

DASNR Faculty Council (AFC) Minutes

February 8, 2000

Members Present: Tom Phillips, Francis Epplin, Carol Bender, Mike Kizer, Glenn Selk, Don Turton, Doug Needham, Darrel Kletke, Janice Herman, and Jeff Hattey

Members Absent: Ulrich Melcher, John Ritter, Terry Bidwell, Gerald Horn, and Kathleen Kelsey

Ex Officio Members Present: Dean Sam Curl and Bill Weeks

Non-Members Present:

Call to Order:

DASNR Faculty Council Chairman Francis Epplin called the meeting to order. Mike Kizer motioned approval of the agenda; Darrel Kletke seconded. Motion carried.

Secretarial Report:

Documents of the DASNR Faculty Council are available in Acrobat pdf format at <http://www.afc.okstate.edu>. Glenn Selk motioned approval of November 17, 1999, Minutes; Carol Bender seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business:

Report from RPT Committee—Turton

Acceptance of AFC Recommendations 1 and 2 (Discussion of changes in departmental RPT documents in response to these recommendations.)

1. The Dean require Academic Units to include a section in their RPT documents that describes the process by which faculty who have programmatic responsibilities to units other than their academic department are to be evaluated.
2. The Dean require Academic Units to include a section in their RPT documents that states that new faculty will be provided, at the time of hiring, with their job description, terms and conditions of employment and a copy of the current departmental RPT document. Commend Dean Curl. Enter recommendations. These recommendations represent official motions of the RPT Committee.

Mike Kizer commented that his department is unsure whether the second administrator, who is involved in the assessment of the faculty member, includes a written recommendation for the faculty member without input from the department's RPT committee and department head. Dean Curl commented that the recommendation comes from the department head to the Dean. Although input is sought from the second administrator prior to the tenure/promotion recommendation, the recommendation still originates from the department. The second administrator is not a voting member toward the faculty member's tenure/promotion.

Tom Phillips voiced that the situation could be circumvented by our recommendation #2. Kizer commented that there is some sense of discomfort because we don't know how future administrators may interact in this process. Dean Curl reiterated that the second administrator's input is purely advisory to the department head. Bill Weeks questioned whether the department head would acknowledge differences of opinion among himself, the second administrator, and the departmental RPT Committee in his letter of recommendation. Dean Curl responded that it would depend upon the department head and the manner in which he feels the recommendation should be written.

Carol Bender voiced some concerns such as clarification of shared department appointments by the Division's administration. Her department addresses recommendation #2 in its RPT documentation. She read questions from her department, such as whether the second administrator should be a member of the department's RPT committee. Kletke commented that it might be difficult for an individual to evaluate the performance of a faculty member whose job description is written by a department other than that of the second administrator. Dean Curl reiterated that there must be close dialogue at the time of hire and

throughout the review process of the responsibilities of the faculty member to the primary department and secondary department/center, and there must be coordination between the two administrators.

Kletke questioned whose responsibility it is for AFC recommendations to be relayed to the departments. Dean Curl indicated that he had relayed the recommendations, both in writing and verbally, to the department heads and other unit administrators. Kletke stressed that it is important to document how these types of appointments are to be handled as it is not an uncommon issue. Curl responded that such a statement from the Dean's office might be misread as an edict, or attempt to interfere with the departmental RPT Committee's process, and that this is a matter best left to the judgment of the individual department.

Kizer questioned whether requirements placed on a faculty member by administration outside of the department should be evaluated by the department's RPT Committee. The example he cited was a requirement for professional registration prior to tenure being granted. Phillips commented that the job description and offer for hire should be evaluated and agreed upon by the parties involved. Dean Curl indicated the terms and conditions of employment are those specified in the letter of offer to hire. Since the letter of offer to hire includes both the Dean's signature and the department head's signature, both the division administration and the academic department have, therefore, agreed on the conditions imposed in the letter.

Don Turton questioned whether the AFC RPT Committee should indeed be advising the departments on how their RPT documents should address this issue. Kletke suggested that we may at least want to review how departments have addressed the two recommendations.

Turton questioned whether the University Faculty Council should make recommendations for faculty whose appointments cross college boundaries. Weeks commented that one college cannot dictate what another does. Janice Herman commented that there must be close contact with the faculty member and the department head involved. Herman said that her department tries to ensure that Cooperative Extension is represented on her department's RPT Committee to evaluate a faculty's scholarly development in extension even if it is through teaching and/or research. Weeks will inquire of the University Faculty Council which of its subcommittees would address our recommendations.

Turton recommended that Dean Curl's letter be included in the Minutes. Dean Curl concurred.

