1. Call to Order – Chair Lewis called the meeting to order at 3:32pm.

2. Roll Call:
   Present: Liz Roth (ART), Janette Steets (BOT), Ramesh Kaipa (CDIS), Blayne Mayfield (Vice Chair, CS), Rebecca Damron (ENGL), Erik Ekman (FLL), Hongbo Yu (GEOG), Priyank Jaiswal (GEOL), Yongtao Du (HIST), Bobbi Kay Lewis (Chair, MSC), Jesse Johnson (MATH), Jeff Loeffert (MUSI), James Cain (PHIL), Bob Hauenstein (PHYS), Mark Wolfgram (POLC), James Grice (PSYC), Michael Long (SOC), Carla Goad (STAT), Andy Dzialowski (ZOOL).

   Administration: Bret Danilowicz, Bruce Crauder

3. Approval of the Minutes of the September 4, 2013 Meeting

4. Approval of the Agenda – Liz Roth added an announcement of Art and Graphic Design Faculty Exhibition with a reception on October 4 from 5pm to 7pm. Exhibit at the Gardiner Gallery is from September 30 – October 25. The agenda of the October 2 meeting was then approved.

5. Committee Updates - (Chairs)
   a. Curriculum Committee – Michael Long SOC – no report
   b. Scholarship Committee – Rebecca Damron ENGL – reports 1 student member so far.
   c. Rules and Procedures Committee – Barry Lavine CHEM – no report
   d. Policy and Planning Committee – Jesse Johnson MATH – no report
   e. Supplemental Pay Committee – Andy Dzialowski ZOOL – no report; Committee is scheduled for their first meeting on 10/3/2013.

6. Report of University Faculty Council Liaison Representative (Blayne Mayfield) – see Attachment 1

7. Report of Department Heads Meeting (Bobbi Kay Lewis) – In the September 24, 2013 Dept Heads Meeting, business included: 1. OSU’s Engagement Initiative. Dr. Lindsay Smith will be assisting the College in its transition to a community engagement model. 2. General Education courses at the University are to be assessed in an effort to improve academic performance of students. To assist in the College’s initiative, departments are being asked to collect artifacts from one or two sections of a general education course and evaluate at least one learning outcome for the course. 3. Amy Martindale is working to improve the communications between departmental advisors and College advisors. Martindale is also requesting that departments submit a typical four-year degree plan when they submit their degree sheet revisions in November. 4. Danilowicz noted that some CAS department web sites are out of date. Departments are instructed to work with College Web Services to upgrade their web sites. See Attachment 2 for more details.
8. Old Business
   a. Jeff Loeffert presented a revised ASFC Funding Request Evaluation draft. Loeffert clarified that only 1 renovation submission was made this year. The document allows for more than one submission in future processes. See Attachment 3.
   b. A&S Junior Faculty Award – Bobbi Kay Lewis for Barry Levine – Councilors were given a hard copy of the proposed process for the A&S Junior Faculty Award Selection Committee. Suggested revisions were in item 3. Line 1: “...should be a full Professor” revised to read “...should hold the rank of Professor” and delete the word “full” before “Professor” in lines 2 and 5. In item 4, a suggested revision in line 2. “...represented by 2 faculty members” replaced with “...represented by 1 faculty member”. No vote taken at this time.

9. New Business - none

10. Secretary's Report of ASFC Recommendations to the Dean (Carla Goad) – no report

11. Dean's Report (Bret Danilowicz)
    Summer Use of Campus – Danilowicz chairs a University committee that is examining the usage of instructional and residential spaces over the summer months. This committee is investigating other campuses to see if more usages can be identified.
    Proposed Change to Grand March at University Commencement – Receptions will still be held at locations across campus prior to the commencement ceremony. Due to extreme weather possibilities, it is proposed that colleges will gather under cover of the stadium.
    Department Websites – Department Heads have been given a web address to submit to CAS/IT minor changes to department websites. Major changes to department websites do not go through this process. CAS/IT staff can assist with major changes.
    Reminder – Danilowicz invited councilors to ask questions for clarification of College business matters.

