

**DASNR Faculty Council  
Minutes  
February 14, 2002**

**Members present:** Brian Adam, John Caddel, John Damicone, Jerry Fitch, Mike Kizer, Mark Longtine, Dennis Martin, Dean McCraw, Tom Royer, Don Turton, Sue Williams, and Mike Woods

**Members absent:** Nick Basta, Steve Cooper, and Robert Terry

**Ex-officio member:** Sam Curl, Dean & Director

**Non-members present:** D.C. Coston, Assoc. Director of Ag. Exp. Station; Joe Williams, Chair of OSU Parking Committee; Geary Robinson, OSU Parking Manager; Steve Stone, Director of Finance for DASNR.

1. **Call to order:** Call for additional agenda items by Chair Sue Williams. Agenda was approved as sent out except for a few changes in order to accommodate visitors.
2. **Announcement:** Lodging information is posted on Intranet at [http://intranet.okstate.edu/Fiacal\\_Affairs/travel.htm](http://intranet.okstate.edu/Fiacal_Affairs/travel.htm) Travelers are encouraged to use the site to facilitate travel and reduce costs.
3. **Minutes for December 6, 2001:** Approved as posted by the Secretary on-line at <http://www.afc.okstate.edu>.

4. **Committee Reports:**

**DASNR Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Committee:** No report

**DASNR Curriculum and Academic Standards (CAS) Committee:** Dean McCraw attended the meeting in the absence of Dennis Martin - Full minutes will be on the web. The committee met 5 Feb 2002, and discussions included the following:

1. Institution of a masters of Ag degree in Agribusiness in AgEcon to accommodate non majors interested in agribusiness instead of AgEcon. Should allow the department to reach some non majors.
2. Discussed re-designation of AGECON 4703 to environmental sciences and publicizing it as an environmental sciences course as taught By Larry Sanders. This should increase enrollment from 12-14 students per semester in the currently un-advertised course.
3. Biosystems and Ag Eng proposed creation of a new option on bioprocessing and biotechnology. Discussion indicated this was probably a departmental matter rather

than CASNR matter.

4. Hort and LA discussed designation hort seminar to 5020 to allow graduate students go get more direct credit for taking the course.

5. Passing comment was made about individuals considering individually whether the Ag. core curriculum might be approaching the need for revision.

## **5. Old Business**

Amendment of Bylaws Update - Revisions to the by-laws will be distributed via email.

## **6. New Business**

a. Report from OSU Faculty Council: Damicone reported that the following committees reported – Faculty, Academic Standards and Policy, Budget, Student Technology Fee, Research, Student Affairs and Learning Resources, and Athletics. Full minutes are on the web at - - - [http://www2.okstate.edu/fac\\_council/minutes/default.html](http://www2.okstate.edu/fac_council/minutes/default.html)

b. OSU Parking Committee Report: see appendix A

c. Question for Dean Curl:

**Background:** For at least 25 years, the system has been that faculty drafting articles for publication had their draft manuscripts reviewed by two colleagues before submission. I have participated in this system on both ends (as writer and critic) and found it to be a very useful and helpful. It has improved the quality of my manuscripts and I believe I have contributed to improving the quality of those of others. I have, in reviewing the manuscripts of others, tried to be as critical as possible, almost a devil's advocate---believing that strong criticism is what is most helpful.

Recently, DASNR has changed the policy in that copies of the reviews are to go to a central departmental person, often the department head, as well as to the faculty author. At first, I did not think that this was a big change. Now, I have two such manuscripts to review. I find it difficult to be as critical as I once was knowing that my comments will be used, whether officially or subconsciously, in evaluating the faculty members submitting the manuscripts. In a way, I feel that my academic freedom to criticize the manuscripts has been restricted. Certainly the new policy is antithetical to producing the highest quality manuscripts.

**Questions:** What motivated the institution of this new system? Was the policy change reviewed? What safeguards are in place to keep reviews from being used in the faculty evaluation process?

**Response** by D.C. Coston: One of the goals of the Experiment Station is to get the

results of research out to the public. One of the primary ways this is accomplished is through publication of peer-reviewed articles. To help assure that articles have the highest probability of being accepted for publication, we encourage review prior to their submission to the journal. We believe that this is in the best interest of the career development of the faculty and also for the Experiment Station as a whole.

