to the institutions to stimulate new projects. Proposals were due recently and OSU submitted 14. **8. College Savings Plan:** House Bill 2933 created the Oklahoma College Savings Plan with allows parents to save money and when it is used for tuition there is no state tax. Dr. Eastman asked about the difference in appropriation between OSU and OU. OU got about a 9.7% increase and OSU got about 6.5%. Dr. Birdwell replied that in 1992 when the HERO bond issue was passed the legislature agreed to fund the maintenance costs for the new buildings when they came on line at a rate of approximately \$4 per square foot. OU's Stoval Museum will come on line next year and all OSU's buildings came on line last year. Last year OSU got the maintenance money for the Advanced Technology Research Center and the last half of the money for the Food Processing Center. This represents about a \$2M difference in their funding and OSU's. They also will probably report 700 to 900 more FTE students than OSU will. Dr. Moder asked if the 4% compensation package included the equity money. Dr. Birdwell replied that whatever equity money is approved will be in excess of the 4%. Dr. Edgley asked about the constitutional issues with the appointment of a separate board for Tulsa. Dr. Birdwell said that their board is not a constitutional board. It is a statutory board and it is advisory to the Oklahoma A&M board. Dr. Young said that OTRS will not cost OSU more money but will the base be raised so that it will cost the employee more money. Dr. Birdwell replied that it would. Dr. Arquitt asked if the possibility of merging OTRS with the OK Employees Retirement Program was discussed. The OK Employees Program is well funded. Dr. Birdwell replied that it was discussed. The Judicial Pension System, the Firefighters Pension System, and the State Employees System are all funded at 100% or in excess of that. Nationally the average funding level for public pension systems is at the 80% level which is actuarially sound. It was discussed by the task force to look at the over-funded level of each of the other three programs and as long as they are funded above the 80% level shift the contributions from those plans to OTRS. If this were done then OTRS would be immediately raised to a 64% funding level and in eight years would be funded at an 80% level.

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 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.

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

June 9, 1998

Page 4

- 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):*** Accepted.
- 98-05-02-BUDG ***Increase in Promotion Raises:*** Under review by the Budget Committee. History of current promotional increases being researched by Academic Affairs. To be considered by the academic deans.
- 98-06-01-BUDG ***Compensation Guidelines for Faculty Within Ranks: Program Completion and Revision:*** To President Halligan
- 98-06-02-BUDG ***Health Care Cost Offset Raise:*** To President Halligan

Dr. Wilkinson asked the status of the Patent Policy. It is currently being considered by the Research Committee. How soon does the administration want it returned. Dr. Keener replied that they would like to have it by early fall due to the creation of the new Intellectual Properties Office.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — **Bill Warde** reported that the Faculty Council approved the following five recommendations brought by the ASP committee. 1. Part-time student GPA for honor roll, 2. Preparation of Common Exams for multiple sections, 3. Change in Academic Regulation 1.6 re: enrollment of student on probation, 4. Alternate Admission (8%) program, 5. Changes in Academic Regulation 5.4 (Dropping Courses). All of these recommendations have been accepted by the administration. The committee is studying the policy for withdrawing from the university and the time period by which the grade of "I" has to be changed. Other items that have been brought to the committees attention are policies for make-up exams for students, the policy for granting students an academic reprieve, and the policy on military admission to the university. The last item has to do with allowing full-time military personnel the right to enroll as adult students in the university regardless of age. There seems to be a misunderstanding between us and some military personnel on what our policy is.

