ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
September 11, 1978

2:00 - 5:00 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Shirley Wilson, Arnulf Zweig.

Members Absent: Donald Tull

Others: (2:10 - 2:45): Richard T. Scott, OCE and Fred Waller, PSU;
(3:15 - 5:00): William Boyd, David Frohnmeyer, John Lallas and Paul Olum.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the July 31, 1978 meeting were mailed to Advisory Council members and were approved on September 11, 1978 without corrections or additions.

2. Interinstitutional Faculty Lobbyist (also #5)

Dick Scott and Fred Waller from the IFS met with the AC to discuss the merits of having the University of Oregon join the other institutions in the state in the hiring of a lobbyist for faculty concerns. The participation of the University of Oregon is viewed as critical according to Waller and Scott. Phase I of implementation includes the naming of a University of Oregon faculty member to serve on the Lobby Activating Committee. Members of this committee will oversee the publicizing and pledging of $36 by each faculty member. When $20,000 is pledged, Phase II of the plan will proceed i.e., the hiring of a lobbyist and the formation of a Steering Committee to develop priorities. This group would be separate from the IFS.

A number of questions were raised as this topic was discussed. First, are the institutions so diverse that faculty concerns would differ from institution to institution? If the concerns were agreed to, would priority ratings differ from institution to institution? Would it be better for us to have our own lobbyist? Does the University of Oregon lobbyist act as an advocate for University of Oregon faculty concerns? How can we be assured that the interests of the University of Oregon faculty are served in the setting of priorities for the lobbyist? Will our lack of participation seriously affect the relationship we have with other state institutions?

The need for strong advocacy of faculty concerns, especially in light of propositions 6 and 11, was acknowledged. Members decided to seek council from Olum and Boyd on the value of this idea.

(3:10 - 5:00 pm.) William Boyd, David Frohnmeyer, John Lallas, and Paul Olum.

3. Legislative Session Briefing

David Frohnmeyer provided a description of the seven sections of Proposition 11 and also cited the following preliminary figures on the effect of
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this proposition on state revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979-81</td>
<td>+44M</td>
<td>-108M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-83</td>
<td>+190</td>
<td>-388M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-85</td>
<td>+380</td>
<td>- 62M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on a 8% growth rate. Although troublesome, these figures are lower than some have predicted.

4. Budget Preparation

Olum indicated that his office will not be approving position authorizations for Fall, 1979 until more is known about our level of funding. Olum also indicated that it is clear that budget cuts will be made and the AC should be thinking about the "process" that should be used.

5. Faculty Lobbyist (continued)

The advantages and disadvantages of having a state faculty lobbyist were reviewed. Major advantages were as follows: a) The need for advocacy of faculty concerns is even greater now with 6 and 11, b) there is concern over the degree to which the Chancellor's Office is an advocate for faculty, c) a state faculty lobbyist would help offset the state student lobbyist, and d) it may be politically embarrassing for us if we do not participate.

Major disadvantages center around nagging concerns about the diversity of institutional priorities and lack of information on how the plan will be implemented. It was decided that the chair will talk with Scott and Wallers about who they had in mind for a lobbyist. He will also speak with the OSU representative about our concerns.

6. Admissions

John Lallas provided a summary of the Board meeting. The recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee of the OSSHE to increase admission standards by 1983-84 was discussed. This topic needs to be discussed further by the AC.

---------------

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, rock concerts, budget planning (see information Lallas sent to Advisory Council members); legislative liaison; carrying load of graduate students; debriefing on August 3, session with legislators; affirmative action function; non-retention of tenured faculty; Hawk, Moseley, Civic presentations; roll-call voting on AC matters.

Meetings: October 9, 1978 joint meeting with OSU, PSU and HSC.

DLR/sb
ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
September 12, 1978
September 13, 1978

5 - 5:45 pm. September 12, 1978 - President's Office

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull, Shirley Wilson, Arnulf Zweig.

