

## **DASNR Faculty Council Minutes November 30, 2000**

Members Present: John Caddel, John Damicone, Kathleen Kelsey, Mike Kizer, Darrel Kletke, Ulrich Melcher, Tom Phillips, Glenn Selk, Sue Williams, and Mike Woods.

Members Absent: Terry Bidwell, Jerry Fitch, Dean McCraw, John Ritter, and Don Turton

Ex-officio Members: Bill Weeks and Dean Sam Curl

Non-Members Present: Assoc. Dean Ed Miller and Assoc. Director David Foster

### **Call to order:**

DASNR Faculty Council Chair Tom Phillips called the meeting to order at 8:15 and ask for approval of agenda (e-mail Nov. 20, 2000) -Approved

The chair recognizes that AFC members may have teaching conflicts with AFC meetings during a given semester. Members are reminded that AFC by-laws allow for a substitute representative to be sent from your department who may participate in discussion but may not vote. This is strongly encouraged so that departments do not go unrepresented.

Approval of minutes of Sept. 12, 2000 (on line [www.afc.okstate.edu](http://www.afc.okstate.edu)) - Needham/Caddel  
Minutes Approved

### **Comments from the Chair on meetings format:**

Chair Tom Phillips indicated that agenda topics will be solicited 2-3 weeks prior to each meeting. The agenda will be finalized in collaboration with the Dean and the AFC executive committee and be posted for members to share with their departments at least 1 week prior to the meeting. Agendas will typically include committee reports, old business, and new business, in that order. Meetings will be conducted using commonly accepted rules of order. Discussion of topics will be allowed at any time, and motions can be entertained at any point in the meeting. Motions for action by AFC will be handled with a second to the motion followed by discussion, restatement of the motion for the record, and then the vote by sign of member.

### **Committee reports:**

**Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (RPT Committee)** - Ulrich Melcher reported that two members of the RPT committee served on an advisory committee that submitted a draft revision of the DASNR Academic Rank Descriptions Statement to the Dean. From the Dean's office the report will go to the departments heads and then to faculty for input.

**Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (CAS Committee) - no report**

**OSU Faculty Council - Bill Weeks, DASNR representative to OSU Faculty Council**

The way faculty are represented on the OSU Faculty council has been revised. Previously (and currently) most of the Council represented disciplines that crossed college lines. The new structure will be primarily within colleges, with the number of representatives proportionate to the number of faculty members in the respective colleges. Agriculture will have five representatives; whereas, under the old system there were several representatives from agriculture, but only one represented the college.

Comments: The Faculty Council Representatives make a 3-year commitment. Williams encouraged Ag and HES to line up strong individuals to fill the positions. Presently our University administration is sensitive to faculty concerns and this is a good period to make important changes.

The way faculty on 9-month and 11-month appointments could be paid for additional work is being revisited. The OSU Faculty Council says that additional salary money may come from any source. The Deans say money should come from outside sources as an incentive for the faculty to attract grant funds. There is little obvious middle ground for compromise on this issue.

Comments: Faculty on 9-month appointments can add 2 months for summer teaching from University funds. As the Deans interpret the policy, a faculty member who wants the third additional month must find the money from outside the University. In Agriculture, it is normally outside funds that cover additional salaries.

**Old Business:**

Charles Taliaferro was appointment by the Chair to the RPT committee.

Revised AFC meeting date: Feb 20 (instead of Feb 13) meeting date was approved unanimously. There was no date change for the April 10, 2001 and September 11, 2001 meetings. Due to a conflict in Dean Curl's schedule, the February meeting date was changed to February 22, after the meeting and announced by Chair Tom Phillips via e-mail on Dec. 22.

## **New Business:**

### **Questions submitted by Agriculture Faculty Council for discussion at the November 30, 2000, meeting**

---

**Question 1:** *What if anything has transpired in regard to the Cooperative Extension federal appointment status change as described in the "unofficial" email circulated a few months ago?*

**Response:** The status of Schedule A federal appointments will be on hold until after the new administration takes office on January 20. Under Secretary Miley Gonzalez has asked that CSREES employees make no further comment on the issue. The new CSREES administrator has indicated her intent to work with the Extension system, once she is free to do so, to find a solution that is fair to all parties and protects the interests of the individuals who hold a Schedule A federal appointment. In anticipation of that eventuality, the ECOP chair has appointed an ad hoc committee that will work with the CSREES administrator after January 20. Dave Foster has been appointed as chair of that committee. As the process unfolds, he will report developments on this issue via the DASNR listserver.