12. Adjournment 5:00pm

Announcements
Art and Graphic Design Faculty Exhibition with a reception on October 4 from 5pm to 7pm at the Gardiner Gallery

Faculty Council Liaison Report
The faculty council met on Tuesday, September 10, 2013. The following were among the items discussed:

- On behalf of President Hargis, Gary Clark reiterated the President’s position on the Sports Illustrated allegations against the OSU Athletics program.
- Joe Weaver, Vice President of Administration & Finance, reported the following:
  - The fall 2013 freshman class is the second largest ever for OSU.
  - Farm road should be open by the second home football game.
  - The University is establishing a “Safety Walk” program, in which student workers will be vetted and hired to escort students after dark from their classes to cars or residence halls, and to go around campus rattling doors to make sure they are locked. The program will go into effect around November 20 to 30, and student workers will be paid $10/hr.
- Rick Krysiak, Chief Facilities Officer, reported that the problems with the OSU water color, odor, and taste have been solved at the water treatment facility; it should take another couple of days for the pipes in the building to be flushed. There was never any health threat, but OSU has taken steps to provide bottled drinking water to students living in campus housing and is working with those students to resolve damage to clothing caused by the discolored water.
- Marilyn Middlebrook made a presentation about the Joe & Connie Mitchell Academic Enhancement Center for student athletes.
- Daniel Chaney of the OSU Library made a presentation on the availability and use of open books and other open resources in the classroom. Use of such resources in courses has increased by 82% over the last decade, and 812% since 1980. He reminded the Council that – in an effort to reduce costs to students – the library will work with faculty to make available for 2-hour loan textbooks for courses with enrollment \( \geq 125 \) and textbooks that cost \( \geq $125 \).
- Interim Provost Pam Fry gave an update on the status of outstanding Faculty Council recommendations to the University Administration. (See attachment.)
- ‘Bus’ Jaco, Chair of the Provost Search Committee, reported that the job description is almost complete. The goal of the Committee is to fill the position during the spring 2014 semester, with a start date of summer 2014. An executive search firm has been retained to assist in the search.
- Deb VanOverbeke, Chair of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee, recommended on behalf of the Committee a change to OSU Policy 2-0128: Requirements for Undergraduate and Graduate Minors. The recommendation is to change section 2.02 from, “No more than one-half of the credit for the [undergraduate] minor may be earned through transfer credit of courses taken at other institutions.” to, “A minimum of six credit hours for the minor must be earned in residence at OSU.” The recommendation was approved by the Council.
Attachment 2

Department Heads Meeting
September 24, 2013

Agenda Items:

Bret Danilowicz introduced Jorge Atiles, Associate Dean for Extension and Engagement in the College of Human Sciences, who gave a power point presentation on OSU’s Engagement initiative. Atiles noted that Dr. Lindsey Smith, A&S Faculty Fellow, will be assisting with College efforts to transition to a community engagement model. Danilowicz indicated that the power point presentation will be forwarded to the department heads to share with departmental personnel as appropriate.

Danilowicz introduced Jon Comer, Professor and Graduate Program Director in the Department of Geography and Brenda Masters, Associate Provost, who gave an overview of existing processes related to general education assessment. Comer is the chair of the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE), and he gave the department heads the following synopsis of the different assessment bodies at OSU. The General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) sets policy for GenEd on campus, drafts the criteria and goals that define the GenEd categories, reviews new GenEd requests, and reassesses GenEd courses on a regular basis. The Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) oversees all assessment on campus, not just GenEd assessment, and administers the surveys of current and past students and the alumni surveys. The committee is tasked with using assessment data to improve the academic performance of students, to promote the use of assessment data, and to act as stewards of assessment money. The CAGE committee reports to both the GEAC and the AAIC, and both of the latter committees delegate the practice of assessing GenEd on campus to CAGE. Each year, CAGE collects artifacts in the following portfolios: writing, critical thinking, science, problem solving, and diversity. Up until 2010, the committee attempted to review as many portfolios as they could collect artifacts on, with modest sample sizes. In 2011, the committee made the decision to review portfolios on a rotating basis; therefore, writing was assessed that year with over 500 artifacts. In 2012, nearly 500 artifacts on critical thinking were assessed. This past summer, diversity was assessed with 250 artifacts, and science and problem solving were assessed with approximately 200 artifacts. Using assessment funding, faculty members are hired, and trained, to review approximately 500 artifacts during the summer. Rubrics are used to assess writing quality, for example, and those guides can be found on the Assessment office’s web page. The Assessment office analyzes the data to generate assessment reports. Danilowicz continued on this topic to emphasize that CAGE works well at the university level but assessment is needed at the College level to determine if the departments are doing well or if there is room for improvement. The proposed College plan, beginning this year, will be for each department to begin with one learning outcome in at least one course or, possibly, two courses. The suggested method for implementing this initiative would be to identify a course that has multiple sections and then to design a way to collect artifacts across those sections. The artifacts could be single author papers, and the University rubric could be used or adapted for departmental use in this process. There would be some type of financial compensation arrangement for faculty who commit to assessing artifacts, in addition to a training requirement. The assessment outcomes would be included in the departmental reports under student learning, and would be used, internally, to adjust pedagogy to improve student learning where warranted. It was emphasized that the information would not be used punitively against the departments or faculty members unless no effort for improvement could be demonstrated. A question was
raised about beginning the assessment endeavor in the spring, and Danilowicz responded that such a plan would be acceptable given the short lead time. The funding arrangement will be determined and communicated to the department heads next month. Masters asked the department heads to contact her if they are interested in receiving assistance from the Assessment office on this College assessment initiative. In addition, the department heads were reminded that Rick Rohrs, the College assessment specialist who is housed in the History department, would be an excellent resource for assistance with either general assessment or GenEd assessment.

