DASNR Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
September 3, 2015

Meeting called to order at 12:00 PM.

Roll call:

Dr. Tom Coon, Dean and Vice President, Division of Agricultural Science and Natural Resources
Dr. Chris Richards, Animal Science (chair)
Dr. Eric Rebek, Entomology and Plant Pathology (secretary)
Dr. Randy Taylor, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering (chair of CASNR RPT Committee)
Dr. Gopal Kakani, Plant and Soil Science
Dr. Sam Fuhlendorf, Natural Resource Ecology and Management
Dr. Mike Smith, Horticulture and Landscape Architecture
Dr. Ranjith Ramanathan, Animal Science
Dr. Max Melstrom, Agricultural Economics
Dr. Gina Peek, Design, Housing, and Merchandising
Dr. Astri Wayadande, Entomology and Plant Pathology
Dr. Jon Ramsey, Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership
Dr. Ajay Kumar, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering
Dr. Junpeng Deng, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
Dr. Rodney Jones, Agricultural Economics
Dr. Robert Matts, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
Ms. Cheryl Mihalko, Horticulture and Landscape Architecture
Dr. Tim Bowser, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering
Mr. Shane Robinson, Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence
Ms. Deb Garrard Foster, Nutritional Sciences

Questions for Dr. Coon, Dean, Vice President, and Director of DASNR (Dr. Coon's responses are in italics below each question submitted by faculty and staff):

Accounting and Travel

1. With the implementation of the new accounting system (Banner), there have been quite a few problems over the last 2 months. Most of our staff are only now being trained on the system even though we have known for quite a while that we would be moving to the new system on July 1. Given the lack of training, our accounting staff have not been able to have access to our accounts for grants and we are now approaching 2 months without receiving a ledger sheet for those accounts. It is very difficult to oversee research projects without having a good idea how much funds are available and to plan for future expenditures/hirings. Can Dr. Coon address this issue and provide a time table when our staff will be trained appropriately and be able to navigate through the new system?

After more than a year of preparation and planning, Banner was implemented. It is frustrating, not only for staff, faculty, researchers and administrators, but even for our partners outside of the university. I have noticed that business is slowly returning to normal and believe that trend will continue. Dr. Owens is working very closely with the VPR on the grants portion that you mentioned. I am aware of the hardship this poses and understand your frustration, and that of your department administrative and financial team. Bob Klein and I continue to work with Whitehurst to overcome these hurdles.

2. Please ask the Dean to reduce the electronic approval steps in DASNR for travel, procurement, etc. He needs to ask his colleagues in other colleges; my impression is that DASNR typically has twice the approval steps as A&S. (for example, a travel reimbursement apparently needs 3 approvals in Ag Sponsored Programs alone). Also, too many offices in DASNR hold up things unnecessarily when someone is gone or failing to have a designee to sign. In a few cases, we experienced a week or more delay because one person was on vacation.

Perhaps there are some routings that should be re-considered. Once the department head has approved, I have a fiscal person and the Associate Dean/Director approve prior to it coming to me. It is very easy to setup delegates for these approvals so that a travel never gets "hung" for a week. I have seen some travels take more than a day when there was a questionable budget or some other questions that arise. However, the examples below which I consider typical requests, there is no reason for it to be more than a 1 or 2 day process which is an improvement over the prior paper requests. The information in the examples shown in italics is a Pre-Route that is unique to DASNR.

EXAMPLE 1: Professor Joe Blow wants to travel out-of-state to a meeting. Funding will be through a research grant. The routing approvals are:
- *Originator: Generates the travel request in the department*
- *Claimant*
- *Sponsored Programs (Janice): Assigns it to the grant officer to speed the process.*
- *Sponsored Programs (Hollie or delegate): Verifies budget and approves.*
- *OAES Associate VP (or designee): Approves all research-related travel.*
- *Department Head (or delegate): Must approve as required by OSU.*
- *Dean Coon (or delegate) – Approves as required by the University*
- *Provost Sandefur (or delegate) – Approves as required by University*

EXAMPLE 2: Professor Jane Snow wants to travel on Extension M&O funds to an out-of-state meeting. The routing approvals are:
- *Originator: Generates the travel request in the department*
- *Claimant*
- *Extension Finance: Verifies budget and approves.*
- *OCES Assistant Director (or delegate): Approves all Extension travel*

- *Department Head (or delegate): Must approve as required by OSU.*
- *Dean Coon (or delegate) – Approves as required by University.*
- *Provost Sandefur (or delegate) – Approves as required by University*

EXAMPLE 3: Professor Tom Doe wants to attend a professional development conference using non-grant CASNR funds. The routing approvals are:
- *Originator: Generates the travel request in the department*
- *Claimant*
- *DASNR Fiscal Affairs: Verifies budget and approves.*
- *CASNR Associate Dean (or delegate): Approves all CASNR travel*
- *Department Head (or delegate): Must approve as required by OSU.*
- *Dean Coon (or delegate) – Approves as required by University.*
- *Provost Sandefur (or delegate) – Approves as required by University*

This is typical and if you are seeing electronic approval steps that are more detailed, please call Bob Klein or your department head to discuss. If you have a problem with a travel being hung for more than 24 hours, contact Bob Klein or Jane Fuhlendorf.

