

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Arquitt, Bertholf, Carlozzi, Cole, Daugherty, Edgley, Gedra, Gregson, Hallgren, Hoffer, Hsu, Johannes, Kimbrell, Krenzer, Locy, Martin, Moder, Montgomery, Peck, Rhoten, Sanders, Scott, Sisson, Tilley, Warde, and Wilkinson. Also present: Birdwell, Collins, Conway, Harp, Holmes, Jones, Keener, Konigmacher, Lomenick, Matoy, Mitchell, Vitek, and Watkins. Absent: Bost, Dawson, Eastman, and Miller.

HIGHLIGHTS

Plan for the Development of OSU-Tulsa.....	1
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	3
Reports of Standing Committees	3
Academic Standards and Policies	3
Academic Reprieve Guideline Changes Recommendation	3
Budget.....	4
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security	4
Faculty	4
Long-Range Planning	5
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	6
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	6
Reports of Liaison Representatives	7
Athletic Council.....	7
Student Publications	7
Emeriti Association	7
Staff Advisory Council.....	7
Student Government Association	7
Meeting Concerning Technology Recommendation Scheduled	8
OSU Web Site New	8
Electronic Surveys.....	8

Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the October 13, 1998, Minutes. Dr. Krenzer seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Wilkinson asked that a Special Report on the Plan for the Development of OSU-Tulsa by President Halligan be added to the November 10, 1998 Agenda before the Report of Faculty Council Recommendations. Dr. Moder moved acceptance of the, November 10, 1998, Agenda as amended. Dr. Warde seconded. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Plan for the Development of OSU-Tulsa — President Halligan reported that Senate Bill 1426 called for the President of OSU to write such a plan. A rough draft was written. Smith Holt and others went over the draft and what follows is the final result. The complete text of the plan can be found on the web at <http://www.tulsa.okstate.edu/plan.htm>. This is an evolving plan. President Halligan has already presented the plan to the Governor, the Tulsa mayor, the Tulsa legislative delegation, an economic development group that involves the Greenwood Chamber of