**Question 2:** *Posse parking enforcement created major problems during the Ag Alumni Barbecue on October 14. Students and staff were harassed for trying to unload their club displays at the CITD, and participants in the barbecue were forced to park several blocks or even as much as a half-mile from the CITD. What can be done in future years to reserve parking for the Ag Alumni Barbecue closer to the CITD and to make sure participants can load and unload their displays without harassment?*

**Response:** Associate Dean Ed Miller and his staff review the logistics of recurring College events in an effort to continue to improve those events. Parking and access to the CITD building for the annual Ag Alumni Barbecue are on the College's logistical review list, and each of the problems noted as well as other considerations will be addressed in preparation for next year's event.

**Question 3:** *A request has been made for clarification of the DASNR position on faculty involvement in private consulting. The question arises from a situation where a faculty member was asked to provide technical assistance to a lawyer investigating a situation for a client to determine if litigation was warranted. The faculty member submitted a request to his department head, giving the following conditions to the consultation:*

1. *the consulting would be in his area of technical expertise;*
2. *it involved no clients, lawyers or companies from Oklahoma;*
3. *all work would be done outside of working hours or while on annual leave;*
4. *if the case did go to trial, any testimony given by the faculty member in written deposition or on the witness stand would be given only after issuance of a subpoena.*

*The department head approved the request and forwarded it to DASNR administration for consideration. Later, the faculty member was notified that the request was not approved as presented. The faculty member was told that a subpoena would be required before ANY work could be performed. When this requirement was communicated to the lawyer, his response was that this was an unreasonable stipulation because at that time it was unknown if there would even be a legal case in the matter.*

*Has there been a change in DASNR policy related to private consulting? Are there any conditions under which a faculty member can do private consulting?*

**Response:** University policy regarding outside professional activities and other activities of faculty members was approved by the Board of Regents in February 1984. (See policy and procedure letter, 2-0111. All faculty are encouraged to review the OSU policy.) Division administration is responsible for assuring that this policy is followed. The Division also has a policy statement, distributed in March 1992, which addresses expert witnesses. This policy states, "...The Division has taken the position that it is in the best interest of the individual and of the Division if such requests for services of its employees as expert witnesses come in the form of a subpoena(s)....All future requests to provide expert testimony should include a copy of the subpoena or receipt of same..." Due to the nature of our funding and the services we provide, it is possible that the service of Division employees acting as consultants or expert witnesses can raise questions regarding conflicts of interest and ethics. Therefore, after discussions with OSU Legal Counsel, we have been requiring that those faculty who are asked to consult with attorneys (supply depositions, etc.) in cases in which there may be legal action to have such requests come in the form of a subpoena. We are currently considering a revision of the policy statement to provide needed clarification. A draft of a possible revision has been distributed to unit administrators for their consideration, and is scheduled for discussion at our Unit Administrators meeting in December.

**Question 4:** *New guidelines for the reappointment, promotion and tenure process have been announced by Dr. Keener and officially codified into OSU policies and procedures. Here are two questions about the new policy.*

- a. *I read that Dr. Keener stated the new policy went into effect following extensive campus discussion. What groups were involved in this discussion, and what inputs did DASNR faculty or administration have on this policy change?*
- b. *Regarding the specific new policy that regards outside peer review letters for candidates facing tenure or promotion decisions, what is the reaction of DASNR administration to this mandated requirement?*

**Response:** The University's reappointment, promotion, and tenure policy has been under review since 1996, and input has been sought and provided on a number of occasions. The dean's office has kept unit administrators apprised of the process and, on several occasions, asked for their review and comments and that of faculty in their units on the draft documents. OSU Faculty Council was very involved in this lengthy process. Minutes detailing that body's discussions were distributed after each meeting. The minutes can also be accessed on the Council's web

page ([http://www2.okstate.edu/fac\\_council/](http://www2.okstate.edu/fac_council/)). Anyone interested in doing so may want to discuss the OSU Faculty Council's involvement in the process with the College's Faculty Council representative or with the individual(s) who represent(s) their discipline on the Council.

DASNR administration supports the addition of letters from peer reviewers for promotion and/or tenure considerations. We view the letters to be valuable additions to the faculty member's dossier of promotion/tenure materials. Such letters have, of course, been permitted as part of dossiers in the past although not required by the University.

---

Motion by Melcher – **Recommend to Dean Curl that when issues regarding RPT matters are brought for DASNR input, he solicit input from the AFC RPT committee.** Second by Kiser. Motion Passed.

**Issues for referral to OSU Faculty Council - None**

**Request from Secretary:** AFC was requested by the secretary to closely review our web page and draft minutes. To assure correct reporting, the secretary would appreciate the text of any "on the record" comments during meetings.

**Adjourn:**

The next meeting will be Thursday, Feb. 22, 2001, at 8:00-10:00 in 102 Ag Hall

Thomas Phillips adjourned the meeting at 9:45.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Caddel  
AFC Secretary