At a recent meeting with Department Heads we discussed this. A number of the attending Department Heads described the procedures that are used in their respective departments. No two departments do this exactly alike – it varies from fairly formal to informal. Several of the departments have their processes written, many do not. A number of the attendees asked that, where available, copies of these procedures be shared. Based on email traffic and conversations, apparently there has been sharing of materials subsequent to this meeting.

We encouraged the Heads to discuss this with their departments, review how it is currently being done, and discern if there were improvements that might be made. We did say that when the Department forwards the article for OAES approval prior to submission to a journal, that we are taking this as verification that there has been some type of internal review to assure that it is of the highest quality possible. We did not prescribe any particular procedure.

**Background:** The word on CIS's move to use AT&T exclusively for wireless phone services is just getting out to faculty. Faculty complaints are beginning to strongly voices. Some believe that Cingular service is superior to AT&T in many parts of rural Oklahoma in terms of signal availability and strength. CIS may have good reasons for making the change to a single contractor, but none have been articulated to the faculty. If there are good reasons for this change they should be shared with the faculty.

**Questions:** Why did CIS decide to go to AT&T as exclusive provider? Will it save the university money to go to a single vendor? Is Cingular the best choice? Please ask CIS to justify this decision.

**Response:** A study was conducted to determine the cost of wireless telephone service for the university. It was discovered that eight different vendors provide service, with an estimated total annual cost approaching \$1 million.

A committee was formed to look at the possible merits of having a single vendor provide wireless service for the university. The university administration felt that using a single vendor would result in significant cost savings. Bids were taken and the committee recommended to the OSU administration AT&T wireless as the preferred vendor.

We understand that there can be exceptions to using AT&T as the wireless provider. Steve Stone is preparing a memo to J.L. Albert outlining that there cases, particularly in distant areas of the state, where using AT&T wireless exclusively would represent a substantial problem for us. We will be requesting exceptions in those cases. Steve Stone indicates that present service contracts may be continued for another 18 months.

d. The next AFC meeting date was changed to April 30, with April 17 for executive committee with Dean Curl.

**7. Adjourn** at 9:15

Respectfully submitted,

John Caddel, AFC Secretary

Appendix A.  
OSU Parking Committee Report  
to  
DASNR Faculty Council  
February 15, 2002

Discussion led by  
Joe Williams, Chair of OSU Parking Committee, and Geary Robinson, OSU Parking Manager

A. Membership and Mission

1. Membership

- a. Faculty Council (Marcia Dickman)
- b. Staff Council (Vina Spickler)
- c. Student Government Association (Jill Lawler)
- d. Resident Hall Association (Beth Gray)
- e. Off-Campus Student Association (Justin Barnett)
- f. Parking Office (Geary Robinson)
- g. At Large Member (Joe Williams, Chairman)
- h. At Large Member (John Houck)
- i. At Large Member (David Bosserman)
- j. Graduate and Professional Student Association (Clifton Sager)

2. Mission

To review and propose parking and traffic regulations and rates to the Vice President for Business and Finance that expedite the safe and orderly conduct of University business and to provide parking facilities in support of that function within the limits of available space to meet current and projected needs.

- B. Walker Report (Consulting firm – 1999) [Overview & record activities. Held forums with many on-campus groups. Final report in Fall 2000.]
- C. Dr. Harry Birdwell requested the Parking Committee develop a 3, 5, and 7 year implementation plan for the Walker Report.
- D. Campus Transit System – [Started Oct. 1996. Growth, as measured by number of boardings, is rapid.]
- E. Current Parking Survey – [Suggested by the OSU Faculty Council. Two phases – Current phone survey, and follow up will be somewhat more detailed.]
- F. Stillwater – Tulsa Shuttle – [Growing rapidly. 5:45 am to 10:30 pm. Average of 20 passengers/run. 10,016 passengers in Fall 2001. Close to breaking-even.]
- G. KA Associates assisted in developing a grant/legislative proposal for funding of Multimodal Transportation Facility (MMF) – (November 2001 – present) [Perhaps \$11 million facility with 80% Federal funding may supply 1000 spaces and offices for the OSU Police east of CITD.]