

DASNR Faculty Council (AFC) Minutes

April 11, 2000

Members Present: Gerald Horn, Tom Phillips, Carol Bender, Darrel Kletke, Don Turton, Ulrich Melcher, Doug Needham, Francis Epplin, Glenn Selk, Kathleen Kelsey, and Jeff Hattey

Members Absent: Terrence Bidwell, Janice Hermann, Mike Kizer, and John Ritter

Ex Officio Members Present: Dean Sam Curl

Non-Members Present: Ed Miller

Call to Order:

DASNR Faculty Council Chairman Francis Epplin called the meeting to order. Horn motioned approval of agenda, Melcher seconded. Motion carried.

Secretarial Report:

Documents of the DASNR Faculty Council are available in Acrobat pdf format at <http://www.afc.okstate.edu>. Horn motioned approval of the AFC February Minutes; Bender seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business:

Statement of concerns about timeliness of Physical Plant Work (see 2/8/2000 AFC Minutes, p. 3, item 5).

Hattey distributed copies of a letter drafted to John Houck with respect to Physical Plant's timely attention to Ag Hall facilities. He cited the flooding of his basement lab as an example. Turton questioned whether other Ag facilities should be included in the letter. Ag Hall and other DASNR facilities associated with the main campus were targeted to be identified in the letter. Kletke questioned whether others should be cc'd. The letter will be cc'd to Monty Karns, Vice President Keener, and Dean Curl. Miller commented that Monty is new in his position and, thus, should be well aware of the letter before it is sent to Houck. Dean Curl commented that our situation with Physical Plant has improved since Monty was hired. Miller reiterated that we want to build a strong, positive relationship, rather than adversarial. Dean Curl commented that Monty has saved DASNR money already. Horn suggested that the letter also address temperature control and protection of sensitive equipment as other problems indicated by Bender. Epplin suggested that the draft be routed to the committee via e-mail for comments and, then, mailed to Houck. Epplin, as Chair of AFC, will sign the letter. Phillips motioned that Hattey incorporate the suggested changes above, then route the letter for additional input, and, finally, mail and cc: as specified; Kletke seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:

Discussion with the Dean—Dean Curl

Response to Issues and Questions

- 1. What is the status of the strategy for the enhancement of the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service (specifically the "enhanced communication technology" and "increased compensation levels" components)?**

We have been making contacts with key legislators, other state government officials, members of the State Regents for Higher Education staff, and others since mid-December, and providing information concerning our OCES legislative request. (A summary sheet outlining this year's legislative request was distributed to members of AFC.) Although it is really too early to know how successful our efforts may be (the amount of funding available for higher education has not yet been determined), we are cautiously optimistic given the fact that legislators generally appear to recognize our need and think very favorably toward approval of our request provided there is sufficient funding available. We are asking our friends statewide to contact their legislators in behalf of our request. Two important upcoming events in this regard are tomorrow's (April 12) 4-H Day at the Capitol, and Lay Leaders' Day at the Capitol on April 26.

2. Which faculty members are on the task force (mentioned at the February meeting) addressing issues facing the undergraduate Environmental Sciences Program? May they be contacted for information about progress of the task force and to make faculty input?

Ed Miller is working with these committees. He distributed Minutes of the last two Environmental Sciences (ES) Task Force meetings—March 10 and March 31, 2000. Membership, as indicated on the Minutes, includes Tom Phillips, Don Turton, Jeff Hattey, Sam Fuhlendorf, Larry Sanders, Craig McKinley, David Lewis, Art Stoecker, Julie Arntz, Dale Maronek, Jim Trapp, Bob Westerman, Nick Basta, Greg Bell, Brian Carter, and Ed Miller.