Out of country travel still requires a paper record, and this does slow down the process. Unless and until the University goes to an online option for out of country travel, it is important to allow plenty of time for any paper records either authorizing travel or approving expense reimbursement. The same applies to any travel records for non-employees and students.

Any holdups should be called to the attention of the department head, the Assistant VP (Bob Klein's) office, or the Dean's office.

Logos

3. Would you ask the Dean if it would be possible to add a DASNR "mark" (the A and land-grant triangle "logo") to include one for "natural resources"? There is a logo that includes Agriculture, but not one for Natural Resources even though the division and college include natural resources in their titles.

   At this time, we recommend that you use the DASNR Triangle Logo without a word mark to encompass all programs broadly. When we were given approval for our logo by OSU Marketing, they approved the logo without a wordmark and with the Agriculture, Teaching, Research, and Extension word marks. I will approach OSU Marketing and request the addition of "Natural Resources" as an approved word mark. However, until such an approval is given, I recommend using the logo without a wordmark.

Evaluation and Employees

4. With regard to measuring departmental productivity in the areas of research and extension, do the metrics include non-tenure track faculty combined with tenure track faculty? How is non-tenure track productivity considered toward department success/output?

   Extension: Metrics are calculated for both tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty. They are not lumped together -- non-tenure track faculty performance levels are reviewed separately from performance levels of tenure track faculty. Some departments may not report all non-tenure track faculty metrics, but most do.

   Research: Non-tenure track faculty are expected to be fully involved in scholarship. The publications, funding, and presentations of non-tenure track faculty are included in departmental metrics. The level of expectations may be a bit lower on an individual basis because of constraints on independent programs, but they are full faculty members and contribute to departmental metrics.

   Instruction: Adjunct/NTT faculty with teaching appointments contribute to both the quantity (student credit hour production) and quality of the department's instructional efforts. Teaching evaluations (student survey of instruction) should be completed for all courses. Adjunct/NTT faculty may also contribute to student organization advising, mentoring of graduate students and to scholarship in teaching and learning. While instructional metrics are tied to individual faculty, the combined contribution of all faculty (tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track) result in the overall departmental success.

5. In terms of faculty ratios, CASNR has a maximum of 25% non-tenure track faculty allowed. Does that percentage apply to each department or can a department exceed CASNR's percentage of non-tenure track faculty?

   I am not aware of this ratio being a rule or a current standard in place. However, the evolution of our budget may reflect this to some degree although it would vary between departments. Some departments may negotiate to trade block salaries for faculty lines or vice versa, move block to M&O and other trade-offs which would also cause more variability in this ratios.

6. What is Dr. Coon's philosophy on faculty governance at the department level? How does he ensure faculty contribution to governance at the Department level?

   "The Faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Regents for Oklahoma State University and the A&M Colleges have come to play the most important roles in the government of Oklahoma State University" (Charter and Bylaws of the General Faculty Council). In all of our administrative offices, we refer to the OSU Faculty Handbook on a

regular basis. This document supplies guiding principles on a number of issues and underscores the role of faculty governance in many areas.

Here in DASNR, we believe the policies within the department are very important. For example, RPT policies are developed by the faculty in each department and are normally approved by the dean and provost. With regard to recommendations from the dean on RPT issues, the input of the departmental RPT committee is taken very seriously.

Faculty comments concerning administrative/department head hires are strongly solicited and heavily weighted. Faculty input into position priorities is sought – department heads are asked by DASNR administration to consider faculty input on setting position priorities.

Departments are encouraged to participate in inclusive strategic planning processes and to incorporate appropriate committee structures within departments to facilitate faculty participation in overall academic program and curriculum development, recruitment of graduate and undergraduate students, allocation of student scholarship support, faculty, student and staff recognition programs and other department priorities.

Academic freedom is endorsed and defended with regard to curriculum development, publication of research results, and extension programming.

7. The custodial services around NRC, and likely other buildings, has been lackluster as of late. Also, many carpeted areas around NRC look terrible; some carpet likely has not been replaced since NRC was built. Can these issues be addressed and corrected despite the budget issues we are facing?