New Business:

Discussion with the Dean—Dean Curl

Response to Issues and Questions

- 1. What faculty-relevant issues are the Dean and his associates discussing or planning to discuss in the next two months? Have any committees or study groups (formal or informal) been established in the last two months with faculty participation? Please identify the issues being studied and the faculty members involved.**

Dean Curl's response: As I indicated at our last meeting, the associates and I hope that practically all issues we discuss are in some sense faculty-relevant. I will mention several topics that I think are particularly faculty-relevant. We are currently involved in management sessions with all DASNR Unit Administrators. These sessions address the teaching, research and extension priorities for departments. Faculty and staff positions, facilities, maintenance budgets and capital needs are all addressed in these sessions. New programs or priorities are also identified.

In the College, a new task force is being formed to address issues facing the undergraduate Environmental Sciences Program. This group includes student, faculty, department head and administrative membership. There is overlap with the Environmental Science Steering Committee membership, but the Task Force membership needs broader input for topics such as student satisfaction, administrative support, and financial and facility needs.

Two groups that are meeting periodically are task forces related to OSU-Tulsa and information technology. These groups both have broad membership. Participation will vary from meeting to meeting as the issues of concern to be discussed vary. To some extent we are in a reactive mode in these areas because of uncertainties of budget, University level support, political considerations, and other rather unpredictable factors.

Within the broader context of reappointment, promotion, and tenure policy issues, we will soon be forming a task force to examine the Division's Academic Rank Descriptions statement currently in use and recommend any revisions. The input of the AFC will be very important in this regard. The statement was developed in 1984 and has not been revised since that time.

- 2. Faculty and staff recently received cards announcing the appointments of the new Assistant Dean for International Programs and the new Head of Forestry. (Many of the cards probably went directly into wastebaskets within seconds of being opened.) What does this cost? Is this a wise or justified expense in view of tight budgets, staffing problems, etc.?**

Dean Curl's response: The cards are printed for the purpose of announcing particular appointments to external audiences, including private and corporate donors and foundations, state and federal governmental agencies, selected alumni and friends, advisory groups, and peer groups (in this example, international programs and forestry departments) at other universities. I believe they project a quality image from which the Division derives benefits which far exceed the costs. In the quantity in which we have the cards printed, they cost about 33 cents each. Cards left over after external distribution needs have been met have been distributed internally.

- 3. Let the Dean know that some of us are frustrated and outraged about the "white fence" being erected west of Western. What are we supposed to tell farmers and the public about such a flamboyant expenditure at a time when we are being assailed from producers who already wonder what we're doing with the taxpayers' money instead of helping them?**

Dean Curl's response: It is disappointing and a little surprising that someone would become outraged over the fence. I could talk for a long time about the importance of image to such things as good public relations, external fund development, political support, alumni pride, and student recruitment, but I don't believe you want me to take your time or mine to do that here. The fence, from my perspective, represents a solid long term investment for the Division. Even from a purely utilitarian standpoint, the fence will be there for many, many years and will continue to look very good throughout that time, with virtually no maintenance cost. Concerning the last part of the statement, most farmers and ranchers do not expect or want the university research farm to appear to be average or ordinary. I consider it very important that we project a progressive quality image and endeavor to always "put our best foot forward" in interpreting and marketing the Division to our internal and external constituents.

- 4. Does OSU have a maintenance plan for buildings on campus including Ag Hall? It is assumed that rooms in the Classroom Building were renovated with general University maintenance funds. When are classrooms in Ag Hall scheduled for renovation? Will this be from general university funds?**

Dean Curl's response: OSU does have a plan for maintenance of buildings on the OSU campus. The priorities are established by a committee. The Dean and the Associates point out classroom concerns to Dr. Keener, Dr. Birdwell, and others periodically throughout the year and specifically in our annual budget presentations. Dr. Keener has toured Ag Hall at our request and has taken note of our requests for improving the classrooms in the building.

The Classroom Building was renovated using Section 13 funds. Section 13 funds can only be used for construction or renovation.

At this time, we are not aware of any particular renovations planned for classrooms in Ag Hall. If and when the classrooms are renovated by the University, funding will come from either Section 13 funds or bonds.

- 5. Who is responsible for maintenance of classrooms, labs, and offices in Ag Hall (departments, division, or university)?**

Dean Curl's response: The Physical Plant has responsibility for maintenance of general classrooms in Ag Hall. Physical Plant has responsibility for heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; lighting; broken desks; etc. Physical Plant is also responsible for labs and offices.

Jeff Hattey also commented that Physical Plant is often not quick to respond to immediate needs such as flooded laboratory space. Kizer questioned whether it is the responsibility of Physical Plant to replace equipment its personnel has damaged.