Others: William Boyd, Paul Olum

1. Factfinders Report

This special meeting of the AC was called by the President. At this meeting copies of the Factfinder report were distributed. The AC was asked to advise the President on the following: 1) whether or not the report should be accepted, 2) if accepted, where should the money come from within the budget, 3) if rejected, how to deal with the political backlash.

Since time was a critical factor, AC members agreed to review the report and meet on Tuesday at 8:30 am. to formulate a position.

8:30 - 10:00 am. September 13, 1978

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull, Shirley Wilson, Arnulf Zweig.

Member Absent: David Povey (sent written comments)

1. Factfinder Report

Before discussing whether to accept the report, the financing of the proposal was discussed. The following alternatives were identified:

a. Faculty salary allocation
b. inflation S & S
c. appointment of fewer GTF's
d. elimination of faculty positions
e. some combination of a-d.

Only a and b of the alternatives were seriously considered as viable. By a vote of 5 to 2, alternative b (S and S inflation funds) was selected to be recommended to the President.

Whether to accept the factfinder report was the next topic of discussion. Arguments for acceptance included the following: a) rates
for GTF's maybe high but total dollar amount at .30 FTE is difficult to live on, b) health insurance is important, c) a strike would be extremely damaging.

Arguments for rejecting the proposal included the following: a) fairness for faculty to have a 13% increase while GTF's had 20%? b) University simply does not have the funds, c) some members of the AC were also concerned about the Workload and Appointment-Reappointment sections of the report.

After considerable discussion, the AC voted 5 - 3 for recommending the rejection of the Factfinder report. It was decided prior to any discussion that roll call votes would not be taken but that the value of using this practice on future issues would be discussed at another meeting.

10 - 11:15, William Boyd, Paul Olum

Before the recommendation of the AC was made known, Boyd shared with the group his tentative decision and associated rationale. The press release, indicating that the report was not being accepted, was reviewed and suggestions were made.

The AC recommended that negotiations begin as quickly as possible and that the relationship between the administration and students be more collegial.
2:00 - 4:30 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Arnulf Zweig, Donald Tull.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the September 11, 12 and 13 meetings were distributed and reviewed. The names of Civid and Simic were added to the list of persons to meet with the AC.

2. Items From the Floor

a. Newsletter.

The meaning of a section of a newsletter from the College of Business Administration was discussed.

b. Committee Assignments

It has come to the attention of one AC member that persons who are asked to chair committees are not called in advance which is a common courtesy to faculty members. The extent of this and other problems dealing with committee assignments will be determined and discussed at a future meeting.

3. Interinsitutional Lobbyist

The discussion continued from last week's meeting.

Hesse, a retired Political Science Professor from O.C.E., is the person being considered as the lobbyist. No one has heard of him. The pros and cons of participating were again identified but there was a lack of enthusiasm for active AC involvement. The value of putting the question before the faculty was, however, recognized. Therefore, the AC decided to ask Beverly Fagot to identify faculty members who support the idea (as determined from her questionnaire results) and submit those names to Waller and Scott as potential University of Oregon contact people for the solicitation campaign.

4. Retirement

Boyd has asked the AC for advice on whether the University has a moral right to extend the retirement age to 70 even if they are legally not required to do so. The AC discussed this matter briefly. These initial discussions seem to indicate that AC would clearly prefer a policy that provides for decisions on a case by case basis. However, since that is not possible, it was tentatively agreed that the advantages of retirement at 65 outweigh the disadvantages when the total interests of the University are considered. This topic needs to be discussed further at a future meeting.
5. **Schedule of Presentations**

At next week's session, Ray Hawk will meet with the AC at 2:15 pm. The AC identified a set of questions which Hawk will address. Simic and Moseley will also be scheduled for presentations.

6. **Joint Meeting with OSU, PSU, HSC**

This October 9 meeting will be held at the Collier House (Faculty Center). A list of agenda items were identified. The AC agreed to ask President Boyd to meet with the group for a part of the scheduled meeting time. A meeting of this group with the Chancellor is scheduled for later in the quarter.

