

DASNR Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

December 13, 2005

Members Present: Lynn Brandenberger, Jim Criswell, Shiping Deng, Udaya Desilva, Steve Hallgren, Gerald Horn, Mike Kizer, Derrell Peel, Dan Tilley, Sharon von Brombsen

Members Absent: Dwayne Cartmell, Sam Fuhlendorf, Ramamurthy Mahalingam, William McGlynn, Sissy Osteen

Ex-Officio Members Present: Bob Whitson, Vice President, Dean and Director, DASNR

Call to Order: Chair Lynn Brandenberger called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. He called for any additions to the agenda. Dan Tilley noted that the information in 5-year academic ledger reports and how it would be used was a subject of importance to this group. Since it is a complex matter and had not been placed on the agenda in time for Dr. Whitson to prepare a response, Tilley asked that the item be included for discussion at the next meeting. Steve Hallgren moved and Udaya Desilva seconded that the agenda be approved as presented. The motion passed.

Approval of Minutes: Tilley moved and Hallgren seconded that the minutes of the September 23, 2005 meeting be approved as they appear on www.afc.okstate.edu. The motion passed.

Questions for Vice President/Dean Whitson:

5-year Academic Ledger Reports:

Dr. Whitson opted to make some preliminary comments on the 5-year academic ledger reports brought up by Tilley. The reports show that CASNR stacks up very well against other colleges at OSU. However, any faculty member with at least 0.1 FTE teaching is counted as a full teaching faculty member in the report. Consequently, many of our departments have student/faculty ratios around 10 or 11. This looks good with regard to quality of teaching, but could possibly hurt us when trying to hire more faculty. We do not know for certain if there is a relationship between these reports and allocations from the Provost. It is likely that they will have a little impact on salaries or allocations in the short run, but could impact longer-run considerations. Dr. Whitson will do more research before the next meeting and report further.

Question 1: Why doesn't OSU collect royalties from new plant varieties/cultivars?

OSU does collect royalties on new plant varieties. We use Genetics, Inc., a 501(c)(3) group, (as well as other marketing firms, such as Agipro) to market our varieties and collect royalties which are then submitted to the Technology Licensing Office. We have received some criticism from producer groups for accepting check-off money and other financial support to develop new varieties, and then collecting royalties on the foundation seed developed, too. These groups have been assured that the collected funds go back into the program to support further research work. The state legislature has encouraged us to generate funding in this fashion to help support our programs. When we do license products we also have a responsibility to go after individuals who violate patent agreements. Genetics, Inc. will pursue violations of patents, which will

provide some litigation assistance to OSU as the patent owner should legal action be required. 50% of royalties collected go back to the developing scientist personally, 30% are kept by the Intellectual Property Management Office, and 20% come to the DASNR.

Question 2: Regarding IDCs on grants, can DASNR negotiate the rate with Dr. McKeever's office for different types of grants (Research, Teaching, Extension)? The reasoning is that not all grants are equal in size and taking 44%-52% from a \$2500 grant is very different than taking 52% from a \$250,000 grant. This is not an argument against IDCs, but the amount of an IDC collected.

Small grants are exempt from F&A costs. (There was some discussion of the exact size of exempt grants, and it was decided that the current published limit is \$5000 for exemption from indirect costs.) We also do not charge IDCs on grants from commodity groups. Otherwise, negotiation of indirect rates is generally not allowed. However, if the granting agency's policy is to not pay indirect costs (e.g.: commodity groups, state agencies), we do not charge. The collected funds are used to support research activities. Dr. McKeever's office keeps 55% of the IDCs collected and 45% is returned to DASNR. 75% of DASNR's share is returned to the PI's home department (the PI's share of the money returned to the department varies from department to department). DASNR's share of the funds are used to support research-related activities, including start-up funds for new faculty. On occasion, Dr. McKeever has also used some university-level IDCs to help with start-up support for new DASNR faculty. Since there seems to be some confusion about IDCs on small grants Dr. Whitson will work with the Associates to send out a new memo related to F&A charges on grants.