Tom Wikle informed the department heads that they should have received two renovation request forms that look almost identical, one for 10K and under and one for over $10K. The College will be providing the data on the over $10K requests for the ASFC who will rank the proposals using criteria the Council has developed. Last year, nine out of approximately 40 proposals were recommended for funding, and some projects have been completed. The department heads were asked to stay within the words limit that has been instituted for the requests this year. A question was raised about Core Facility Renovation proposals, and the department heads were instructed to submit both that proposal and a Technology Fee proposal for appropriate renovation projects. The deadline for Technology Fee proposals will be October 1 (to Tom Wikle), and the Core Facility Renovation proposals will be due on September 30 (to Ron Van Den Bussche). Wikle noted that any items that are associated with deferred maintenance have been entered into a College spreadsheet in order to keep track of progress, and the data will be shared continually with the Physical Plant. Danilowicz interjected that the University has a substantial list of deferred maintenance projects and the College list is surprisingly small; therefore, the department heads were encouraged to provide a list of needed repairs that fall under this category to Tom Wikle to be placed on the College master list. Wikle asked the department heads to contact him to determine suitability of a repair for the deferred maintenance list since those projects should not be included in the departmental renovation requests. He noted that estimates are not necessary when submitting the renovation request forms. After the proposals are ranked, a ballpark estimate will be sought from the Physical Plant to be followed by formal estimate requirement.

Amy Martindale informed the department heads that her office should know what is happening in the departments in order to properly advise freshmen and prospective students. Therefore, the departmental advisors will be working in concert with the College advisors to maintain up-to-date communications concerning departmental opportunities. She then referred to a four-year degree plan example in the agenda packet, a high-impact practice that lays out the critical courses, the course order, and the associated semester course offerings for degree plans, which the College will administer to provide a valuable resource for students. The objective will be to create a four-year degree plan for each College undergraduate degree. In order to avoid duplication in effort, the departments will be asked to have the one-page (front and back) degree plans ready when they submit their degree sheet revisions, using the standard timeline (November request and a January deadline). She noted that it would be beneficial if the departments could include the types of extracurricular activities associated with departmental degrees that are important for student success in professions or graduate school. The degree plans will be placed on the Student Academic Services website, which also links to the departmental websites. Martindale encouraged the department heads to place the plans on their individual websites for added student accessibility. She noted that the department heads and the departmental advisers will be sent a template to facilitate this initiative and any necessary assistance can be sought from the College advisers and Martindale.
Danilowicz observed that many of the departmental websites are substandard and need to be updated; therefore, a College plan has been formulated to address this issue. Wikle continued on this topic and indicated that he and Gary Jones peruse departmental web pages each year and, subsequently, contact departments when upgrades are warranted. He noted that permission has been received from the University for the College to use the new University web template. The departments are also welcome to use the new template but it will not be a requirement. Departments who elect to use a different design can consult with Jones, who has a finite number of templates that he can develop or customize for departmental needs. This year, the College will be undertaking a new endeavor to assist departments who are experiencing difficulties with maintaining their web pages by hiring students in the College Web Services office to perform light maintenance. He referred to the Web Services attachment in the agenda packet, which included an email address for web maintenance requests. Either a department head or a designee can send the maintenance requests, but the department heads were warned that wide distribution of the email address may result in website changes that have not been vetted through the department head. The requests should be limited to relatively simple revisions, and departmental requests will be given higher priority than individual faculty or staff requests. Wikle noted that the Web Services students will not be able to offer assistance with online course development. Furthermore, if substantial changes are required, a department head or designee should contact Web Services by phone and schedule an appointment to meet with either Jones or a member of his staff. Additionally, the departments were encouraged to send departmental personnel to Joomla (HTML software editing) training, which may be the best alternative for some departments to customize their website to fit their individual needs. Jones offers training for Joomla in small class settings in the basement of Life Sciences East. Wikle again referred to the Web Services attachment, which included information on how to flip a classroom with equipment provided by ITLE. He noted that the College website now includes a faculty link, with posts such as technology fee deadlines and RPT information. In addition, the College will be developing a sharepoint site, where documents can be placed in folders specific to a department or in a general College folder for departmental use. The sharepoint site will require a log-in for security purposes.
Procedure Synopsis:

A&S Recurring Funding requests will be divided into three departmental subunits in the College – Arts/Humanities, Social/Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences – for evaluation. These requests will be evaluated by the ASFC councilors representing their respective areas. Councilors representing Arts/Humanities will evaluate requests from Arts/Humanities; councilors representing Social/Behavioral Sciences will evaluate requests from Social/Behavioral Sciences; councilors representing Natural Sciences will evaluate requests from Natural Sciences.

Councilors will identify each request with a priority designation of high, medium, or low (H/M/L). When assigning these designations, councilors should adhere to the priorities assigned by the department; in other words, councilors should respect the department’s decision that their first priority should be ranked at least as high or higher than anything ranked below it. Councilors cannot vote for the department for which they represent.

After assigning a priority designation, councilors will create a numerical ranking for the proposals for which they designated a “High” priority. Each councilor will then submit their numerical rankings up to the top 3 proposals to the ASFC Vice Chair for tabulating results.

The ASFC Vice Chair will then submit the priority ranking (also up to the top 3) from each departmental subunit to the ASFC for a second round of evaluations. The ASFC will designate a hierarchy for the top 9 proposals, which will then be submitted to the Dean.

A&S Departmental Subunits:

**ARTS/HUMANITIES:** Art, English, Foreign Languages, History, Music, Philosophy, Theatre

**SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES:** Communication Sciences and Disorders, Geography, Media and Strategic Communications, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology

**NATURAL SCIENCES:** Aerospace Studies, Botany, Chemistry, Computer Sciences, Geology, Mathematics, Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Physics, Statistics, Zoology
The Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences will periodically request that the Arts & Sciences Faculty Council (ASFC) review and rank a variety of requests originating from the various departments. There will commonly be multiple proposals from each department, and the Dean’s office will frequently need our rankings back in a relatively short timeframe.

**Proposed Procedure:**

1. The Dean will make the ASFC aware of the need for such a ranking as early as is feasible but no later than one ASFC meeting prior to the meeting at which the ranking will take place (hereafter termed the “ranking meeting”).

2. The Dean will provide the Chair of the ASFC with the complete requests/proposals to be evaluated in time for the Chair to forward those materials to the full council at least one week in advance of the ranking meeting. These requests/proposals will be divided into the three departmental subunits in the College for evaluation. The Dean will also provide a description of the evaluation criteria to be used in the ranking process. The Chair will forward these materials to the councilors by that one-week deadline.

3. Councilors will review the materials from the departmental subunit for which they represent. For example, the ASFC councilor who represents the Department of Physics will evaluate the requests/proposals from the departmental subunit of Natural Sciences.

4. ASFC Councilors will initially assign a priority ranking of High, Medium, or Low for each proposal considering an evaluation criteria that includes but is not limited to safety concerns, immediate instructional needs, impact on the number of students and faculty impacted, etc. The ASFC is encouraged to assess their collective evaluation criteria prior to assigning a priority ranking in order to obtain greater consistency in the evaluation process and to more accurately address the needs of the College from year to year. When assigning these designations, councilors should adhere to the priorities assigned by the department.

5. After assigning a priority ranking for each proposal, ASFC councilors will assign a numerical ranking for each proposal with a priority designation of “High.” Ties are not allowed. Each ASFC will then submit his/her numerical rankings up to the top 3 proposals to the ASFC Vice Chair. ASFC councilors are not permitted to include proposals from the department that they represent in their numerical rankings.

6. The ASFC Vice Chair will create a priority ranking for each of the three departmental subunits based on the numerical rankings provided by ASFC councilors. A top-ranking proposal will be scored a ‘3.’ A second-ranking proposal will be scored a ‘2,’ etc.

7. The proposals with the top 3 scores from each departmental subunit will be resubmitted to the ASFC for a second round of evaluations. During these evaluations, the ASFC will designate a hierarchy for the top 9 proposals, which will then be submitted to the Dean.