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

November 10, 1998

Page 2

Commerce, and a neighborhood association that surrounds the campus. There is no way that this plan will take place in its entirety but there has to be a starting point. The Vision is by the year 2020 there will be 20,000 students. The basis for this is that UCO has about 15,000 and surely will grow to at least 20,000 by 2020 and the institution in Tulsa should be about the same size. The question is always asked what is going to happen to TU. Using OKC as a template, OCU has successfully competed with OU and UCO. Similarly, OCC is successful in OKC so ORU should be successful in Tulsa. Therefore, OSU-Tulsa should not be the death knell for private education in Tulsa. President Halligan and his wife Anne have met with the students at Rogers two times. They are an excitingly different group than OSU-Stillwater students. They all have jobs, children and they know what they are taking and why they are taking it. OSU-Tulsa can develop into a classic urban university. The campus should be very technologically advanced from the very beginning. Seventy-five thousand dollars has been set aside to buy a long-range plan for the land use. The vision is to have 800 full-time faculty by 2020. A research and graduate education center and a library are the two most pressing needs. These are necessary in order to hire faculty. President Halligan and the Governor have already visited some foundations to try to raise money for these facilities. There should be money out of the upcoming legislative session to get this started. However, new money should be divided between OSU, OU and Tulsa in roughly equal amounts. OSU is not trying to go into this venture cheaply. The legislature has been told up front to expect a price tag of \$15M for a library and \$40M for a graduate and research center. By 2020, it will take about \$80M for the research faculty. (800 faculty times 100K each). A technology transfer center similar to the one under development in Stillwater has been discussed. The president has been meeting with CEOs in the Tulsa area and they say they need "knowledge workers." One said that if OSU can do it then the company would build a 15 story building next door and employ 3000 "knowledge workers." By "knowledge workers" they mean people with degrees in business, computer science, electrical engineering, accounting, etc. OSU is getting pressure to open programs in engineering and the response is "no money, no bring." OSU cannot sacrifice accreditation by offering substandard programs. The University of Tulsa has been contacted about using their laboratories. Langston and OSU are working on a cooperative program in Accounting whereby students that meet certain standards could be admitted into a 3-2 program where they would receive a masters degree from OSU and an undergraduate degree from Langston at the end of 5 years. A similar program is under consideration in Hotel and Restaurant Management. It is very important to the people of Tulsa to have many seminars and speakers on campus. Smith Holt is on a special assignment to work on the area of humanities. An American Studies program is envisioned as an undergraduate degree program to benefit students, particularly the older, job-secure students, who wish a flexible degree program rich in the arts and humanities. An Arts Management program is being discussed with Philbrook and Gilcrease Museums to be taught at the graduate level. McClain High School may be targeted for special education initiatives by OSU's College of Education. The people of Tulsa are interested in having an entertainment district surrounding the campus. Four-year Architecture students have been asked to develop, as their 1999-2000 joint class project, a comprehensive concept and development plan for this area. Dr. Moder asked if the assumption of this plan is to say what we will have there in 2020 that we do not currently have there. Dr. Halligan replied that is correct. Some programs like engineering will be put into place as soon as the money is obtained and some of the others will take more time. In 10 years we may be half way there but as the programs develop other needs may arise that will come before some of those in the vision. Dr. Krenzer asked how this will effect the Stillwater campus. President Halligan replied that he thinks it will have the same effect that UT San Antonio had on UT Austin, practically nothing but good. Oklahoma has something like 70,000 too few college graduates. The fraction of the population that needs a college education will continue to increase and many of the students that get their undergraduate degrees at Tulsa will think of OSU Stillwater as their mother campus. Dr. Johannes asked if this is seen as a blend of day and night programs or will night programs dominate. President Halligan replied that currently the parking lot at 5 p.m. is practically empty but by 8 p.m. the lot is full. But, the facilities are sitting there and so they need to be used as much as possible. Scholarship funds will be needed. It will always have an urban university character.

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 has worked with Legal Counsel to consider Appendix D changes. Legal Counsel is currently drafting policy options to include ombudsperson in the process.
- 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 by 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 and following up on possible revisions (see Halligan memo dated 3-31-98). Revised draft has been reviewed by Dean's Council. Review group will meet on 11/20 to discuss this version.
- 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.
- 98-04-03-RES ***Research Scientist Positions be Added to the Faculty Handbook:*** To be reviewed with the Research Committee to identify how the proposed position differs from the "Research Professional" already included in the Faculty Handbook.
- 98-05-02-BUDG ***Increase in Promotion Raises:*** Under review by the Budget Committee. History of current promotional increases has been researched by Academic Affairs. To be considered by the academic deans in November.
- 98-10-01-RFB ***Equalization of Premiums for OSU Employees, Retirees and Spouses:*** Under review. External consultant currently reviewing entire OSU Health Care Plan and made presentation Nov. 4 for review by all campus constituents. Video of presentation available for those who could not attend.
- 98-10-02-RFB ***Desirable Features of the OSU Health Care Plan:*** Under review. External consultants are specifically reviewing the six elements in relation to the health care options under consideration.
- 98-11-01-ASP ***Academic Reprieve Guideline Changes:*** To President Halligan