Miller responded to the question, “Yes, the information is open, and, yes, the membership may be contacted.” He indicated that all possible issues of concern were formulated and discussed at the ES Task Force’s first meeting. The Task Force then identified those issues that were appropriate for its address—1) Employment/placement, 2) Administrative support statement, 3) Program marketing and education about the program, 4) On-campus program identity and program home (to be combined with) Departmental identity or interdisciplinary strengthening, 5) Appointments and the appraisal process for ES faculty, and 6) Program funding: faculty positions, maintenance, courses and facilities. The order of issues does not indicate priority. Miller commented that #4 is critical to all the other issues. #5 and #6 are also very important; #1, #2, and #3, although important, are probably less important than #4, #5, and #6. Dean Curl reiterated that we want the members to be contacted. Miller is disappointed that the information flow from the Task Force has not flowed to the faculty through the department level yet. Turton commented that possibly the information has not flown as desired because every department does not have a representative on the ES Task Force. Miller indicated, however, that all department heads have been kept aware at the department head meetings. He suggested that it might be appropriate for him to route a communiqué to those departments that are not represented on the ES Task Force. Selk questioned the level of importance of #3. Miller did not intend to indicate that it was less important, but rather that the other issues may need to be addressed first. Melcher indicated that the AFC Minutes provide another mechanism for faculty to gain information about activities in DASNR. Miller commented that we have about 80 students in the Environmental Sciences program. Horn supported Selk’s comment about the importance of issue #3. Turton commented that the Environmental Sciences Steering Committee is a volunteer group.

3. Are the OSU-Tulsa and information technology-related task forces (also mentioned at the February meeting) DASNR task forces? If so, how do they relate to similar university task forces? Does the “broad membership” of these task forces include DASNR faculty? If so, who? May they be contacted for information about progress of the task force and to make faculty input?

Miller brought our attention to this issue with respect to the strategic plan of OSU-Tulsa; the item is in the DASNR strategic plan, also. The OSU-Tulsa Task Force consists of the DASNR department heads. Three meetings have been conducted—two at Ag Hall and one at OSU-Tulsa. The Task Force discovered that some of their conceptions about the OSU-Tulsa facilities were flawed, *e.g.* OSU-Tulsa has three very nice labs. Miller said, “We are not in a rush to develop a plan because of some higher administrative issues and budget uncertainties. We would be in a rush to establish programs at OSU-Tulsa if budgets allowed.” Miller indicated that without faculty budget lines for OSU-Tulsa, it will be difficult for DASNR to deliver complete programs to that campus. DASNR is moving ahead cautiously. The first budget line is not until that requested for 2002. Ag Education and Horticulture & LA are moving ahead cautiously with a presence at OSU-Tulsa. The task force is in a holding pattern.

Miller addressed the Information Technology Task Force. The task force is still a big need, but is not strictly an Instruction issue. It is cross cutting through Extension, Research, and Instruction. Video streaming and distance education is moving ahead under Jim Keys direction. Ag Education is planning a Masters of Ag program at OSU-Tulsa and via distance education. Epplin questioned whether Level III of the OCES document that Dean Curl distributed is part of this task force’s responsibility. Miller reiterated that information technology cuts across all areas, including Extension. The Distance Education (DE) Committee has been actively addressing faculty compensation and pricing of DE programming. The DE Committee will be taking to the departments via Miller these two issues. Miller already has a meeting scheduled with the Department of Horticulture & LA. The DE Committee is working with OSU-Tulsa, too. Miller indicated that marketing of DE programs is critical.

4. What is the composition (faculty members and others) of the DASNR task force on revising the Academic Rank Description statement? May the faculty members be contacted for information about progress of the task force and to make faculty input?

Dean Curl responded that a committee will soon be formed to study our Academic Ranks Description statement developed in 1984 and recommend possible revisions. The committee will include some faculty members who are members of AFC, other faculty, and administrative representation. We will encourage widespread input from the faculty.

5. Have any new committees, task forces, or similar groupings been formed since the February AFC meeting?

No major task forces or DASNR-wide committees have been formed since the February AFC meeting.

