1. Chair Finchum called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

2. Roll Call

Attendance
ASFC Present: Isabel Alvarez-Sancho (FLL), Leticia Barchini (MATH), Lee Brasuell (TH), Allen Finchum (GEOG), John Gelder (CHEM), Emily Graham (HIST), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Doug Heisterkamp (CS), Apple Igrek (PHIL), Kelley Sittner (SOC), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), David Meinke (PBEE), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Peter Richtsmeier (CDIS), Jennifer Shaw (IBIO), Mark Sisson (ART), Gil Summy (PHYS), Carla Goad (STAT)

ASFC Absent: Ed Burkley (PSYC), Babu Fathepure (MICR), Stephen Nemeth (POLS),

Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder

3. Approval of the September Minutes
   a. Motion to approve made and Minutes approved.

4. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion to approve made and Agenda approved.

5. Standing Committee Reports
      i. On hold, pending more information with regard to the clinical faculty policy.

      i. The Committee is still in the process of evaluating course action forms.

      i. McKinnon: the Rules and Procedures Committee is in charge of reviewing the College Space Allocation Proposal. The Committee met, discussed the proposal and supported the proposal. The Committee contacted Associate Dean Dr. Mullins with regard to the need for the proposed Committee, who expressed the necessity of such a Committee as a sounding board to ensure equal representation across different departments. With Mullins’ feedback, the Committee supported the proposal to form a College Space Allocation Committee. The only issue is the makeup of Committee members, which needs further clarifications in the proposal.

      ii. Graham raised a comment with regard to potential department rebuttal procedure. McKinnon: Once the proposed Committee is formed, the Committee would clarify such a procedure of rebuttal.

      iii. Dean: I prefer an election process for selecting Committee members. McKinnon: right now, the proposal suggest that the Committee should include the Associate Dean, one department head, and three other members (including one current ASFC member) to serve a 3-year term. For instance, if someone who served on ASFC rotated off, how would his/her rotation affect the makeup of the Committee? Dean: I’ll be happy to clarify such
questions and please compile them. Finchum: we will have a formal vote next time with
the clarifications.
iv. Dean: the review by the proposed Committee should also include Administrative space
use/allocation. McKinnon: how about classrooms? Dean: only if the use is to be changed
(e.g., from a classroom to a lab).

i. Meinke: check with Dean’s office on information with regard to student members, pending
more information.
ii. Finchum: Scholarship awards are coming up, and applicants will be reviewed.

6. Old Business.
a. Issues Concerning Future Budget (Cut), special ad hoc Committee led by Jeff Loeffert
i. Loeffert: distributed the draft budget efficiency plan, and explained how the ad hoc
Committee brainstormed and came up with guiding principles and a list of
hierarchy/priorities to help reach the overall goal of 2 million dollar cut. Guiding principles
suggested by the Committee include: (1) to avoid cutting staff if possible; (2) departments
should have sufficient leeway to meet the cuts; (3) to minimize reduction plans that stifle
potential growth for departments (for details, see the draft budget efficiency plan)

ii. Loeffert: shared challenges and concerns by the ad hoc Committee, including (1)
reductions are likely to disproportionately affect different departments (and individual
departments will have more insight into which reduction plans would have the least
adverse impact); (2) the committee is not provided with specific figures to adequately
estimate the impact of suggested cuts (e.g., standardizing GTA teaching load, cutting
telephones: not knowing how many TAs/phones are there within each department presents
some challenge) (for details, see the draft budget efficiency plan)

iii. Loeffert: discussed items to avoid and shared the Committee’s rationales, including (1)
hiring more adjuncts in lieu of VAPs; (2) deleting Summer ASR + 1 program, travel
program, DIGS; (for details, see the draft budget efficiency plan)

iv. Loeffert: discussed priority considerations by the Committee, including (1) reduce the
number of telephones (OU did it); a few council members (e.g., Gregg, Brasuell,
McKinnon) shared their experiences: some rarely use office telephones, while others use
them frequently;

