

DASNR Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
November 11, 2015

Meeting called to order at 1:00 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. Max Melstrom, Agricultural Economics

Dr. Gina Peek, Design, Housing, and Merchandising

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

Dr. Tim Bowser, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering

Dr. Tyson Ochsner, Plant and Soil Science

Mr. Shane Robinson, Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence

Ms. Deb Garrard Foster, Nutritional Sciences

Dr. Randy Taylor, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering (CASNR RPT Committee rep)

Dr. Nathan Walker, Entomology and Plant Pathology (OSU Faculty Council rep)

1. 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)

- 1) Can Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty have a hatch account? The concern for tenure track faculty is that it is taking away our resources. What are the policy rules that determine when NTT faculty can and cannot have a hatch account?

NTT faculty are valuable members of our faculty. They are eligible for Hatch, McIntire-Stennis, Hatch Multi-State, or Animal Health accounts if their department head requests such an account. There is no OSU or DASNR policy stating when a NTT faculty member should have an account, but it must fit the mission of OAES and the department. Rather than taking away from our resources, NTT faculty are important to accomplishing the mission of DASNR and OAES.

- 2) The Provost stated in the last town hall meeting with faculty that for accreditation, the university must have evidence of shared faculty governance. This year, the university is being reviewed for accreditation. CASNR is the only college without a true faculty council, but has a Dean's council which serves as an advisory committee? Can we ask the Dean or current faculty council to put forth a ballot to all voting faculty in CASNR as to whether they would like to create a CASNR faculty council that participates in shared governance.

The results of shared governance are evident in DASNR through the processes which we participate in regularly. Departments have shared governance through monthly faculty meetings and the department heads represent the departments and faculty to the Dean. The DASNR Faculty Council is another layer of shared governance and there are certainly others, such as committee work.

Faculty members wishing for the DASNR Faculty Council to take a different approach to shared governance should get involved in discussions with the council. I would prefer changes to their bylaws be initiated by faculty and the elected members of the council. It is my understanding that DASNR Faculty Council bylaws and all DASNR faculty policy, such as the new RPT policy, were written and voted on by the DASNR faculty as a whole. If you are not being included in these votes and opportunities, please talk to your DASNR Faculty Council representative.

Additional discussion about this issue: Nathan Walker stated it is important for DASNR to have a voice and formal representation at the university level. Chris Richards supports this and it could be put forth as a subcommittee assignment next semester. However, Jon Ramsey stated that we already have a mechanism in place for DASNR representation in the form of AFC, reiterating Dr. Coon's response above. So, is there a need to have a formal governing body? Our bylaws do not prohibit creation of a more structured faculty body. Dr. Walker will look into how other colleges are represented at the university level and report back to AFC at our next meeting.

- 3) My understanding is that faculty on 12 month appointments (yes, us "old ones") are not allowed to claim a 13th month salary. Is this true? If it is true, why? It seems not equitable to allow faculty on less than 12 month appointments to get a 13th month.

There is considerable confusion surrounding the allowance for supplemental or overload pay. I think it would help to have an ad hoc group of faculty and administrators review our current policies and practices and to provide recommendations for ways we can improve, clarify and simplify our policies within the boundaries of OSU policy. I would appreciate your thoughts on how we might form such a group and how we might frame their assignment.

Currently, OSU policy allows for faculty to apply for supplemental salary for an amount valued at no more than equivalent to one month of the individual's annualized salary beyond payment of their annualized salary. Annualized salary is defined as equivalent to compensation for 12 months of work. A faculty member on a 9-month appointment could receive up to 4 months of supplemental salary (the 10th, 11th, and 12th months plus one more). A faculty member on an 11-month appointment could receive up to 2 months of supplemental salary (the 12th month, plus one more). A 12-month employee could receive supplemental salary equivalent to one month's salary. Most grants will not allow direct payment from grant funds for supplemental salary beyond 12 months since the employee is already compensated for 12 months. However, other kinds of supplemental pay (i.e. Correspondence Course or other pre-approved overload) are available to those on 12 month

appointments. I think we need to review the alternatives for compensating supplemental pay for anyone beyond 12 months in light of federal accounting standards and with an eye towards consistency among our units.