Question 3: As of November 30, our department had not received its special fee allocation. We have been buying supplies for our classes that have a laboratory component (e.g.: the MCAG welding class) without knowing how much money will actually be available. Will we be receiving these monies soon, and what can be done to streamline the process so that the funds are available when they are actually needed?

The memo releasing special fees to the Division came from the Provost's office on December 6. An email announcing the impending release of special fee funds was sent to the DASNR departments on December 12. For whatever reason, the funds were held-up at the Provost's office. If necessary, Dr. Miller can attend the next meeting or do a follow-up memo to discuss the timing and use of special fee funds. There has been a discussion between DASNR and the Provost's office regarding carry-forward balances in these accounts. Dr. Whitson and Dr. Miller reported to the Provost that in some cases a fairly sizable sum must be accumulated for special purchases, such as replacing all of the computers in a computer laboratory.

Extra "FYI" Discussion by VP/Dean Whitson

Item 1: The academic side of the Campus Master Plan hasn't been discussed much. The focus has been on the Athletic Village and the property acquisition process. However, there are some provisions of the plan which will have a direct effect on DASNR. One of these is the new building that will be across the street from Ag. Hall (on the current site of the old Dairy

Building). It is not designated to any specific college, and the DASNR administration is putting together proposed research assignments within DASNR for space in this new research building.

Item 2: Dr. Whitson has been looking for a way to get more user-friendly space for the Dean's Office. The current office space is too partitioned and is too far from the main entrance of the building for convenient access by visitors. There are active plans underway to take over Room 102 (Long Conference Room) as personal office space for the V-P/Dean and 1 or 2 assistants, plus a receptionist's area. The current plan mirrors the arrangement of the Student Advising and Success Center across the hallway, with an open, inviting reception area. The loss of the display cases from the recent and planned new construction in the Ag. Hall foyer area will be remedied in some fashion, possible through plasma displays that can be used to run slide shows and videos about departments and clubs. There will also be a need to develop a large conference room nearby to replace the loss of the Long Conference Room.

Item 3: Dr. Whitson and Hallgren discussed progress by the task force working on the formation of the new, natural resources-related department. Hallgren reported that things are progressing well. Most activity currently underway is faculty-driven. Forestry, Range Management and Wildlife Management faculty are engaged in committee work related to departmental organization and curriculum development. The task force draft report will be released shortly and will be made available to all faculty, with all departments having an opportunity for input to the final report. Hallgren reported that it was anticipated that the new department would have approximately 25 faculty and 150 students initially associated with it.

Item 4: The OSU Foundation is interviewing candidates for Gary Sherrer's replacement as Senior Director of Development for DASNR. While the position is a Foundation employee, DASNR will have input in the hiring process.

Item 5: Three interviews have been scheduled for the OAES Associate Director position. All Division faculty should participate in the interview process by attending the seminars and meeting with the candidates whenever possible. The OCES Associate Director search has been extended. A computer glitch with NASULGC apparently resulted in the position announcement being deleted as Spam by their email server. Consequently, a very small number of outside candidates were included in the applicant pool. The message has been resent and the extended time will permit additional external candidates to apply.

University Faculty Council Report

Hallgren reported that the monthly UFC meeting will be this afternoon. The most significant items on the agenda are a resolution proposing that the administration reopen the Campus Master Plan process, and a discussion of TABOR (Taxpayer's Bill of Rights) and its implications for higher education and OSU.

Meeting Schedule

It was proposed that the March meeting of the DASNR Faculty Council be moved up to the end of January or early February to permit a timely presentation of the draft report from the proposed

natural resources department task force. It was also suggested that perhaps Drs. Miller and Martin could brief the Council on the new Student Success Center, including a short tour of the facility. Chair Brandenberger will explore these options and inform the members via email.

Adjournment

Tilley moved and Darrell Peel seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion passed, and the meeting adjourned at 11:35 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Kizer, DASNRFC Secretary