7. **Faculty Open House**

The AC agreed to continue the practice of having Faculty Open-Houses during the academic year. The first one is scheduled for October 23 at 4 pm. at the Collier House (Faculty Center). The AC secretary will see that an announcement is made at the University Faculty Meeting and that notices are put into the Emerald and Oregon Week. A letter to the faculty will also be developed.

8. **Legislative Meeting Debriefing.**

The value of scheduling another meeting between Lane County Legislators and the AC was discussed. These meetings are designed to foster the development of personal relationship between University of Oregon faculty members and legislators. There was some concern for the busy schedules of legislators after the election and during the session. A decision on whether to schedule another meeting was postponed until the next meeting.

9. **GTF Debriefing**

The AC indicated a need to check on the status of the Faculty Advisory Committee. The position of the University on other items such as workload and appointment-reappointment should also be reviewed.

10. **Library Committee**

Paul Holbo provided a progress report on his Library Committee work. Apparently the OSBHE has approved $50,000 for a volunteer storage facility at Camp Adair. This is troublesome to the Committee for a number of reasons. Currently, the Committee is formulating a response to this action. The full report of the committee deliberations should be available sometime Fall quarter.
ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
September 25, 1978

2:00 - 4:50 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Arnulf Zweig, Donald Tull.

Others: (2:15 - 3:05): Ray Hawk
(3:10 - 3:30): William Boyd
(3:10 - 4:40): Paul Olum

1. Items from the Floor

   Wanda Johnson indicated that SCH for Fall will probably be down by about 3%. The number of freshmen has increased. Housing requests are up and the University had to turn students away from the dorms.

2. Announcements

   Curt Simic will meet with the AC on October 2. The joint AC's meet on October 9 and Jerry Moseley will meet with the AC on October 16. The AC chair also distributed the following items: a) a draft of a letter regarding the joint October 9 meeting, b) copies of letters he wrote to Waller and Scott and to University of Oregon faculty members who may be interested in participating in the faculty lobby solicitation campaign and c) a draft of proposed legislation for IFS representation.

3. Ray Hawk's Presentation

   A list of seven questions was presented to Hawk prior to the meeting. A summary of the presentation is as follows:

   a. Currently, Hawk supervises the athletic department, museum, physical plant, housing, health services, budget and personnel. Many of the support services of the University are under his direction. Before Simic's arrival, Hawk also assumed day-to-day management supervision of the University Relation's office.

   b. The lack of computerization of some of the business functions limits what can be done. The University is in desperate need of funds for both hardware and software. With the exception of a modest request within program improvement, there are no other plans to increase our computer capability.

   c. Distribution of funds derived from indirect cost credits was discussed. A large portion in the past has been directed to the improvement of our computer facilities. Recently the funds have been used toward the under-funding problem. The overhead rate is determined by the "feds" and is
a provisional rate that is later checked to see if it was a "true" rate. Problems of audits and some units dissatisfaction over the lack of rewards (i.e., a returned portion of the overhead funds) were briefly discussed.

e. Hawk indicated that he influences academic matters in a number of ways. First, he is a part of the central administration team and therefore has input into budget reduction decisions as well as other decisions. Second, he has direct responsibility for the environment within which faculty, staff and student live and interact.

f. Hawk pointed with pride to the Physical Plant and its director Harold Babcock who has been very creative about implementing cost saving devices in this area.

3:10 - Boyd and Olum

4. Assembly Room Change

The question was raised as to whether it would be appropriate to change the room where faculty meetings are held because of the small number of faculty members who attend. Boyd indicated that unless the AC formally makes a recommendation, he was unwilling to make the change. Council members disagreed on the value of changing the room assignment.

5. GTF Strike Concerns

A number of concerns regarding the GTF strike were raised. First, some faculty members were concerned that pressure would be put on them or on the non-striking GTF's to assume more work responsibilities during the strike. The AC was assured by the University administration that this would not occur and that any additional workload would be strictly on a volunteer basis.