BUDGET — **Carol Moder** reported the Budget Committee has three possible areas for investigation next year. The first is the budget impact of the addition of OSU/Tulsa to our system. What will now happen to compensation or course load for faculty who teach in Tulsa? Another issue is what are faculty priorities with respect to the distribution of compensation between salary and benefits. That is, would faculty rather get more in salary and pay for the benefits themselves or have more of the benefits provided by the university. The committee is considering surveying the faculty on this issue. A third issue is compensation for extension activities across colleges. University Extension has been centralized and the committee wants to see if there are consistent policies across colleges in terms of compensation. The committee also presented two recommendations. First, **Compensation Guidelines for Faculty Within Ranks: Program Completion and Revision. The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:** 1) **The university provide funds to complete the program begun this year to bring the academic year salary (nine or ten months) of any tenured faculty member that falls below \$50,000 for the rank of Professor or \$40,000 for the rank of Associate Professor to these levels, subject to administrative review. Beginning at the time of the next salary raise program, all salaries below these levels should be raised to the levels given, unless a low salary can be justified by the supervising administrators on the basis of clearly documented low productivity.** 2) **In the future, faculty members should be brought up to the appropriate level when promoted.** This recommendation is related to a recommendation that was brought last year and which failed by one vote. Last years recommendation carried an estimated price tag of \$300K . However the administration addressed the issue by taking \$50K of the equity money and raising the salaries of 29 faculty members who were below these levels, whose departments were on average below the Big 12 average and who were three years in rank. If there is no raise program there would still be 42 faculty who do not meet these minimums. As of last fall the administration estimated that with a 5% program the number would only be 18 faculty and would cost \$46K. With a 4% program the cost would be more than \$46K but less than \$110K. Dr. Sanders asked if there was any plan to handle people who are on 11 or 12 month appointments. Dr. Moder said a persons salary should be calculated on a 9 or 10 month basis to see if they qualified. Dr. Johannes asked about the word "falls" in the recommendation. **Dr. Moder accepted the friendly amendment to change the word "falls" to "is".** Dr. Eastman asked if the administration used the same numbers when they did the equity last year. Dr. Moder replied that they did. Dr. Eastman asked why these numbers were chosen. Dr. Moder replied that the numbers came from a comparison with four-year institutions in the state. These numbers put OSU's minimum salaries for each rank above the average salaries in each rank of the four year non-comprehensive universities in the state. Dr. Wilkinson said that the committee will publish a report that compares OSU's salaries with those of the Big 12. Dr. Johannes said that he has mixed emotions about this recommendation. The marketplace does dictate certain salary levels. Also, it appears from the numbers presented that the \$110K is probably closer. Dr. Moder said that last years merit increase decreased the need. Dr. Johannes asked if these numbers would be changed every year. Dr. Moder said that it should be linked to some kind of index but the current plan is to look at it in a few years and see if we are out of line. Dr. Rhoten asked where the money would come from. Dr. Moder replied that it would come from the equity pool. Dr. Eastman asked what would happen if the equity pool is not large enough. Dr. Moder said that the administration should put in what they can this year and do the rest in the future. Dr. Johannes asked if this needed to be passed. Last year it was voted down and the administration went ahead with a similar program. Dr. Moder said that the Faculty Council has the obligation to let the administration know what the priorities of the faculty are. Dr. Gedra asked if Dr. Birdwell or Dr. Keener knew how large the equity pool would be this year. Dr. Birdwell replied that the budget has not been completed so there is no definite number available but the last two years there has been \$200K in each faculty and staff equity. It should be in the same range this year. Dr. Edgley asked about the administrations opinion on this. Dr. Keener replied that there are certain areas where the salaries are low according to the Big 12 average. The administration wants to do this on the basis of merit. Dr. Edgley said it would be astonishing if faculty thought this was an unreasonable proposal and endorsed the idea that market value should completely determine salaries. Would it be alright to hire a professor for \$15K if the market was saturated in his area? This is a very reasonable proposal. Dr. Eastman said the numbers seem to be very arbitrary. The numbers should be gauged against peer institution numbers not just against a fixed dollar amount. Dr. Moder said that the equity issue is generally dealt with across the board. So that a faculty member who makes \$90K per year may be treated the same way as one who makes \$29K per year if they

are both below their peer's salaries. Dr. Eastman said that the money should be distributed to faculty on the basis of the percentage they are below their peers not based on salary. Dr. Moder said we all live in the same community with similar living costs so just because of market forces why should one person make \$29K and another make \$90K. The committee is not recommending that everyone be paid the same salary only that the minimum salary at a comprehensive university should be as much as the average salary at a non-comprehensive university. Dr. Eastman said it makes more sense to give the money to someone who is 40% below their peers rather than someone who is 10% below. It is not possible to legislate out the market forces. Dr. Moder said that relying only on market value could result in salary discrepancies of \$50K for Associate Professors. Dr. Warde said that any index is just as arbitrary as \$40 or \$50K. Dr. Johannes said that the \$40-\$110K does not include the cost imposed by number 2 in the recommendation. Dr. Moder said that the cost is not included but will not be a very large amount. The faculty that received this money last year received a significant morale boost. **Motion passed as amended.** Dr. Moder said the next recommendation came to the committee late in the year and the committee did not have time to discuss details about how this should be carried out or what the appropriate dollar amount should be but the committee feels it is important. **Health Care Cost Offset Raise. The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: In addition to allocating funds for a merit raise program, the administration consider funding a salary increase of a specific dollar amount for all employees in order to help offset the increase in health care costs.** Dr. Moder continued to say that the particular concern to the committee was staff and lower paid faculty who are much harder hit by the health care increases. Dr. Rhoten asked if the emeriti would be getting a check to cover this also. Dr. Johannes asked if this proposal had gone before the RFB committee. Dr. Moder replied that it had not. Dr. Daugherty asked if this would also apply to employees who are not eligible for the health plan. Dr. Moder said that the assumption is that everyone would get a raise. The details are being left to the administration but assumption is that everyone would be given a dollar amount in addition to the merit raise program. There was some discussion about it being better if the university just paid the premium increases but some employees will only realize deductible increases. Dr. Sanders said that the council needs to continue to study the question, does this institution have adequate health coverage? Dr. Moder replied that this only covers the current problem. The administration could choose to handle this as a one-time raise until we know what the permanent solution will be. **Motion passed.**