   The university re-organized and re-branded the old Physical Plant which is now known as Facilities Management. They have a new mission with more focus on preventative maintenance. This is a shift in the way business has been conducted and there is quite a bit of catch up to do. The carpet in the NRC should have been on a replacement schedule from the beginning, however funds were never allocated in this manner. In NRC, I believe that you have seen some of the preventive maintenance occurring such as painting, window cleaning, replacement of broken tiles, etc. We will see more of this and I recommend that our department heads in NRC (or other buildings) report the shabby conditions, such as worn out carpet, to Facilities Management to gauge the likelihood of replacement at no cost to the department.

   With regard to custodial services, there have been some hiccups in the service since moving to a contractual arrangement for custodial. Anytime you experience problems or if you have questions/suggestions, please contact GCA at 744-3254 or email mpharis@gcaservices.com. If the problems persist, please work with your department heads or contact Denise Winzenburg in my office with specific issues that are not being resolved.

Although I was not here prior to the move to GCA, some individuals have told me that they feel the building looks cleaner than it did previously. And some have indicated that they feel they have a productive relationship with the custodian for their floor and are pleased with the service. That it varies considerably across floors and buildings is an indication that there's still need for improvement. Calling the issues to the attention of GCA is the most direct way for unit administrators to address this. And keeping the Dean's office informed of these efforts will help to reinforce the need for improvements.

8. This summer, an announcement was made related to reducing funding for county staff positions. How do you see this impacting State Specialist in the short and long term? Do you project any changes in state or area staffing or resource allocations?

   Reduced staffing impacts state specialists by having fewer people to get materials/programs disseminated. We may also see an increase in requests for State Specialists to do program delivery due to reduced staffing. Our estimate at this point is a reduction of 15-20 Educators across the state, some of whom may be Ag Educators. It is estimated that approximately 10 counties may choose to share an educator, giving them 1.5 FTEs in each county.

   Area positions are not being reduced at this time but we may keep a position vacant for a period as our success in finding good candidates has been slow.

   State staffing will not grow and we anticipate a limited decline in numbers. Finding joint positions with either research or teaching will be difficult as we are having budget reductions in those areas as well. This may create challenges for maintaining Extension positions that fit DASNR priorities.

   Ultimately, program delivery through technology can help to address some of the shortcomings that accompany reduced staff numbers. It still remains important for us to remain engaged with Oklahomans in communities where they live and work so we can ensure that our programs remain relevant to the issues that they are facing. Technology can assist with this as well, either directly, for example through on-line surveys and interaction with community members via email and social media or indirectly, through tracking of data on use of fact-sheet downloads, social media contacts, and other marketing data. Working in the 21st Century means we need to engage differently. But our mission to serve all of Oklahoma and to be relevant to needs in our core program areas remains unchanged.

9. Why are faculty members not given the opportunity to evaluate the performance of department heads <u>on an annual basis</u>? Because of the importance of their jobs and the impact their behaviors have on a unit's performance for *good* or *ill,* shouldn't input be solicited from faculty members every year?

Reviews of department heads are conducted annually by the dean and input is formally solicited from faculty every year for the first 3 years a person is in the role of department head and every 3rd year thereafter according to OSU policy. However, some departmental policy also calls for an annual review of the department head. This is acceptable.

We follow a 3 year cycle in the evaluation of chairs/professorships for reappointment as well. Some have suggested we should do this annually, but the 3-year cycle seems more manageable by the faculty of the department so we do not solicit the input every year. Rather, they experience a formal evaluation every 3rd year similar to department heads.

There may be merit in seeking input on an annual basis, and using a shorter survey instrument may be helpful towards this end. However, surveys are not reliable if only a small number of those who are eligible to provide a review do so. Even with a three year cycle, the number of respondents is small, and it is difficult to understand how to interpret non-responses. One adjustment that may be helpful and perhaps more constructive for improvements would be to establish a faculty advisory committee in a department in order to improve communications with unit administrators and to provide counsel on unit needs and administrative actions.

10. Why are faculty members who develop grant proposals and conduct funded projects – essentially, the "customers" of DASNR's SPO – not given an opportunity to evaluate that unit's performance in a systematic way on an annual basis? Shouldn't the input of PIs be solicited at the conclusion of all projects – at a minimum?

    Three years ago we conducted a survey of all faculty concerning the effectiveness of DASNR Sponsored Programs. We certainly want to know where the faculty believe our strengths lie and where we should add resources or make adjustments to provide necessary service. We will make a point to conduct a review and seek faculty input this academic year.

    At any time, if there are problems with the Sponsored Programs office or with other support units, it is best to bring those problems to the attention of your unit administrator and for them to follow up with Mr. Klein (in the case of Sponsored Programs) or the administrator of the service unit of concern.

11. Why was there no systematic participant evaluation of the academic program office's advising workshop held in August, e.g., a post-training questionnaire? Shouldn't that be standard operating procedure (SOP)? Perhaps suggestions would have been made that lead to improving a similar activity in the future.

    Dr. Clary indicated that this was a missed step. She will follow up with workshop participants to solicit feedback. Thanks for the reminder.