Second, some faculty members were concerned about a rumor that GTF's would not be allowed to register or have offices. The AC was told that nothing would be denied GTF's in their role as student e.g. registering. However, office space is provided in their role as employees and would not automatically be available to them if a strike occurred.

The third concern was that a number of faculty members and GTF's are ill informed of the legal ramifications of certain actions under strike conditions e.g., state law against any state employee who participates in an illegal strike, potential loss of tuition waiver for .15 GTF if they honor the strike. All AC members recognized the need to educate faculty and GTF's, however, there was some concern that a fact sheet distributed by the University would be viewed as a propaganda document. After reviewing a number of alternatives such as involving the University legal counsel or the Lane County Labor Council, the AC recommended that President Boyd provide the answers to the seven questions that AC members identified at the first University Faculty Meeting.
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The Final concern that was raised and discussed centered around some faculty members' concern that the University was unwilling to do some serious negotiating in order to avert a strike. The University position on sections of the contract was discussed. The AC recommended that Olum and Boyd meet informally with the GTF's and also encourage the negotiating team to return to the bargaining table as soon as possible.

6. Review Process for Creation of New Department and Degree

The Office of Academic Affairs has a request for the creation of a new department and degree in the area of Gerontology. Advice from the AC on the appropriate review process was solicited. Three alternatives were identified. First, the Office of Academic Affairs could make a recommendation and forward the proposal to the State Board's Office. Second, the proposal could be sent through the Curriculum Committee and eventually to the entire faculty. Third, a notice of motion could be made at the next University Faculty Assembly which would result in the review process being recommended by the faculty Senate. The Senate could recommend creating an ad hoc committee to study the proposal, could refer the proposal to the Curriculum Committee or could send it directly to the University Faculty Assembly with Senate recommendation. The AC advised the Provost to use the third alternative, i.e., present a notice of motion before the faculty assembly.

-----------------------------

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements; Retirement; rock concerts; budget planning; carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, committee on committee appointments, I.F.S. appointments, Amazon Housing Policy Board replacement.

Meetings: October 9, 1978, 12 pm. joint meeting with OSU, PSU, and HSC. October 23, 1978, 4 pm. open house Faculty Meeting.
ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 2, 1978

2:00 - 5:00 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair),
David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull,
Shirley Wilson.

Others: (2:20 - 5:00): Curt Simic
(3:30 - 5:00): John Lallas, William Boyd

1. Minutes

The minutes of the September 18 and 25 meetings were distributed.
Members were asked to read them and identify any corrections at the next
AC meeting.

2. Items from the Floor

The state of our computer facilities needs to be discussed at a future
meeting.

3. President's Evaluation

The AC chair indicated that the Chancellor would like to meet with
us on Thursday October 5 regarding Boyd's evaluation. He was unclear
about whether the meeting was to be on process or substance or both.

4. $25,000 for Health Emergencies

The advantages and disadvantages of offering this proposal were dis-
cussed. There is some confusion about whether this service would just
be for dependents or for both GTF's and dependents.

2:20 - Curt Simic

5. Curt Simic's Presentation

Simic described his position and identified the following needs:

a. A need to strengthen the development fund. Last year $100,000 was
raised in unrestricted funds; Simic hopes to have $500,000 in this
category in three years. We need personnel in this area to act as
fund raisers. Currently we are recruiting for a Director of Development.
The Development Fund has been renamed the University of Oregon
Foundation.

b. The need for a creative writer—in order to better present the Uni-
versity to the public, alumni student/faculty, legislators, etc.
c. The need to strengthen use of radio and T.V. in our public relations efforts.

Simic and his staff will be moving into the first floor of Susan Campbell. Other activities cited included: the development of a student recruitment film (10 minutes) that alumni could use and the meetings that McVicar, Blumel and Boyd are holding throughout the State.

