

DASNR Faculty Council – Minutes

3:00 PM - AGH 106 – 26 February 2014

1. Introductions / attendance

DASNR Faculty Council members in attendance- Jeff Edwards, Gopal Kakani, Brian Whitacre, Sam Fuhlendorf, Gina Peek, Dan Storm, Haobo Jiang, Ulrich Melcher, and John Ramsey were in attendance. Notes were taken by Jeff Edwards and Ulrich Melcher.

2. Questions for Interim Dean Dr. Mike Woods

- a. I have a concern or suggestion for the Dean. I would urge him to mark his 2014 calendar for Veterans Day. To my knowledge the recent Veterans Day was not recognized by ANY of the OSU administration (assoc. deans, dean & vp, provost, nor president). Perhaps the number of vets (students, faculty and staff) is too insignificant to warrant a simple recognition and thanks. These people gave up several years of their life to serve their country. Sure would have been a great photo op for the dean or president to have their picture and a short story with some student veterans.

Woods' response: Thank you for the suggestion and I will note Veterans Day 2014. Dr. Woods made note of a University-wide initiative focused on assisting veterans through student services and online courses, and indicated that programs to assist veterans are very important to DASNR and OSU.

- b. Why does it take so long for academic departments to receive outreach funds due for courses taught? For example, faculty that taught an outreach course as overload last fall have not been paid as of mid February. Is that acceptable?

Woods' response: The delay is due to several factors, not the least of which is the multiple steps required in processing the payment. The first step is handled by University Fiscal Affairs and includes tracking of credit hours by student ID and on a student-by-student basis. This step cannot be completed until the end of the semester in question, as incorrect numbers could result in overpayment or underpayment of the faculty member. At the beginning of the following semester there is a series of paperwork exchange among the department in question, CASNR, DASNR, and OSU Admin. This all requires time.

Another issue that comes into play is the 13th month salary limit. That is, checks must be in place in the process to ensure the faculty member's total compensation does not exceed 13 months. The whole 13th month salary issue is part of an ongoing discussion that will be addressed at the next Unit Leaders' meeting with the Dean.

- c. What does Dr. Woods know about the RPT policy that the Regents did not approve?

It wasn't that it was not approved; it was removed from the docket by OSU legal counsel. The concept has not changed and is still moving forward, there are just some changes in wording that will occur prior to the final approval.

Dr. Woods explained the current process, which essentially includes four opinions or voices for RPT actions (outside letters, departmental committee, department head, Dean). The proposed changes would add a fifth voice, which is the DASNR RPT committee (see notes below for composition of this committee).

Question – how will the DASNR RPT committee fit in to the new system? Will they make an up or down recommendation on every action or simply review to ensure policies and procedures were followed?

Woods' response – That remains to be determined. This is no small task some years. There were 23 RPT actions to review this year, for example. Dr. Woods recommended that the DASNR RPT committee meet with Sue Bonner to determine the timeline for action and where the DASNR RPT committee would fit into this schedule, as all actions will still have to adhere to University deadlines. Realistically, the policies and procedures need to be in place by August for everything to flow smoothly for the 2014/2015 RPT actions.

- d. What does Dr. Woods know about the workload definition policy that the Regents had on their December agenda, but that seems not to have made it to approval?

Dr. Woods asked for clarification.

Question – how do 5000 and 6000 level research courses fit into Workload requirements?

Woods' response – Efforts should be made to look at how teaching allocation is being used and making sure that everyone is being dealt with fairly. The whole concept of teaching workload is becoming more complicated as OCES and OAES budgets are flat or reduced. Dr. Woods' supports the idea of research workloads being based on Hatch Proposals and Extension workloads being based on annual Plan of Work.

The key to the whole concept is annual conversations between the individual faculty member and his/her department head when plans are discussed and goals are set.

- e. In the past, has the administration advised the department heads how merit based raises are to be generally distributed across their faculty?

Woods' response – Yes and this is a topic of discussion with department heads.

- f. Is there potential to get a merit pay scale for non-tenure track faculty? What is your opinion on this topic?