v. Loeffert: on priority considerations, (2) share copies across departments. In principle we
should encourage green use, but logistically it will present challenges (e.g., entry into
another department without keys after hours); a few council members (e.g., Gregg,
Alvarez-Sancho) shared experiences and asked questions such as how it is going to save
money exactly and whether it includes printers. Loeffert: saving accomplished through
reducing paper waste (e.g., monitor personal use) and reducing the number of leased
copiers (by sharing), and printer should be included;

vi. Loeffert: on priority considerations, (3) voluntary staff FTA reduction to nine month
contracts. Some staff may want to take summer off, and there is less demand in the
summer especially with fewer/no summer teaching. Meinke: if staff take summer off,
who’s going to take on the necessary work? It might affect departments. Loeffert (and
others): it would be decided on a case-by-case basis by each department, as some
departments don’t have much requests/works in the summer.

vii. Loeffert: on priority considerations, (4) consolidate labs (computer, teaching). Not all labs
are used frequently (concurred by Finchum’s experience with Geography). Meinke: where
does the savings come from? Dean: Savings mainly from reducing the frequency of
refreshing labs (less Tech fees).
viii. Loeffert: on priority considerations, (5) replace administrative course releases with IDC/travel incentives. A few council members raised questions on how this item would save money. Dean: normally, released courses have to be covered by hiring people externally or GTAs. This proposal aims to replace course releases with IDC/travel incentives instead of hiring additional people to cover released courses.

ix. Loeffert: continued with instructional considerations, (1) reduce face to face summer courses taught by faculty. College has been losing money in the last four years due to summer face to face teaching, though the Council has been working on related issues (e.g., pay scale). This item is to reduce face to face courses (to save), and encourage online courses (for potential growth), as a large percentage of students are from out of state (e.g., Texas). Barchini expressed concern about teaching math online (challenging), and how reducing/eliminating summer face to face course would affect graduate students (e.g., delaying their progress). Dean: with regard to hybrid courses, there is a caveat, i.e., courses cannot meet on (STW) campus. The policy varies across different campus (e.g., Tulsa charges fee but OKC does not). Meinke asked about the revised numbers (i.e., estimate savings), and Dean explained the new estimates. Dean also mentioned that the College tried to keep GTA-taught courses and larger courses (e.g., Physics), but every face to face course is a loss. Summy: for Physics, it would be difficult to teach classes online because of frequent use of lab/equipment. Graham: for History, we have detailed feedback, when & how to submit them? Finchum/Loeffert: we don’t have a date set for the next Ad hoc Committee meeting. Feedback can be submitted to Finchum/Loeffert. Graham: a few faculty depend on summer teaching salary and have litter interest/incentive moving classes online. Though painful, cutting face to face summer courses is feasible for History. Sisson: for Arts, studio classes cannot be offered online, and students are already delayed in graduation, a potential problem. McKinnon: there will be a way to do it, and we have to be creative about how to do it (e.g., offer more electives). Finchum: if we offer more online courses, would it be able to subsidize face to face courses? Dean: possible, we just don’t know the exact numbers given little information. Lewis: this item is aimed to reduce, not to eliminate face to face courses. Some departments (e.g., Physics, Arts) should work with the Dean on this issue. Braswell: we should keep student needs in mind, and there has been more demand for summer online courses. Summy: asked about the pay difference between face to face and online courses. Dean: it is the same pay, and explained how OSU budget constraints the pay.

x. Loeffert: Instructional considerations, (2) reduce/eliminate “traditional” honors sections and replace with add-ons. It is happening now. Dean used Geography as an example to explain how it saves money.

xi. Loeffert: Instructional considerations, (3) standardize GTA teaching load to 2/2 or equivalent. Meinke, Gregg, & McKinnon expressed concerns about how the proposed items may affect GTAs, e.g., their recruitment, research productivity of the departments that heavily rely on GTAs (e.g., science departments). Richtsmeier (CDIS): GTAs are meant for teaching, not research. Gregg: Nevertheless, we prepare our graduate students for research and they still play an important role in research, especially in science.