6. What is the latest plan for the hybridoma center in view of the resignations of Prof. Wikel and Dr. Neethling?

Dean Curl commented that a search process is underway for a person to oversee the Hybridoma Center—essentially the responsibilities that Dr. Neethling had. Dr. Wright has identified a search committee including Bob Matts, Matt Greenstone, Jeremiah Saliki, JeanMarie Verchot, Jacque Fletcher, and Kim Burnham. Dr. Wright would appreciate receiving leads on potential candidates.

7. What is the timetable for filling Prof. Wikel's chair in agricultural biotechnology?

Response combined with #8.

8. What are the plans for replacement of Dr. Cushman as nucleic acids specialist in the Recombinant DNA/Protein Resource Facility?

Dean Curl responded that Life Sciences is an important and vital thrust in our future. Over the last couple of years, we have recruited several outstanding new faculty with skills in molecular biology and biotechnology. Our plans are to continue to recruit additional faculty with such abilities.

Presently for the Experiment Station, there are a number of budget uncertainties for FY 2001, including increased backcharges, increased health insurance costs, and OTRS. Until we understand the full impacts of these increased costs, we are unable to know definitely when we will be able to authorize position searches.

Epplin clarified that the Wikel and Cushman positions are on hold. Phillips clarified that the Neethling position is not "tenure-track" faculty, but rather staff; Neethling carried the title of Assistant Researcher.

9. Could you discuss the plans for the Assistant Director of the Experiment Station position?

We are still deliberating with respect to the responsibilities to be included in the Assistant Director position description. Because changes have been so recent, we have not made firm decisions on how to proceed. Any input or suggestions in this regard would be welcomed.

Issues for referral to OSU Faculty Council

Horn questioned how we are communicating the needs and problems associated with the SCT software. Miller said Wes Holley sits on the committee that addresses these issues and that on the Instructional side, \$3 of every \$5 of the tech fee goes to CIS. Kletke said he heard that the company that provided the software was purchased by a rival company, and, thus, support of the software is unknown. CIS has increased its expenses because of SCT. Dean Curl commented that part of the back charges is to pay for the new SCT software package. Horn voiced concern of the unavailability of grade reports for students. Horn commented that President Halligan had addressed creativity of OSU's faculty as a priority, and, yet, we find the whole SCT system is taking away from this creative time. Miller commented that "shadow accounting" is now prevalent in the Instruction as well as Research. He and Dean Curl said the problems have been carried to university administration almost on a weekly basis. Horn said that OSU Faculty Council needs to address the SCT issues. He indicated that he will draft a letter of concern. Melcher motioned that Horn prepare a letter as indicated to be given to Bill Weeks to carry to the OSU Faculty Council; Hattey seconded. Horn requested input from faculty with respect to SCT access, stability, functionality, budgetary reports, etc. Epplin suggested asking Lou Solie for input with respect to graduation checks, also. Motion carried.

OSU Faculty Council Report:

No report - Representative Weeks had a conflict and did not attend the meeting.

Additional New Business:

Miller commented that Ag Hall 005 is scheduled to be re-equipped this summer. He commented that the Student Tech fees do not cover the expenses of DASNR computing facilities. DASNR gets only \$2 per credit hour of the tech fee. Dean Curl said DASNR has tried to increase these fees since he has been here, however, without success. Engineering receives \$18 per credit hour; we need similar funding. Miller commented that we need to address departmental programmatic need, rather than the same fee across DASNR. He cited the Department of Horticulture & LA, for example, having different tech fee needs than the Department of Animal Sciences.

Adjourn:

Next meeting is September 12, 8 A.M., in Ag Hall 102. By policy, department administrators are to conduct an election prior to the September meeting so that the newly elected representatives may attend as well as those completing their terms. The following members will complete two-year terms at the September meeting: Bender, Epplin, Hattey, Needham, Hermann, Horn, and Turton. Epplin will e-mail department heads to remind them of their need for an election. He suggested that those rotating off AFC also remind their respective departments.

Turton motioned adjournment; Kletke seconded. Motion carried. Chairman Epplin adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Needham,
AFC Secretary