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — **Bill Warde** presented a recommendation from the committee. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:** 1) **Paragraph 2.01 of the Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures: Academic Reprieve Guidelines be amended to read "Undergraduate students who are currently enrolled and who meet the following criteria are eligible to petition for academic reprieve."** 2) **Paragraph 2.01(B) be amended to read "Prior to requesting the academic reprieve, the student must have earned at least 12 credit hours at OSU and a GPA of 2.0 or higher with no grade lower than a "C" in all regularly graded course work excluding activity or performance courses."** 3) **To be consistent with this recommendation, section B of paragraph 3.01 should be stricken, and sections C and D re-lettered as sections B and C.** 4) **The title "Dean of Undergraduate Studies" in the new section B (old section C) of paragraph 3.01 should be replaced by the current title "Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs," and the phrase "Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs" should be changed to "Office of the Executive Vice President" wherever it occurs.** Dr. Warde pointed that the last two parts are included to update the titles to those currently in use. One rationale for this change is that OSU is somewhat unusual in that it allows students to transfer in grades as well as credits when they transfer from other institutions. This presents some problems in computing grade point averages and makes it meaningful to require a 2.0 or higher GPA in courses taken at OSU. For the last year the committee on Academic Reprieve has not granted reprieves to students who did not meet the guidelines given in the recommendation. This recommendation would bring the written policy of the university in line with the current implementation of the policy. Part 1) removes the option of petitioning for an academic reprieve in order to gain admission to OSU. Dr. Tilley said that in 2) it says "no grade lower than a 'C' in all regularly graded course work," and asked if this only implied to the 12 hours. Dr. Warde replied that they should have a 2.0 in the courses that they are taking before they can petition for a reprieve. Dr. Halligan asked if the committee fully understands that interpretation. Dr. Warde replied that they did. **The motion passed.**

BUDGET — **Carol Moder** presented an update dealing with some activities of the University Budget Committee. The University Planning and Budget office in consultation with the University Budget Committee submitted a survey of budget priorities to the OSRHE. In a very good year for funding OSU will get approximately \$8M in new funds. The budget priorities which were submitted contain about \$4M in mandatory increases, including about a \$2M item for a new chilled water plant. Other items such as a salary program for faculty and staff, new faculty positions in response to increased enrollment, increased library funding and new graduate student positions were all given high priority by the committee, but will have to compete for funding from a small pool. The Faculty Council Budget Committee proposes to take an e-mail survey of faculty to determine what their priorities are for new funds. The survey will also ask about the proportion of money that should go into benefits as opposed to salary.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — **Mark Sisson** reported the committee had met with Everett Eaton about bicycle safety and has developed some new printed symbols to be placed in the bike paths to try to reduce pedestrian-cyclist conflicts.

FACULTY — **Chuck Edgley** reported the committee met with J.L. Albert from CIS and Joey Senat from the School of Journalism and Broadcasting about the e-mail and internet policies. On the question of privacy of e-mail there is good news and bad news. The bad news is there is no e-mail privacy. The good news is that at a practical level the system is too busy to look into anyone's e-mail unless there is a compelling reason to do so. The reason the university cannot guarantee the privacy of anyone's e-mail communications is that there are too many privacy holes that are beyond the control of the university. One such hole is the open records act which makes any e-mail message on the system accessible by any citizen who invokes the conditions of the act. Faculty are required to log each e-mail message sent or to keep copies of such messages. The second privacy hole is a clause in the university's e-mail policy that refers to legitimate maintenance. It states that under certain