12. Why were several important deadlines for various reports (or proposals) "pushed up" in the calendar – <u>creating significant hardship for those who do that work</u> – with no solicitation of input from faculty members who prepare the reports or proposals before significant changes were made to the due dates? Examples include new Hatch/OAES proposals, learning outcomes assessment reports, as well as annual and final Hatch/OAES reports. In the case of the learning outcomes assessment reports, CASNR's assessment coordinators' work flow schedules were truncated 2.5 months in regard to the University's deadline, i.e., July 1 (CASNR) v. Sept. 15 (remainder of the University). (In other words, assessment coordinators of the other colleges had an additional 2.5 months to prepare their reports and the work flow schedules of CASNR's assessment coordinators had to be significantly modified.)

The communication of the need for these changes could have been directed to faculty in a more timely way. Unit administrators and accounting staff were consulted and included in the planning for this, but communications to faculty members were not addressed by those involved in the decision process as early as would have been preferred.

New Hatch/OAES:
When a Hatch or McIntire-Stennis project is completed at the end of five years (they do not allow extensions anymore) and a new project is developed, account numbers had to change and departmental staff often had to move expenditures, salaries, students, matching, etc. from the old account to a temporary account while we waited for the project to be approved in Washington and finally to a new account. The budget entries then had to be reversed out of the temporary account and placed into the new account. This created a lot of duplicate effort by departmental staff. The new due date was developed with the input and agreement of the departmental accounting staff and department heads to make the process more efficient for departmental staff and others who have significant investment of time in the process.

Annual/Final Hatch reports:
We are required to have these reports submitted to Washington within 90 days of completion of the project (or fiscal year). We were simply getting these reports too late from faculty for review and input into the system. The process is not instantaneous and takes time. We needed the reports earlier than they were being submitted.

Academic Assessment Reports:
An email was sent to academic department heads and the department undergraduate and graduate program assessment coordinators on May 7th outlining changes to the assessment plan and report deadlines. These changes were in response to feedback received from the University Assessment office which suggested that we may need to strengthen and/or update our program assessment plans. The earlier CASNR deadline

was necessary to ensure that all program assessment plans and reports could be reviewed by the CASNR assessment evaluator (Dr. Marshall Baker) with enough time to allow for revisions if needed prior to the final submission date. While July 1 was the recommended deadline, we asked departments requiring additional time to work with us in developing a reasonable timeframe.

Discussion of RPT and Cumulative Review Process:

Randy Taylor provided a brief update on behalf of the CASNR RPT Committee. He mentioned that the first year of conducting the RPT process at the collegiate level illuminated the need for some changes, especially the way that packages are reviewed. Specifically, the review process may become more akin to a panel process like the process used for grant review. Thus, the committee members would be assigned packages as first, second, third, etc. tier reviewers, providing commensurate feedback to each package based on their review assignment. It is hoped that this move will expedite the process. On another note, Randy Taylor mentioned that elections were held for new RPT committee members, who serve a 1-year term.

Review of Newly Approved Agriculture Faculty Council Bylaws

There was a general discussion about the newly approved AFC bylaws that went into effect August 22, 2015. No further changes to the document were recommended.

Website Update

Eric Rebek mentioned that there were problems with the AFC website. The main problem was that the server was hosting an old version of the website, so meeting minutes and the recent bylaws changes were not available. This problem likely occurred during routine website maintenance and has since been resolved with assistance from Dwayne Hunter and his staff.

Subcommittee on Non-tenure Track Faculty Issues

At the previous AFC meeting, it was decided that a subcommittee should be created that focuses on governance issues related to non-tenure track faculty housed within CASNR. This subcommittee consists of Astri Wayadande, Chris Richards, and Jon Ramsey. Astri Wayadande mentioned that the subcommittee is currently gathering data about the types/titles of non-tenure track faculty, status of these appointments, and representation of these faculty at the department and college level.

Creation of OSU Faculty Council Representative to AFC

Chris Richards will meet with DASNR members of the University Faculty Council to represent Faculty Council at AFC meetings. Chris Richards is following up with these individuals. Nominations were called for an AFC representative to CASNR's Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee and Mike Smith agreed to take on this responsibility. Randy Taylor will be asked to continue in his capacity as an AFC representative to CASNR's RPT Committee. If he accepts, Randy could serve as liaison between AFC and the CASNR RPT Committee, filling two roles as representative for both groups.

Election of Officers for 2015-16

Members present nominated and approved new AFC officers for the 2015-2016 academic year. Results of this election are Chris Richards (chair), Rodney Jones (vice-chair), and Eric Rebek (secretary).

Meeting Minutes from April Approved

All AFC members in attendance approved the April 2015 Meeting Minutes (motioned by Dr. Wayadande and seconded by Dr. Jones).

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.