Dr. Woods indicated these individuals are part of the merit pay program and asked for clarification. It was explained that the question was essentially asking why is there not an advancement system, such as assistant, associate, full professor, for non-tenure track faculty?

Woods' response – There has been some discussion of a career advancement system for research faculty. The Career Ladder program used in Extension was offered as an example of how a system such as this could operate outside of the traditional asst, assoc., full system. The primary question is where the money would come from.

- g. Why are department heads not evaluated annually after their first 3 years?

The Dean evaluates department heads annually; however, the call for DASNR-wide input occurs each of the first three years and only periodically after that point. Dr. Woods indicated he is always open to receiving input and could use this input as part of his evaluation process. There has been discussion about adding an open-ended question at the end of the web-based form that is used for administrator evaluation. Something along the lines of “is there any input you would like to provide on any administrator not listed on this form”.

- h. Question – “What is being done about the sub par custodial services in Ag Hall?”

Dr. Woods' response – There have been an overwhelming number of emails and calls on this subject. Dr. Woods met with the general manager for GCA and conveyed the concerns raised by tenants of Ag Hall. There have been a few reasons for the poor service. None of the Ag Hall custodial staff opted to stay on with GCA, so this resulted in trained staff leaving on a Friday and new staff arriving Monday morning without any knowledge of the building or the location of facilities. GCA is also having difficulty hiring employees. The impression was also given that GCA initially underestimated bathroom use during the day in AGH and did not fully understand that cleaning and stocking bathrooms the night before was not sufficient to keep them in good working order during the day. Dr. Woods emphasized that this is not to make excuses for the company and also emphasized that the custodial workers should not be the ones receiving complaints directly.

Dr. Woods' encourages faculty to continue sending information regarding the status of custodial services.

Dr. Woods was thanked by the council for his answers and willingness to meet with the group.

3. Dean search update – Jon Ramsey

Jon Ramsey provided an update on the Dean search. He indicated that the overall experience in this search has been more positive than the initial search and that the search firm being used appears to be putting forth a good effort at recruitment. He also indicated that the President's office has been very supportive through the process. Currently the committee is evaluating the pool of applicants and looking at directed references.

4. DASNR RPT committee

The re-establishment of the DASNR RPT Committee was discussed.

Edwards - Given the proposed changes in University RPT guidelines, this committee will have some important tasks to undertake over the coming year. The DASNR RPT Committee will serve as the college-level committee for DASNR as required in the proposed changes to University RPT guidelines.

Fuhlendorf – Will the DASNR RPT committee need to change its policies and procedures to be in line with University guidelines?

Edwards – If the new guidelines are passed by the Board of Regents, then some changes will likely be needed. These will likely involve changing the DASNR Faculty Council bylaws. It will be the charge of the DASNR RPT Committee to work with administration to figure out what changes need to occur and how the committee will operate in the new RPT framework. One such issue is the proposed rule that no one can serve on both a departmental RPT committee and the University level committee. How will this be handled in departments, such as NREM, where all faculty effectively serve on the departmental RPT committee.

Edwards submitted the following list for the three at-large seats on the DASNR RPT Committee. Motion to approve by Melcher. Second by Ramsey. Motion carried.

- a. Note terms began Jan. 1 2014
- b. At large positions appointed by AFC chair
 - i. John Damicone, E&PP – three year term
 - ii. Udaya DeSilva, ANSCI – two year term
 - iii. Francis Epplin, AGECEC – one year term

Edwards called for nominations for the two DASNR RPT Committee seats to be filled by DASNR Faculty Council members.

Ulrich Melcher was nominated for the two-year term (Vice Chair) by Fuhlendorf. Second by Ramsey. Motion passed.

Craig Davis was nominated for the one-year term (2014 Chair) by Fuhlendorf. Second by Ramsey. Motion passed.

5. Jon Ramsey was appointed as the DASNR Faculty liaison to the CASNR Curriculum and Academic Standards (CAS) committee
6. Discussion of bylaws was deferred until the April meeting.
7. Motion to adjourn by Ramsey. Second by Melcher. Motion passed