Phillips asked who DASNR's Physical Plant representative is. Dean Curl responded that Monty Karns is DASNR's Facility Engineer. Kletke motioned that we prepare a statement of concerns about timeliness of Physical Plant work; Phillips seconded. Motion carried. Hattey will draft a letter. Weeks will also address this issue with the OSU Faculty Council.

6. Who is responsible for maintenance of AV Multimedia equipment in Ag Hall? Whom should we call if equipment is broken?

Dean Curl's response: Audio Visual (University) is responsible for replacing AV/multimedia equipment in rooms other than 101, 201, and 202 when it fails. The College owns the multimedia equipment in Ag Hall 101, 201, and 202. Replacing that equipment when it fails is the responsibility of the College. Overhead transparency machines are maintained exclusively by Audio Visual. Computer malfunctions and/or software are attended to by college computer personnel. Some equipment in classrooms is owned by departments, and the departments are responsible for it. Necessary batteries and bulbs for slide projectors in Ag Hall 101, 201, and 202 are supported by the Academic Programs office in 136 Ag Hall. Other classrooms are supported by Audio Visual. When anyone has questions or comments concerning the maintenance or replacement of classroom equipment, he or she should contact Wes Holley in 136 Ag Hall.

Hatthey commented that AGH 101, 201, and 202 were some of the first multimedia classrooms on campus and that we must not wait too long for upgrade of the equipment. Weeks questioned whether it is appropriate for the College to own the equipment in these classrooms when it is used by classes from across campus. Dean Curl indicated that classroom issues should first be addressed with Wes Holley.

Issues for referral to OSU Faculty Council

Weeks will inquire of the University Faculty Council which subcommittee would address our RPT recommendations 1 and 2. Weeks will also address issue #5 above with the OSU Faculty Council.

OSU Faculty Council Report:

Weeks addressed increases in insurance rates. Since spouses and dependents tend to have more claims, those rates were increased. However, rates are still lower than if we had continued with American Fidelity.

Updated finals policy addresses evening classes' final exams and MWF 8:30 classes' final exams.

Dave Buchanan is chairing a committee to review scholarship. Weeks encouraged all to participate.

Adjourn:

Next meeting is April 11, 8-10 A.M., in AGH 102. Election of officers will be held at the September 12 meeting. Turton motioned adjournment; Hatthey seconded. Motion carried.

Chairman Epplin adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Needham,
AFC Secretary

Attachments:

Dean Curl's memorandum to academic department heads with subject "Departmental Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies," dated January 10, 2000.

January 10, 2000

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Academic Department Heads

From: Sam E. Curl

Subject: Departmental Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies

The Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Committee of the Agriculture Faculty Council (AFC) has completed its review of departmental reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies. A complete copy of the committee report is attached for your information. As a result of their review, the RPT committee proposed, and the AFC approved, the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1:

“The Dean require Academic Units to include a section in their RPT documents that describes the process by which faculty who have programmatic responsibilities to units other than their academic departments are to be evaluated.” (AFC, 11/17/99)

This past spring, the associates and I met with each Food and Agricultural Products Research and Technology Center faculty member in light of the unique programmatic responsibilities each of these individuals has outside his/her academic unit. Also participating in these meetings were the faculty member’s academic department head, the director of the Center, and the chair or a representative of his/her departmental RPT committee. These meetings were considered to be extremely beneficial to all parties, and we intend to have similar meetings within the next few months with other faculty members who have programmatic responsibilities in units outside their academic department. I concur with this recommendation and ask that academic department heads work with their respective faculty to revise departmental RPT policies to include the above statement.

Recommendation 2:

“The Dean require Academic Units to include a section in their RPT documents that states that new faculty will be provided, at the time of hiring, with their job description, terms and conditions of employment, and a copy of their current departmental RPT document.” (AFC, 11/17/99)

I concur with this recommendation and ask that academic department heads work with their respective faculty to revise departmental RPT policies to include the above recommendation. This recommendation is covered in the OSU Faculty Handbook, appendix D, sections 1.1.3, and 1.4.2. It would be useful to include a reference to these two sections in the departmental RPT policy. Please note that an employment offer letter to a faculty member must include a copy of the position description for the position to be held by the faculty member, departmental and Division reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies, and formal appraisal and development statements.

I appreciate the work of the AFC Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee and their efforts to strengthen the Division's RPT process. If you have any questions regarding the committee's report or these recommendations, please let the associates or me know.

enclosure

xc: D.C. Coston
Edwin L. Miller
Lowell Satterlee
Merritt Taylor
Francis Epplin
Don Turton
Neils Maness
Mary Anne Gularte
Remaining members of the Agriculture Planning Group