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — **Mark Sisson** reported there are two pressing concerns for the committee. The first is to provide a plan for safe bicycle traffic on campus. The first step is to educate the faculty, staff and students about bicycle and pedestrian rights, regulations and sense of responsibility. A brochure will be produced and the student newspaper could help. Administrators, staff and faculty should be encouraged to bike or walk to work to lessen congestion, parking problems and air pollution. The second concern is to find a way to fund a cost effective shopping shuttle with a convenient schedule for students in student housing. A survey showed that most riders were satisfied with the service but no permanent budgetary line has been established to continue it. Over 1600 business stops were made.

FACULTY — **Chuck Edgley** reported the committee put forth four recommendations and all four were passed by the council but three are still pending administration approval. 1. P&P Letter on Faculty Promotion and Tenure Process. This document was sent to the committee by Dr. Keener. The committee reworked the document. 2. Faculty Council review of Promotion and Tenure P&P Letter. This resolution asked the administration to return the document to the Faculty Council if any other group made major changes in it before it is approved by the administration. 3. Faculty Perceptions of the A&D Process. This resolution asked the administration to distribute the summary of a survey done by Adrienne Hyle and Michael Mills and asked the EVP to remind deans of their responsibility to provide written responses to A&D disputes in the department and conduct workshops on the A&D process. Accepted by the Administration. 4. Personal Profit on Required Materials. This recommendation is that the university adopt a policy that professors can not make a profit on materials which they require students to buy. Dr. Johannes asked about enforcement. Dr. Edgley said that it is sometimes hard to enforce the right thing to do but it does not make it less the right thing to do. Dr. Wilkinson said that the Faculty Committee has a heavy burden in helping Dr. Keener with the promotion and tenure decisions which he feels need additional faculty input before the final decision is made.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING — **Janet Cole** reported that the charge of the LRP committee is to examine the future of OSU, the university clientele relationship, and faculty development. The committee has a high turnover rate so last years committee set out to educate itself about issues inside and outside the university that would affect the universities planning. John Wesley, the Stillwater Community Development Director discussed the Stillwater Comprehensive Plan. Gary Trennepohl, who is a member of the Citizens Commission on Higher Education, discussed the recommendations of the commission. Ron Area discussed the OSU Foundation and Jerry Gill and Harry Birdwell discussed alumni relations. The committee also worked with Jack Vitek in the "Research Makes It Happen" initiative. The committee will be looking at OSU/Tulsa this year.

RESEARCH — **Richard Bost** said this is the second year for this committee. Some issues to be considered this year will be intellectual property rights, patent policy, conflict of interest, distribution of indirect costs, research centers, support for the research infrastructure, especially the IRB, Carnegie 1 research status, the undergraduate research and scholarship environment, and technology transfer. The committee wants to develop liaisons with different research infrastructure groups especially the Research Council. The committee will examine the faculty needs for education about intellectual property protections and responsibilities. The committee should have its first meeting this month.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — **Ed Arquitt** said the committee stays in close contact with Personnel in order to keep up with changes in the benefit programs. The committee sponsored the TIAA-CREF national conference on focus on investing. This is a way of keeping OSU informed as to our need to be more involved in our retirement planning. There was a time when faculty looked to the university to take care of them when they retired, but that is no longer the case. The committee hopes to sponsor the TIAA-CREF conference again this year. The committee will also continue to monitor the OTRS changes. One of the big issues will be health care. No one is happy with what is happening with health care. Hopefully some solutions can be worked out next year. A consultant should be chosen by the Regents at the next meeting. An issue that has been discussed in the committee is the development of a more flexible benefits package. It may be reasonable to go to a "cafeteria" style plan where each employee is given a certain number of dollars and can tailor their benefits package to their own needs. The committee will be looking at a philosophy statement about health care. That is, should our health care plan be basically a wellness program or a program that pays for all our health care needs or a catastrophic health care program. The committee together with the Health Care Committee and the consultant hope to have a recommendation in regard to health care by September.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — **Nancy Wilkinson** reported for Gene Krenzer who was out of town. The committee runs the elections each year. Last spring the committee had the Herculean task of revising and updating the voting rosters.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — **Margaret Scott** reported that the committee's top priority will continue to be library concerns. The committee is waiting for Dean Johnson's paper on intellectual property and is working on this issue from a different direction than the Research Committee. Other issues concern student welfare in general, on campus daycare and the Martin Luther King Day celebration.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