xii. Loeffert: Instructional considerations, (4) standardize full time temp (VAP) teaching load to 4/4 or equivalent. Lewis: raising the teaching load may create issues with enrollment and spousal hires. Barchini: it would create trouble hiring research-oriented VAPs. Graham: on behalf of History, VAPs are at the beginning of their career, and 4/4 load would be hurting their future career prospects, though OSU is not different from other institutions (echoed by Finchum).

xiii. Loeffert: Instructional considerations, (5) equalize enrollment across semesters for high demand introduction courses. Some departments (e.g., English) have different enrollments for spring and fall semesters. Equalizing the enrollment could save money. Dean: This was
attempted last year but rejected by the Provost due to concerns about student needs. Nevertheless, Dean believes that other colleges (involving 75% of students) should pay for the imbalance of enrollments, not A&S. Loeffert: it is worth exploring. The lower priority on the list reflects the rejection by the Provost before.

xiv. Loeffert: Instructional considerations, (6) establish additional guidelines for minimum course enrollments/enforce minimums. Given that many classes need to run small (e.g., labs, safety reason), departments should have leeway on this item. Meinke asked how saving is to be generated, and Gregg provided an example in which smaller sections of a class taught by faculty were consolidated into fewer sections, as a result, generating savings.

xv. Loeffert: Instructional considerations, (7) increase class sizes and reduce number of sections. This is an extension of the previous point. There are some concerns on how to define class size and how to implement it. It’s not clear how much saving it would generate at this moment. Alvarez-Sancho: used Spanish class as an example to show that it is not feasible to raise class size. Graham: asked about facility capacity and how many large classrooms we have. Dean: Wes Watkins just opened up and there are other facilities where we can move classes, despite reluctance from departments.

xvi. Gregg: expressed concern that the total savings out of these proposed items do not add up to the 2 million dollars, because not every proposed item would be realized fully. Loeffert: our task here is to prioritize the proposed items and minimize damages/impact to departments. If necessary, we may turn to other items from the list proposed by Dean in addition to what is recommended by the ad hoc Committee.

xvii. Meinke: VAPs and GTAs are frequently mentioned in our discussion. Can we get more information (e.g., how many GTAs, what amount to cut specifically) in order to see different impact to various departments and make better decisions? Dean: we have roughly 500 GTAs each year (492 this year), which has a budget of 7 million dollars. We can calculate the percentage in order to save $500,000, and see how many estimate GTAs are going to be affected. It will have different impact across departments.

xviii. Shaw: ASR +1 program has an estimated saving of $127,000. These cuts affecting faculty might be worth pursuing than cutting GTAs, and faculty can apply for outside sources. But for some disciplines, outside sources are limited or none.

xix. Richtsmeier: for my department (CDIS), we can save on GTAs, but cutting summer teaching would hurt more. Is it possible to give each department a number (i.e., a dollar amount) and let them figure out how to achieve cuts? Gregg echoed and suggested to provide these guidelines to departments and let them work on cuts. Dean: we did that last year (a universal cut across departments). Departments are complaining that they cannot take more cuts, but this needs to be done collectively.

xx. Barchini: how will this be implemented? Dean: it depends on the penny tax proposal/vote in November. In a reduction scenario, all departments will get together and figure out how to implement the plan in Spring 2017.

xxi. Meinke: in case some departments won’t be able to cut much, will other departments give up more? Dean: yes.

xxii. Graham: what happens if we don’t cut enough? Dean: we will see and hope it would work. Remember this is the worst case scenario.

xxiii. Dean: this serves as Dean’s report. We are working on new ways to raise money. Take Business College for an example. They do a lot of professional development for people outside of university and make money. We need to be organized that way, and be proactive instead of wait for University allocations.

xxiv. Loeffert: Prior to our next meeting, we will email this list, and please highlight information why certain initiatives will or will not decimate your department. If anything else can serve as better substitutes from the list, please bring to our attention.
xxv. Dean: I’d like to thank the ad hoc Committee for going through this list.

b. Issues Concerning College Allocation Policies: No discussion, to be further discussed.

7. New Business: None.


9. Announcements: No

10. Adjournment
    a. Motion to adjourn made and meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.