Additional discussion about this issue: Dr. Walker mentioned there is a subcommittee on OSU Faculty Council investigating the issue of supplemental salary.

- 4) I am asking for clarification of why non-tenure track faculty on an 11 month appointment are ineligible to pay for their 12 month through grant funds? Several faculty in this classification currently have grants, or are encouraged to seek extramural funding, but since they are not tenure track they cannot pay for a 12 month.

Our current OSU and DASNR guidelines do not exclude non-tenure track 11-month employees from participating in the use of Sponsored Funds to pay supplemental salary. DASNR's current guidelines stipulate:

- *the amount dedicated to the salary and the period of time covered must be part of the grant as a budget item.*
- *the source of funds must be based on a peer-reviewed proposal award.*
- *the award must include F&A at OSU's full rate or at the maximum rate allowed by the agency.*
- *the faculty member must perform grant-related work, which will be verified by Time and Effort certifications.*

- 5) What, if any, relationship is expected between DASNR and the OSU Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise?

(See Dean Coon's response below Question 6.)

- 6) Parts of the Overview page of the OSU Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise website (<https://fe.okstate.edu/overview>) hints of advocacy. For example the statement to "foster free market agriculture and educational entrepreneurship" could be interpreted as a call for the demise of publicly funded institutions such as the Cooperative Extension Service, 4-H, the NRCS, AMS, APHIS, FSA, NASS, NIFA, and Oklahoma State University.
- a) Why would OSU advocate for less or zero public funding for institutions that have served the public well for decades?
 - b) Is the purpose of the Institute to return U.S. higher agricultural education, and U.S. agriculture to the way it was prior to 1862?
 - c) We hear a lot of rhetoric from our administrators about the wonders of the Land Grant mission. Do they understand that Land Grant universities are the result of government intervention in educational markets?

The formation of this Institute was stimulated by a gift. Deans were asked to share their thoughts about the best way to administer the Institute and the gift. The decision was made

to house the Institute within the responsibilities of the Provost's office, and as such, the Director of the Institute will report to the Provost.

I share concerns about the role of this institute as it relates to the land grant mission of Oklahoma State University and have voiced those. We have no responsibilities to the Institute, and I don't anticipate there will be any collaboration between the Institute and DASNR faculty and programs. I anticipate that the Institute will benefit from the opportunity for faculty and students to pursue lines of inquiry as they see fit and that its faculty and students will be expected to honor and follow university policy with respect to advocacy. I do not interpret that the Institute will be the sole source of inquiry into the issues and policies at OSU identified in the information that describes its mission and area of study. Nor will its findings and publications be construed as representative of OSU administration nor obligate others at OSU in any way without mutual agreement.

- 7) Some of the restrooms in Ag Hall do not have ventilation fans but they do have windows. However, some, perhaps all, of these windows are sealed. Why not unseal the windows and let them be used for those occasions during which ventilation is warranted?

We posed this question to Facilities Management. After a spot check inspection of restrooms on November 10, they have recommended replacing the grills in the restroom doors of the center wing. Ventilation and exhaust were measured in several south wing restrooms and those were exhausting properly. FM also is working with GCA regarding cleaning the restrooms more thoroughly, especially the terrazzo floors. The floor and grill cleaning coupled with planned exhaust system improvement should greatly reduce the problem. It is not recommend that windows be opened.

If there is a specific restroom which needs attention, please call the Action Desk or submit a Facilities Management Work Order -- <https://workorder.okstate.edu/Customer/>

- 8) Why did the Oklahoma Farm Bureau have a painted window during Homecoming? This is supposed to be a student organization activity and it would seem to set a precedent that industries and other non-university organizations can essentially be advertising through the university.

An OSU registered student group, Student Farm Bureau, decorated the window.