3:30 John Lallas - later William Boyd

6. **President's Evaluation**

   The schedule and criterion for evaluating the Presidents at Oregon Institutions of Higher Education were described by Lallas. The AC was asked to review a list of persons that the Chancellor had planned to interview. Suggestions included more persons from Student Services, and someone from the Minority Council. It was also suggested that persons at the national levels who are familiar with Boyd's work should be contacted.

7. **Faculty Meeting**

   Boyd shared with the AC the focus of his opening remarks for the Faculty meeting on Wednesday.
ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 16, 1978

2:00 - 4:45 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull, Shirley Wilson, Arnulf Zweig.

Others: (2:30 - 3:05): Jerry Moseley
(3:10 - 3:50): William Boyd
(3:10 - 4:45): Paul Olum

1. Minutes

The minutes of the September 18 and 25 meetings, distributed at a previous meeting, were approved as written.

2. Announcements

The meeting with Miles Romney has been postponed.

3. Items from the Floor

At least one member of the AC expressed anxiety about the large number of agenda items that are not being addressed. One alternative is for each member to take a few topics to investigate and bring back the results to the full committee. This approach and others will be examined at a future AC meeting.

4. Jerry Moseley's presentation

After sharing some experiences from his past administrative positions, Moseley described his current position as Associate Provost. His responsibilities include supervision of admissions, registration, financial aid, Dean of Students, data reductions, athletic liaison, student union, academic advising, student services, career planning and placement, counseling center, and international students.

The major problem he has is outdated computer hardware and personnel that were not involved in the original programming for the model we have. Other points made were as follows:

a. 360 model 50 is 8-10 years old.

b. Administrative data processing personnel are demoralized because of past funding arrangements (user generated solely) and obsolete equipment to work with which limits the professional experiences they are able to have at this institution. Turn-over of personnel has been great.

c. There is a need to take data off the 360 files and transfer it to mini equipment because the information may eventually be lost or become difficult to retrieve.

d. A pre-registration system demands better equipment as well as sub-
stablial initial development cost.
e. A request has been submitted to the legislature for additional support (see #5).

Time ran out so the AC needs to decide whether they wish to have Moseley return to talk about student recruitment, retention, etc.

3:10 - Boyd and Olum

5. Computer Needs

Boyd indicated that he testified at an interim committee of the legislature recently and found some support for the condition of computer hardware and software from Jack Ripper, the Committee Chair. The replacement schedule for hardware is usually 6 - 7 years. A number of faculty members have written to the President about problems with our computer capabilities. The University administration is currently thinking about leasing the needed equipment which will cost about $400,000. Some of the financial support will hopefully come from the legislature but some of the funds will have to be diverted from other uses within the University.

6. GTFF Briefing

The negotiators, the faculty advisory group plus other faculty members meet with the University administration in order to brain-storm on possible positions the University could take in the GTFF negotiations. Various positions on the workload issue were identified. The GTF's plan an intent to strike vote on October 19, 1978.

7. Budget Plans

Olum provided a progress report on the budget planning process. The target figure now looks like 5 - 7.5%. The administration will present a proposed budget to the Council when it is prepared. AC members encouraged the administration to provide the information sufficiently in advance to actual submission dates.

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, Retirement, rock concerts, budget planning, carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, committee on committee appointments, I.F.S. appointments, Amazon Housing Policy Board replacement, computers, AC long-range planning.

Meeting: Open-House with Faculty, October 23, 4-6 pm., Collier house.
the particular request of honoring Ersted Award faculty during half time will probably not be well received by those faculty members.

9. Release of Comparative Data

Olum indicated that the data that compares faculty salaries of U of O units to comparable units in the AAU will be released. Preliminary analysis indicates that the Law School has the most serious inequities on salary levels. Other schools considered having equity problems include Business, AAA and Music.

4:00 - 5:15 pm. Open House with Faculty

10. Computer Inadequacies

A relatively new faculty member in HPER reiterated concerns we have already heard regarding the serious problems with University computers both for faculty research and for administrative processes.