circumstances the postmaster in the course of his/her regular duties can access a person's e-mail for legitimate management or maintenance purposes. Mr. Albert assured the committee that content is not the issue. Dead letters must be opened in order to direct them to the proper person. The last hole has to do with the investigation of a crime where e-mail communication may have played a part. In this case the university will comply with any justifiable requests for information. The practical reality is that CIS processes 6.5 million e-mail messages per month on the university system. They neither have the time nor the inclination to look at anyone's e-mail unless they are ordered to do so. E-mail messages are stored about 7 days then destroyed since they do not have storage space to keep them any longer. On the rare occasions when they do open e-mail messages it is on the order of the EVP Keener. One such example would be when a faculty member dies his/her e-mail will be opened to see if there is university business which needs to be completed. The only person who can legitimately access the system other than the user is Dr. Keener. A search warrant would not be required as long as the EVP has given his authorization. If a faculty member's e-mail is opened then the university will notify the faculty member in a timely matter that his/her mail has been opened. All this also applies to the use of the university system from your home computer or to the use of a private provider from a university computer. Dr. Edgley made several other points concerning what a good e-mail policy should contain. 1. Policies on electronic communication should not draw such a sharp distinction between personal and job related use that it makes violators of all faculty. Policies that are too restrictive can lead to disrespect for all policies and can be used for selective enforcement against certain faculty members. 2. Policies should guard the faculty against the predations of the worst administrators we can imagine and not be dependent on the good will of the incumbents. 3. The policy should maximize the freedom of communication which furthers the goals of the university. This condition is not currently present since several faculty have gotten private accounts to avoid the university system. It seems ironic that a system that was designed to encourage openness and free expression is now regarded as a threatening presence in their lives. 4. The policy that was recently distributed to all departments is different than the policy on the university's web site. Neither the e-mail policy nor the policy concerning internet use has been returned to Faculty Council for their approval. The policies that were said to be draft policies and would be returned to Faculty Council after being reworked. There should be some clear guidelines about which policies need Faculty Council approval and which do not. Kristen Jones asked if the e-mail policy applies to students. Dr. Edgley said it applies to everyone who uses the system. Dr. Johannes said that the students may be offered some protection since they are paying a technology fee. Dr. Sanders said that if it applies to ioNET for faculty then it should apply to students. Dr. Carlozzi said that before Faculty Council can discuss the policy it needs to determine what the policy is. Dr. Hallgren said that for several years OSU apparently has not had a policy. Maybe serious consideration should be made as to what repercussions would be to having no policy. Dr. Edgley said there may be other ways of addressing the genuine abuses of the e-mail system that are not so restrictive. The committee wanted to determine both the policy and the practice of the university on this issue. The committee is not concerned that anyone is snooping in anyone's e-mail unless they have reasons to do so. The policy should list the clear and obvious violations like sending threatening and harassing e-mail, using the internet for downloading and selling obscene material, or running a private e-mail business on the system. Dr. Hallgren added that statement at the end should say that anything that is not prohibited is permitted. Dr. Vitek said that OSU currently has a problem with a student who has had his e-mail privileges revoked and there is no system in place to allow the student to appeal the action. OSU needs a procedure to give an individual who is accused of misusing the system due process. Dr. Halligan summarized by saying that his memory is that a policy was developed but was still in draft form and the administration felt that we needed a policy in place so an interim policy was approved by the Faculty Council for one year. During the year the policy was to be reworked and the new policy returned to the Faculty Council. This reworking never took place. The process needs to be restarted. Dr. Edgley said that the Faculty Committee is still interested in which types of policies should have Faculty Council approval. Ms. LaFollette said that the draft policy was passed June 1995 as 95-06-03-SALR and was dropped from the recommendations pending list in March 1996.