- 9) CASNR has a policy that limits the numbers of advisees that a faculty member can advise. In large departments, this cap forces more advisees down to low teaching percentage faculty. In effort equations, advising receives a small credit thereby creating a disadvantage for low percentage teaching faculty. Would it not be more equitable to remove caps and allow department flexibility or base advising load on Teaching FTE's and student numbers in a department?

The CASNR undergraduate academic advising formula is as follows: 1% credit in fall/spring for up to 6 undergraduate advisees. Depending on the faculty member's summer involvement, partial credit may be provided during summer months.

Academic advising credit is limited to 15% per semester. This translates to an academic advising load of 90 undergraduate students each semester.

The limit was put into place after reviewing faculty appointment responsibilities (teaching/research/extension), department advising capacity and the student service issues associated with heavy advising loads (such as timely review of graduation requirements).

Teaching appointments are met with a variety of instructional activities. Some examples are course instruction, academic advising, club advising and undergraduate, graduate or assessment coordinator responsibilities. The faculty member's instructional appointment percentage and appointment length will influence the types of activities used to meet the appointment.

Most academic advising is done by faculty with at least a 25% or greater teaching appointment.

- 10) Does DASNR and/or OAES have a policy for evenly distributing royalties to research programs? If yes, what is it? If no, how does the administrator(s) distribute royalties?

OSU policy prescribes the distribution of royalty returns. 50% is returned to the inventor(s), 30% to the University, and 20% to the college or division. The funds received by DASNR are retained in the OAES Associate VP office and are used to purchase equipment or facilities for the program generating the royalties. The royalties are not evenly distributed to research programs across OAES but are used to strengthen the programs generating those royalties.

Policy stipulates:

The college's(s') share of income under section 5.01(b) shall be administered by the dean(s) of the college(s) and shall first be utilized to support the research program(s) of the inventor(s) as long as the inventor(s) remain(s) (an) employee(s) of the University. If the inventor(s) leave(s) the University, the funds shall be distributed at the discretion of the relevant dean(s) for use in furtherance of said College's(s') research programs and goals.

- 11) How can we get GCFA (Grants & Contracts Financial Administration) for OSU on board with our division- and department-level grants and contracts activities that will truly tell faculty that "bringing in grant funds for their programs is considered important"?

I understand and share your concerns and frustrations with the transitions in our budget and finance systems. GCFA is meant to serve institutional needs for accuracy and accountability and it also has the responsibility of providing a system that is efficient and user-friendly. In the transition from the old financial system (FRS) to the new one (BANNER), they have

attempted to design in greater accountability in a number of ways, including the requirement for more detailed budget planning than used in FRS. Much of the frustration this question voices is with the migration from the FRS system to the BANNER system. The principles remain the same, but the greater detail in the new system's budgeting process is causing a backlog of adjustments. As frustrating as these are, they do not reflect a change in the importance of grant and contract funding for our research, Extension and teaching activities. For a more detailed explanation of the current challenges, I share this summary from Bob Klein, Assistant VP for Administration and Finance:

".... The difference is that FRS (the old financial system) allowed budget lines to be over-expended (incorrect) within budget categories as long as the bottom line was unaffected. Since that was a financial information system issue, it wasn't much of an audit risk. BANNER now requires budgets to be more detailed, and to stay within budget in each line, which makes anything that isn't correct an audit risk even if the bottom line is unaffected.

This will continue to affect our grant administration as we continue through the transition because:

- 1. Older grants that existed in FRS came into BANNER with their account codes overspent (even if the grant total was not overspent), so we're having to do budget transfers to allow expenses to process in BANNER. As we are setting up new grants, we are doing more delineation of account codes on the front end to prevent these things from happening.*
- 2. The process of executing budget transfers was not explained at the time BANNER was implemented, and it has taken time to understand the new procedures required. We recently began training departmental staff to learn these methods, and as they gain experience, we expect that the process will be smoother and quicker.*
- 3. We are told that University GCFA (Grants & Contracts Financial Administration) is backlogged right now due to the large number of transfers this has necessitated. We have asked for enhanced ability to execute these within-budget transfers with less direct involvement of GCFA in the future and have been some assurance that we will achieve this as we gain experience."*

I have asked for an opportunity to address these and other concerns with the slow-down BANNER is causing in our ability to administer contracts and grants with Senior VP Weaver and have a meeting scheduled with him in the next week.