ATHLETIC COUNCIL — **Dennis Bertholf** reported that the AC met May 21 and Maryanne Mowen reported that the council approved the playing of a basketball game the weekend before final examinations. The Fiscal Integrity Committee reported the athletic budget for FY98 was \$13.3M. They were able to apply \$250K to debt reduction which reduced the debt to \$2.7M. The Student Athlete Welfare and Gender Equity Committee will make a recommendation at the June meeting as to whether equestrian or crew will be added in the fall of '98. Compliance Officer, Rich Allen, reported on the many activities he handles as to education about the rules for coaches, athletes, and alumni and support groups. He also deals with the internal audit of institutional scholarships, tuition waivers, general eligibility, summer camps and ticket operations. He has also been reviewing implementation and monitoring activities to see that OSU's procedures are in order.

EMERITI ASSOCIATION — **Don Holmes** reported that most activities of the association continue through the summer. The major challenge is to find accommodations for the first Friday dinner. They are trying a different arrangement about every month.

STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL — **Tina Beverage** reported that the council has nearly raised the \$1500 needed for staff scholarships which will be matched by the administration. Please encourage the staff who qualify to apply for these scholarships. SAC is also concerned about the health care program and has most of the same concerns as the faculty. The Sick Leave Bank Committee has been formed and there are faculty, staff, and administrators on it. The new compensation classification system is to go on line July 1, 1999 and this will be a big change for staff.

NEW BUSINESS:

Dr. Keener said the Big 12 vice presidents meet at least one time and sometimes twice a year. Some initiatives have been developed in which all the schools can participate. One of those is the Big 12 fellowship program. All schools are now participating and sending and receiving fellows. OSU has had the lead in sending but trails in receiving. Please encourage your colleagues to invite scholars to come to OSU as well as applying to go to other universities. The program will be expanded somewhat. The real objective in expanding the program from the Big 12 institution's viewpoint is that they would like to see a higher participation rate in under-represented minority faculty and, to some extent, women. Another issue considered was the journal costs at the libraries. Every institution is feeling like they can not continue to fund the library at the level the faculty wants. This is not just OSU but all the institutions including Texas, Texas A&M and Kansas. They are all considering large cut backs in the number of journals purchased. The major problem is in the physical sciences, engineering and mathematics. The costs of journals in these areas are increasing at 40% per year and have been for several years. As an example, a study of math journals has shown that the cost per page published by Elsevier or Springer-Verlag is about \$2.60 whereas the AMS was costing only \$.34 per page. The big publishers feel no need to justify this. It is going to take the work of individual faculty to stop this by accepting alternative publications or not publishing in places that are generally thought of as the place to publish. Faculty could publish papers by different means and in different places. Faculty are the producers of the research, as well as the reviewers of the research and the editors of the journals and then we have to buy it all back at inflated prices. The universities are not going to get help from the federal government because at that level we are competing with Walt Disney, etc. This fall there will be some informational sessions for faculty about these problems. Dr. Gedra pointed out that this problem will probably continue due to the consolidation in the publishing industry. Dr. Keener said people thought that electronic publication could solve this problem but the publishers are getting control of the copyrights and if you want an electronic version they will sell it to you only if you buy the paper version and possibly other journals. Dr. Johannes asked the status of the satellite library in the old IGA building. Dr. Birdwell replied that the asbestos removal will be complete July 1. It will then take about \$250K to complete the outside and the interior work and lighting will need to be completed. Dr. Warde asked the status of the various computer bulletin boards. They have not been active for the last 6 months. Dr. Birdwell said that Communication Services has responsibility for these. It is in the list of priorities but has not been completed.

Dr. Sanders moved for adjournment. Dr. Moder seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is September 8, 1998.