LONG RANGE PLANNING — **Janet Cole** reported that the charge of the LRP committee is to determine trends or activities which might affect students, faculty or staff at some time and to attempt to position the university to be pro-active instead of reactive as change occurs. At the last meeting the committee discussed the topic of scholarly activity and how it is defined or recognized at the university. It is particularly important to know these definitions, as more and more universities are becoming involved in a post-tenure review process either voluntarily or by legislation. Our current definitions may be adequate or they may need some revision. The LRP is beginning to determine how such a review should take place. The committee has divided into some subcommittees to look at the topic. Dr. Moder said that this is an issue that should be considered in conjunction with the Faculty Committee and perhaps the Research Committee. Dr. Edgley said that the Faculty Committee would be happy to meet with the LRP on this issue.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — **Ed Arquitt** said he had no report but wanted to distribute a new "Benefits Extra" that included information presented by the Segal Company consultants and information on the "State Plan." These will be mailed to all employees. If you were not able to attend the presentations last week by the consultants there are opportunities to view the report by video for the next two weeks. Dr. Wilkinson added that this subject will be discussed at the *Fall General Faculty Meeting which has been rescheduled for Tuesday, November 24 at 3:30 in room 109 of the Bartlett Art Center.* It is hoped to have a regent, a representative from the Segal Company, and some faculty to discuss the OSU health care system. Dr. Halligan asked how we hope to come to a resolution. Dr. Arquitt said the Health Care Committee met with a representative from the Segal Co. last week and will meet with them again. The committee will continue to meet frequently until a decision is reached. The RFB will also be discussing the issues surrounding the health care package. Ms. Matoy said a recommendation should go to the Regents in January, since Personnel needs that much lead time to have the program ready by July 1, 1999. Personnel would like to have an agreement reached, on what the proposal to the Board will be, in early December so there would be time to publicize it on campus and answer questions before it goes to the Board. When the consultants return for the fall faculty meeting they will be meeting with representatives from the "State Plan". There were several issues raised at the forums. One such issue was the type of coverage offered to employees who are out of state. If you are out of state temporarily then you definitely have coverage. But OSU has 126 employees who have addresses out of state and it needs to be determined what type of coverage they will have. Dr. Halligan asked if it is decided to go with the "State Plan," would it be possible to supplement the coverage with OSU's own plan whereby employees could buy extra coverage in areas of concern over and above the coverage in the "State Plan". Ms. Matoy said that there should not be a problem with OSU adding supplemental opportunities. Whichever plan is adopted it will not only cover OSU but all the A&M system. Some of the A&M's do offer some supplemental plans. Dr. Edgley asked if there is a way to determine how OSU's benefit's package compares with those of other institutions and if our ranking has been changing. It is good publicity to say OSU has met the Big 12 average for faculty salaries but it does not mean much if this was accomplished by allowing benefits to decline. Ms. Matoy replied that in the October "Benefits Extra" there is a comparison of medical plans in the Big 12. This comparison is not very satisfactory since the main thing found in the Big 12 is that everyone in the conference, with the exception of Baylor, offers multiple plans. The comparison was made with the single plan opportunity like OSU has. There is also some information put out by TIAA-CREF on overall benefits but the latest such information was done for 1995. The 1997 report should be available in the spring. Dr. Moder said the latest issue of "Academe" has the national figures in terms of total compensation and OSU's figures could be compared with those.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — **Margaret Scott** reported the committee met with Dean Johnson of the library. The focus of the concerns were on copyright policies including intellectual property rights and the fair use provision of the copyright act. With the large number of consolidations and takeovers in the publishing industry the fair use policy is in great jeopardy. The Library Advisory Committee is considering a proposal from the chief academic officers of the Big 12

regarding the copyright problem. Dean Johnson welcomes any opportunity to speak to faculty about this issue. What can faculty do? First, become aware of the issues. Secondly, faculty sign away more copyright privileges to the publishers than is necessary. The author should be able to retain limited copyright privileges. The Library Advisory Committee is working on a policy. The other concern of the SALR is the royalty fee charged to university groups for use of the university mascot. Dr. Keener said that one idea, discussed by the Big 12 academic officers, is to establish a national data distribution center. A faculty member could give the publisher the copyright for a certain negotiated time period and after that the faculty member could post the information in this distribution center. The details have not all been worked out but this is the general spirit. Natalea Watkins said that a link to this document can be found on the library web site. Dr. Gregson asked if this will become a smaller problem as more journals appear on line. Mr. Locy replied that the library still has to buy access to those journals. Elsevier sells a group of journals together and they are not cheap. The large publishers are very strict about copyrights while some of the smaller journals and e-journals are more lenient. Dr. Halligan said that faculty produce the intellectual property, pay page charges to get it published, then pay ridiculous prices to put it back in the libraries. Some of these firms are making large profits. People laugh at us for not coming to a different understanding whereby we could manage this better. The situation is similar to that in the NCAA before the Presidents took it over. They would meet and lament about how the situation was out of control. The lament level is about as high as it was at that time in the NCAA. Some organization will rise up and the universities will all agree on a system that will retain peer review but whereby total control of this information is not given up. It appears that such a system will have to grow out of the current athletic conferences. Dr. Scott added that Dean Johnson mentioned that one step in getting control would be for universities to change their reward system so that faculty are rewarded equally for publishing in less expensive journals or e-journals as they are for publishing in the very expensive journals that the library is now buying.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

ATHLETIC COUNCIL — **Dennis Bertholf** reported that the AC reviewed the schedules for all the sports to see if they meet the requirements for number of missed days, etc. All the schedules were approved.