2. Old Business

a) Approval of previous meeting minutes

Meeting minutes from September 3, 2015 were approved by majority.

- b) Welcome Dr. Nathan Walker as OSU Faculty Council representative and fill-in for Dr. Astri Wayadande, currently interim director of NIMFFAB

Dr. Walker provided notes from OSU Faculty Council. These are provided at the end of these meeting minutes as Addendum I. Dr. Walker's notes include information on members of OSU Faculty Council who are in DASNR and recent activity of the council. A link to detailed meeting minutes from the last meeting is provided in Addendum 1.

- c) Website update (Eric Rebek)

All issues with the AFC website have been resolved and it is now current, including meeting minutes and recent changes to our bylaws. The current list of AFC members and committee members should be available on the AFC website soon. Thanks were extended to Dwayne Hunter of CASNR Information and Technology Office and Melissa Mourer, CASNR Communication Coordinator, for their help in resolving the issue.

- d) DASNR planning process (Jon Ramsey)

Discussion focused on the future location of buildings and facilities within DASNR, including teaching labs. There is concern about the feasibility and safety of students making it to class on time if teaching labs and other classroom facilities are moved out of the main core of campus. Dr. Ramsey stated that these concerns will be addressed as the planning process continues. Incidentally, it was mentioned that all parking will be pushed out of the main core of campus in the future per the campus-wide planning committee.

- e) DASNR RPT Committee update (Randy Taylor)

Dr. Taylor reiterated from the last AFC meeting that the DASNR RPT Committee will likely move to using a review panel system to handle the large volume of packets reviewed annually. This system, similar to a grant review panel, will improve efficiency and expedite the review process. Dr. Taylor also took time to remind everyone that the committee is only responsible for determining if the departmental RPT policies were followed and whether the RPT decision was affected if policies weren't followed. In most cases where departmental policy wasn't followed, it was due to not following the sequential order of personnel involved in reviewing the packet (e.g., unit administrator reviewing before departmental RPT committee).

- f) CASNR Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (Mike Smith)

No discussion as Dr. Smith wasn't able to attend the meeting.

3. New Business

- a) Committee on non-tenure track faculty – interim chair needed

AFC needs to appoint an interim chair to lead this subcommittee of AFC. This will be discussed in detail at the next AFC meeting.

- b) Other new business

None to report.

- c) Next AFC meeting

The next AFC meeting will be scheduled based on Dean Coon's availability. Faculty will then be polled for their availability within those constraints.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Addendum 1. Notes from OSU Faculty Council (Nathan Walker, representative)

OSU Faculty Council

Chair: Stephen Clarke

Nutritional Sciences

stephen.clarke@okstate.edu

Faculty Council Members from DASNR

Carol Jones (Vice-Chair)

Biosystems/Agricultural Engineering

jcarol@okstate.edu

Rita Miller (Chair: Retirement and Fringe Benefits committee)

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

rita.miller@okstate.edu

Christopher Richards

Animal Science

chris.richards@okstate.edu

Tom Royer (Chair: Athletics committee)

Entomology and Plant Pathology

tom.royer@okstate.edu

Deb Vanoverbeke (Secretary)

Animal Science
deb.vanoverbeke@okstate.edu

Jason Vogel
Biosystems/Agricultural Engineering
jason.vogel@okstate.edu

Nathan Walker (Chair: Campus facilities, safety and security committee)
Entomology and Plant Pathology
nathan.walker@okstate.edu

Minutes available at: <https://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/agendas-minutes>

Relatively quiet, no pending Faculty Council recommendations for the year

Budget concerns

Yesterday Retirement and Fringe Benefits committee submitted a recommendation for waived tuition for dependents of faculty and staff employees.