11. Cooperative Education Program

Tina Knight (CSPA) described what a cooperative program at the U of O could be like and asked whether other schools and departments would like to become involved. It was suggested that this program be attached to the Career Planning and Placement Office. It was also suggested that models from other institutions be reviewed as program development proceeds.

12. Salary Schedule

A format request will be sent to the AC to review the step increase plans to determine the degree to which a salary plan is in existence and what is seen as satisfactory progress through the schedule.

13. Fixed-Term Appointments

Some problems associated with fixed-term appointments were identified: official timely notice, covert encouragement to some faculty, and confusion over tenure-track and fixed-term conditions.

14. Schedule for next open-house

It was suggested that we alternate the day of the week when open houses are scheduled in case some faculty always have a conflict with Mondays.
Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, rock concerts, budget planning, carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, I.F.S appointments, computers, AC long-range planning, academic long-range planning, encore for presentations, research support, appointment concerns.
2:00 - 4:00 Johnson Hall Conference Room
4:00 - 5:15 Collier House

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair),
David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull,
Shirley Wilson, Arnulf Zweig.

Others: (3:20 - 4:00): Paul Olum
(4:00 - 5:15): Approximately 10 faculty members.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the October 2 and 16 AC meetings were distributed for
review. Members were asked to read them and identify any corrections
at the next AC meeting.

2. Items from the Floor

   a. Registration seems to be down in headcount by approximately 245.

   b. It was suggested that the University Administration make available
      the data upon which they identified those schools/units e.g.,
      Law School that are below the average salary levels in comparable
      AAU institutions (see also #9).

   c. The question of whether it is possible to eliminate a house from
      assets so financial aid can be granted will be investigated with
      Jerry Moseley by Arnie Zweig. This policy (perhaps a federal
      guideline) has implications for women primarily but also impacts
      on males.

   d. A perceived change in disability insurance was investigated by
      Paul Holbo. However, benefits have not decreased according to
      Osibow.

3. Committee on Committees

The following persons were nominated to serve on this committee:
Jan Bréckhoff (suggested chair) Carmichael, B. Crasemann, Lucille Aly
Gunilla Finrow, Ken Ramsing, Peter Swan; alternates are Lew Ward, James
Hoard, Robert Hurwitz and Mimi Johnson.

This is an important committee which requires a certain knowledge
of the total University community. The AC thought that a study should
be conducted by this committee on a selected number of committees each
year in order to determine if the legislative mandate is still appropriate and also evaluate the committees' usefulness to its primary constituency. Dave Povey will draft a letter indicating the nature of such a study in greater detail.

4. Amazon Housing Board

The following faculty members are listed in priority order: Sally Fullerton, Ruth Waugh and Marydale Gale to serve on the Board as a replacement for a resignation.

5. Ad Hoc Faculty Task Force on Retirements

At the joint advisory council meeting on October 9 we agreed to appoint a small group to work cooperatively with a group of faculty at OSU to examine an expansive set of issues related to retirement. D. Povey will develop a draft of a charge to this committee for the next meeting. This statement will then be shared with the following slate of faculty members to determine their interest, Eaton Conant, Lindstrom, L. Staples, Steve Keel and Esther Matthews. It was also suggested that the following faculty serve as a resource to the Task Force, Spence Carlson, Iven Niven, Henry Osibow and Paul Swadener (Chair of committee last year).

6. Early AC meeting on October 30

The AC will meet at 1:30 pm. next week in order to address more of the agenda items that remain.

3:20 Paul Olum

7. GTFF Update

The series of events for the past week were described. The offer of the 150 hours per quarter was offered prior to the authorization to vote. Again financial concerns were discussed. The administration was encouraged to release the fact sheet that addresses questions on strike ramifications. This will be done if negotiations break down and there is an affirmative authorization to strike vote.

8. Athletic Department Request

D. Littman will call Barb Nichols and indicate that closer involvement of faculty members with the athletic program is a good idea. However,