STUDENT PUBLICATIONS — **Steve Locy** reported that Cary Aspinwall was elected editor in chief for the spring semester. She wants to create an assistant editor in chief position since she will not be able to put in 55 to 60 hours per week that Jason Collington is currently spending in the job. Eight people will be sent to the National Collegiate Press Conference in Kansas City.

EMERITI ASSOCIATION — **Don Holmes** reported that the constitution had been revised to change the titles of the Chair and Vice Chair to President and Vice President.

STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL — **Nancy Konigmacher** reported that SAC has been concerned with the health care program. The council has received many phone calls from staff regarding their concerns about the program. Most of the staff found that their entire salary increase was taken away by the increase in health care. There were eleven staff recognized with distinguished service awards and 378 people received their service pins at the Staff Appreciation Day ceremonies which was attended by about 1000 people. Ms. LaFollette pointed out that the staff is also invited to attend the Fall General Faculty Meeting on November 24th.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION — **Kristen Jones** reported the Student Senate has been looking at safety issues. They are recommending that more blue lights be installed especially toward the Greek areas. The executive group attended OIL and received awards for best house legislation, best senate legislation, and runner-up for best house delegation. They learned several things about transportation from KSU and KU and are thinking of recommending the addition of some night routes. They have also been organizing meetings to give alcohol information to students, faculty

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

November 10, 1998

Page 8

and the extended community. OSU and Texas will be working jointly on an SGA web site which will have links to the Big 12 universities web sites and SGA web pages. The Big Event is coming along and would welcome faculty volunteers. Dr. Wilkinson congratulated the students on the good work they did with Homecoming and asked if they students had any problems with faculty cooperation during the Homecoming week. Ms. Jones said the biggest problem students have with Homecoming is the financial burden. There is a \$3500 limit on spending but it is not realistic for houses to stay under their limit and construct the size of displays that they do. There is a lot of support from the faculty, staff, administration and the city. The students gain practical knowledge by working on the homecoming decorations. Dr. Wilkinson said that a faculty member in the Art Department commented that it was wonderful that there was art going on all over Stillwater.

OLD BUSINESS:

Dr. Moder announced that the meeting concerning the Technology recommendation has been scheduled for December 10. The Budget Committee will be meeting with members of the administration. Please forward any of your concerns to a member of the Budget Committee.

NEW BUSINESS:

Natalea Watkins said that the OSU web site is new. It now contains some custom links allowing a user to jump quickly to an area of interest. There is also a search engine on the first page. Please send any comments to the web master since the page will be constantly revised. A second concern is about electronic surveys. The earlier comment by Dr. Moder about the Budget Committee running an electronic survey is the third one this week. This is an issue that faculty need to address. PIO has received negative comments when they have run such surveys in the past. Some people become extremely irritated when their e-mail is cluttered with surveys. If many groups decided to use this then a faculty member could be receiving 20 surveys per week. One option is to run a certain number per year and have groups apply to include questions on these surveys or some other method of restricting the number. Ms. Watkins also added that the Open Records Act that applies to your e-mail also applies to your regular mail and to practically anything else that is in your office. Dr. Edgley added that the difference is that it is unlikely that someone will come to your office and request copies of all your mail but it is much easier to electronically tap your e-mail or a list of internet addresses that were accessed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m. The Fall General Faculty Meeting is Tuesday, November 24, 1998, 3:30 p.m., 109 Bartlett Art Center. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is December 8, 1998.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary