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

2. Attendance

   **ASFC Present:** Liz Roth (ART), Janette Steets (BOT), Ramesh Kaipa (CDIS), Blayne Mayfield (Vice Chair, CS), Rebecca Damron (ENGL), Erik Ekman (FLL), Hongbo Yu (GEOG), Prijank Jaiswal (GEOL), John Kinder (HIST), Bobbi Kay Lewis (Chair, MSC), Jesse Johnson (MATH), Babu Fathepure (MICRO), Jeff Loeffert (MUSI), Bob Hauenstein (PHYS), Stephen Nemeth (POLS), Maureen Sullivan (PSYC), Kelley Hartshorn for Michael Long (SOC), Carla Goad (Secretary, STAT), Lloyd Caldwell (TH), Andy Dzialowski (ZOOL)

   **ASFC Absent:** Barry Levine (CHEM), James Cain (PHIL)

   **Administration Present:** Dean Bret Danilowicz

3. Minutes of the February 5, 2014 meeting were approved.

4. Agenda for the current March 2014 was approved.

5. Committee Updates

   a. **Curriculum Committee Report** – no report
   b. **Scholarship Committee** – Damron (ENGL) - evaluating applications currently and should finish on or by March 7
   c. **Rules and Procedures Committee** – no report
   d. **Policy and Planning Committee** – Sullivan (PSYC) – have just begun meeting; no report at this time

6. Report of University Faculty Council Liaison Representative

   Vice-Chair Mayfield over-viewed the most recent UFC meeting.

   - See Attachment 1 for more details on these and other issues. Thanks to Vice-Chair Mayfield for providing this attachment.
7. Report of Department Heads Meeting – Chair Lewis reported: See Attachment 2

8. Old Business - none

9. New Business - Supplemental Pay Committee presentation and discussion led by Andy Dzialowski

The Supplemental Pay Committee membership committee consists of:
Andy Dzialowski ZOOL - Chair
Will Focht POLS
Apple Igrek PHIL
John McGuire MSC
Peter Shull PHYS
Moses Vijayakumar MICR
Jeffrey Walker ENGL

The Committee examined data from 2012 that included all summer face-to-face courses (taught for 1 month salary), international courses ($100 / SCH up to $3000), intersession courses, and online courses. Important considerations by the committee were
1. Salary based compensation
2. Workload compensation,
3. Floor for all courses across CAS but allow for exceptions,
4. Ceiling for all courses across CAS,
5. Establish minimum registration numbers,
6. Offer incentives for larger classes,
7. Define/Establish registration increments for incremental pay,
8. Incentives should not increase linearly with enrollment
9. CAS cannot pay everyone 1 month salary and offer all of the courses listed

In establishing registration minimums and increments these numbers should be linked the level of the course: lower-division undergraduate, upper-division undergraduate, or graduate to account for typical increases in workload required per student in higher level courses.

Danilowicz noted that presently there is no incentive for faculty to grow enrollment; face-to-face enrollments are down 25% over the last four years; CAS is trying to be pro-active in saving courses; if CAS does nothing, we will lose summer funding; a plan is needed for Summer 2015.

Roth, Loeffert and Chair Lewis noted that smaller summer classes in their respective departments do not meet the proposed minimums; specifically Roth indicated that fire codes for some art studios cap the number of participants at twelve. Whatever model is adopted it should not exclude any department from offering summer courses.

Dzialowski indicated that these are examples where a department could obtain a “variance”.
Kinder expressed concerns: 1. These suggested minimums would drive more courses online 2. Within his home department (HIST) this proposed model would exclude some faculty because of low enrollment in specialization courses, and 3. When are the enrollment numbers being measured?

In response to 2 Danilowicz indicated that face-to-face specialization courses, in general (not just in the case of HIST) are being cancelled as it is.

Hauenstien asked Dzialowski, what percentage of one-month salary meets the budget? Dzialowski estimated between 60 and 70% but an exact amount is not certain.

Westfall asked if it was known where declines are occurring. Danilowicz replied that is unknown at this time.

Dzialowski acknowledged that the incremental model clearly is not going to work. The committee will re-convene and discuss other alternatives given the input from the ASFC.

Councilors were in general agreement that the task this committee has taken is daunting, and there is a vast amount of information to be considered. Councilors were appreciative of the time and effort expended, thus far, by this committee. However, due to the length of the discussion on this topic, Chair Lewis tabled further discussion of this matter until the next meeting.

10. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 5:21pm with no further agenda items presented.
Attachment 1

Faculty Council Liaison Report

The faculty council met on Tuesday, February 11, 2014.

Ron Beer, OSU Ombudsman, described the role and responsibilities of the Ombudsman.

Meredith Hamilton, OSU Faculty Athletic Representative, made a presentation. She stated that the position is mandated by the NCAA, but the responsibilities of the position are not defined by the NCAA; thus, the responsibilities of the Faculty Athletic Representative may be different from institution to institution. (See Attachment 1a)

Gary Clark of the President’s office made a report.
- Enrollment and admissions are up over last year at this time.
- The Branding Success campaign has had over 91,000 contributors to date; they are hoping to reach 100,000 contributors before the campaign ends.
- OSU received a Higher Education Excellence in Diversity award from INSIGHT Into Diversity magazine.
- Due to alleged fraud resulting in more than $1M diverted from the OSU UML (University Multispectral Laboratories) in 2012, OSU has filed a lawsuit against the company that formerly operated the lab, and the and the FBI has launched an investigation.

Pam Fry, Interim Provost, updated the Council on the status of Faculty Council recommendations to the OSU administration. (See Attachment 1b)

Joe Weaver, Vice President of Administration & Finance, reported that the Governor has recommended a 5% cut to higher education (and other) budgets for the next fiscal year.

Rodney Holcomb, Chair of the Budget Committee, reported that the Committee still is working on a block tuition proposal with VP Joe Weaver. The goal is a proposal that is similar to those being proposed by our peer institutions rather than the rushed draft proposed earlier.

Gilbert John, Chair of the Research Committee stated that the Committee is drafting updates to the laser safety policy.

Suzy Harrington, Chief Wellness Officer reminded faculty that about 160 free wellness classes are available to them.

It was announced that the OSU General Faculty Meeting will be held April 15.
Attachment 2

Department Heads Meeting Report             February 25, 2014

Bret Danilowicz introduced Brian Petrotta, the new Coordinator of Communications and Marketing for the College, who will oversee the College newsletter, website, and other matters related to public relations. Petrotta informed the department heads that he will be telling their stories, with more resources than were available in the past such as the central Communications office and OkState TV. His objective is to focus on recent happenings in the departments and the importance of those related to faculty and students. He noted that OKState TV has the ability to live stream speakers, which is dependent upon appropriate prior speaker authorization. He is working with Gary Jones to launch a new College website with a new look similar to the University website.

Gary Jones, the College Webmaster, expounded upon the launching of the new website by noting that news items will appear on the main page and departmental websites can be accessed from that page. The interface should be user-friendly, which is important because the site receives very heavy use from both current and prospective students and graduate students. He noted that the majority of the site visitors routinely proceed directly to the departmental webpages; therefore, those pages need to be kept up-to-date. He informed the department heads that he is in the process of creating an Intranet site for exclusive College personnel use, and he referred to a handout that described the proposed site. The site will include resources to assist with business processes, such as Physical Plant work orders, forms, and policies. He will be contacting the departments to familiarize himself with the types of information that would be beneficial on the Intranet site, and he will attend some future Department Head meetings to garner systematic feedback.

Ron Van Den Bussche reminded the department heads about the allocated funds that are available for travel for their prospective graduate students. He emphasized that those funds need to be expended; otherwise, they may be drastically reduced or unavailable next year. He noted that the department heads will be required to come to him for an account number for expenditures, as he must forward that information to Sheryl Tucker and Joe Weaver to document that the funding is being used appropriately. The Top Tier funding will be available again this year, which should be used for one-year offers only. He will require the name, CWID, and the amount that will be offered. In addition, he must be kept informed on acceptances and declinations because the Graduate College requires that data. He indicated that the Stipend Enhancement program will conclude this year, and he has held back funding to account for that program. Therefore, the allotments that were given to the departments should be used for the Top Tier program. He asked the department heads to contact him if a student should be getting the third year of a stipend enhancement and satisfactory progress is not being made so that the money can be freed up. He noted that the deadlines and the template for graduate student offers are both available in the departmental Sharepoint folders.
Tom Wikle reminded the department heads about the upcoming March 3 technology fee deadline. He mentioned that many departments will submit both an electronic and a paper copy, probably to provide a signature for their proposals. He noted that a signature is not required on the proposals, but he asked the department heads to ensure that all departmental proposals are reviewed and approved by them. He emphasized that an electronic submission will require a separate file for each proposal. A department head ranking will be required for multiple proposals from a department, which can be sent in a separate memorandum. He noted that there is a sizeable amount of funding to allocate this semester, and questions about the funding process can be directed to either Norma Earp or him.

Danilowicz informed the department heads that the Governor has made a recommendation to increase funding for primary and secondary education by $50 million and to decrease the funding for Higher Education by that same amount. The implementation of her plan would translate into a 2.5 percent allocation budget cut in the College, or a one percent cut in the budget. If the reduction were to happen, the University is discussing contingency plans to counterbalance lower funding levels with measures such as block tuition and a tuition increase. Danilowicz indicated that the departments should not expect any decrease in their individual budgets. However, the rationale used by the Governor for the cuts relates to the high carry forward balances that exist in all state agencies; for example, OU carried forward $35 million and OSU carried forward nearly $200 million last year. He indicated that some of the carry forward can be explained but, Nonetheless, it is still being scrutinized. This past year, the College carried forward $6 million, with some of the money being carried forward in Outreach, for example. The College goal is to reduce the carry forward to $5 million. Danilowicz noted that even encumbrances on carry forward get scrutinized, but endowments are not counted in the totals.

Danilowicz referred to the agenda attachment on Employer Preferences and Priorities for New College Graduate Hires in the agenda packet. He indicated that Pam Ehlers, the Director of OSU Career Services, brought the document to the deans’ attention, which is feedback from the employers of OSU students. On Page 7 of the document, he referred to a table of top skills the employers believe students should possess. A big change from past surveys is that verbal communication skills are increasing in importance according to the employers, and OSU students are perceived to be lacking in that area. The employers are recommending that additional focus should be placed on those skills during curriculum planning. On Page 9 of the document, he referred to the table of top attributes, which included a category for internships. That category has been increasing considerably; therefore, future discussions will be held about establishing broad internships in the departments. The internships could be sponsored by College alums, which could carry associated philanthropic benefits. A department head raised a question about the placement of lab research in the internship scenario, and an answer will be sought and communicated back to the department heads. Danilowicz then referred to the agenda attachment on Appendix: Sample Survey, which was created by the National Association of Colleges and Employers. The general concept of the survey is to acquire additional information
on higher education employment statistics in order to forego possible federal mandates for the information. Amy Martindale interjected that OSU Career Services sends out a survey to graduating students but the response rate is always low; therefore, this past year’s request was followed by a letter from the Dean and an email. Unfortunately, those additional measures did not result in many additional responses. Danilowicz continued on this topic to explain that many non-responders are in the Arts and the Humanities, which conveys the message that employment possibilities in those areas are very limited. The department heads were asked for suggestions to motivate students to fill out the sample survey. After a short discussion, the general consensus was to create a number of prizes to be awarded or, possibly, donations that could be given on the students’ behalf.

Danilowicz reported that the Deans and the Provost receive a large amount of feedback on advisors, which is both good and bad. Since the feedback is important to departments, the department heads were asked for their preference for receiving the feedback from the College. After a short discussion, a decision was made to continue to immediately forward delicate and time-sensitive information related to advising, to be followed by a compilation of other feedback for annual distribution, along with the Student Survey of Advising.

Martindale reported that students in the College have recently begun to transfer to departmental advising in the early spring; however, some struggling students may need additional, more careful guidance from the College freshman advisors. She asked for feedback from the department heads on the proper time to make the transition. After a short discussion, a decision was made to allow freshman advisors to use their experience and judgment to determine the appropriate time in the spring to release students to the departmental advisors. The department heads were encouraged to continue departmental mentoring of students, especially struggling students.

Lauren Kidd referred to the agenda attachment on *OSU Naming and Giving Opportunities*. She indicated that, in the past two years, the Foundation has changed minimum endowment levels, and recently they have made the decision to change some of the annual funding levels. Formerly, a $500 contribution could be named for an annual scholarship or award, including distinctive criteria. That level has been raised to $1,250 with a mandatory four-year commitment. The scholarship or award cannot include specific criteria and, instead, should be based on GPA, need, or discipline area. The four-year minimum intention is to fund a student through his or her college career; therefore, the department heads should anticipate that the scholarship will be renewable because of the four-year commitment. Obviously, if a donor wants to make a commitment of $500 or another amount, the gift could be placed in a departmental general scholarship fund. Those gifts are viewed as annual gifts that are not likely to be repeated; therefore, naming opportunities would not be established for those. Kidd informed the department heads that the spending policy is five percent of the original contributed value, which grows over time due to inflation. She noted that there are higher level ticket items
for Chairs and Professorships, etc. She emphasized that all scholarships and awards that are currently in place will be grandfathered in; therefore, the change pertains to new gifts only.

The department heads were informed that they will receive instructions to complete information that has been requested from Central Administration on scholarship cash balances.