MINUTES OF ARTS & SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, February 7, 2018, 3:30 pm– (Suite 1600 Student Union)

(1) Chairperson Jeff Loeffert called the meeting at 3:34 pm.

(2) Roll Call

ASFC Present: Isabel Alvarez-Sancho (LL), Leticia Barchini (MATH), Brad Bays (GEOG), Lee Brasuell (TH), A.K. Dai for Joe Cecil (CS), Emily Graham (HIST), Grant DeMond (PSYC), Jeanne L’Bellige for John Gelder (CHEM), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Apple Igrek (PHIL), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Ted Kian (SMSC), Jeff Loeffert (MUSI), Chad Malone (SOC), Stephen Nemeth (POLS), Peter Richtsmeier (CDIS), Mark Sisson (ARTS), Gil Summy (PHYS), Mary Towner (IBIO), Linda Watson (PBEE), Lan Zhu (STAT).

ASFC Absent: Grant DeMond (PSYC), Babu Fathepure (MICR).

Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz and Dr. Mendez.

(3) Approval of the December Minutes

Typos were corrected.

Graham made the motion to approve, Gregg seconded.

(4) Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve made by Barchini, seconded by Brasuell. The agenda was approved by the Council.

(5) Standing Committees

- College Policy and Planning: Nothing to report.

- Curriculum Committee: Nothing to report.

- Rules and Procedures Committee: Nothing to report.

- Scholarship Committee: The committee is evaluating files. They plan to complete the task by February 15.

(6) Old Business

Mentorship programs within the College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Mendez attended the Council meeting as a representative of the College Leadership Team. Dr. Mendez spoke on the creation of a collegewide mentorship program. The Council discussed the relevance of such programs during the February meeting. Dr. Mendez acknowledged the feedback received from the Council through Loeffert. She briefly explained old practices regarding mentorship and highlighted the new features of the proposed program. They are:

- Junior faculty will have two mentors from the College;
- Mentors will also assist Associate Professors;
• Mentors will be chosen from within the University and if necessary from other institutions (for example if a department is small or if the department has a small number of senior faculty members).
• There will be oversight of the program. The mentors will report on mentoring activities at A&D meetings. Junior faculty members will have access to mentors outside the department in case they have difficulties with their departmental mentors.

The discussion:
• Kian asked if mentors will be compensated for their activities.
• Mendez spoke of the creation of a mentorship award.
• Barchini pointed out the difference between compensation and an award. An award only rewards the efforts of one person out of a large group. She also pointed out the difficulties in evaluating mentoring activities. This last remark was emphasized by Towner. Kian suggested that nominations would be initiated by mentees.
• Gregg asked if there is an outline of mentor duties and responsibilities. The answer was that there will be no detailed list of responsibilities, but general suggestions. If too many expectations are listed there might not be enough volunteers. To which Gregg responded that general principles should be spelled out.
• Malone commented that mentees should be given a year before choosing their mentors. He explained that relocating and adjusting to a new job takes some time. Lewis agreed by saying that it takes time to get to know faculty members from other departments.
• Mendez explained that department heads will assign a temporary mentor during the faculty members first year at OSU.
• Bays asked if the mentoring program will cover teaching and research activities only. He emphasized that advice on service involvement is also important.
• Gregg stated that he does not believe in the reward system. People are more effective if they get involved in activities they are passionate about. The program will not benefit from involvement of faculty that are just “box checkers.”
• Towner expressed concerns regarding the evaluation of mentors. To what extent will the mentor be made responsible for information given or not given to the mentee?
• Loeffert asked Mendez if the proposal is ready for us to share it with our departments. Mendez said that edits need to be incorporated first. The Council will soon be given a complete version of the proposal.
• Loeffert closed the discussion by encouraging council members to support and promote the program in their respective departments.

(7) New Business

CAS Center Proposal-Center for Pediatric Psychology

Prior to the March meeting, Loeffert distributed material on the creation of a Center for Pediatric Psychology. The Council discussed and voted on the proposal during the February meeting. Vice Chair Zhu observed that of objectives listed in the proposal did not seem to justify the creation of a
center. Loeffert explained that the proposal was motivated by the potential for a donation to build facilities for the Psychology Department. After a short discussion the Council voted unanimously in favor.

(8) **Dean’s Report:**

Dean Danilowicz will make a presentation to the Provost and other officials on the College Budget on February the 8th. The presentation will address three topic (a) student retention, (b) instructional programs with potential to increase growth and, (c) interdisciplinary research programs.

Dean Danilowicz started his presentation by emphasizing that efforts to promote interdisciplinary research initiatives have been successful. More proposals were received containing exciting initiatives. Some of these projects can be costly but are very promising. He spoke about one such project on brain research. He proceeded to identify three departments within the College that have high potential for growth: the Integrative Biology Department, the Computer Science Department and the Psychology Department. The Integrative Biology Department is expected to grow from 630 to 1740 students in three years. A strong Computer Science Department should attract many majors. Pediatric Psychology has the potential to attract substantial external funding. In regards to student retention, the CAS Teaching Fellowship proposal did not receive support from the faculty. The Dean is replacing the proposal by a new one that would convert VAP lines, lecturers, and non-tenure track Teaching Associate lines to Teaching Assistant Professor lines. If his proposal is approved, VAP will receive benefits and non-tenure track faculty will receive a starting salary of $50,000. VAPs will be eligible for merit raises. The program will cost 1.2 million dollars. Graduate students will be required to attend a mandatory training week. They will be required to be on campus by August 1. They will receive $1000 compensation. This initiative will cost the college $225,000. New faculty will also be required to attend a training workshop and to be on campus by August 1. They will be receive one extra month’s salary. The initiative will cost $1.7 million dollars.

The College is requesting an increase in fees that will generate 9 million dollars. It is planned to use 6 million dollars in infrastructure projects. New facilities for Life Science were mentioned. Once the new building is completed, cleared space will need renovation to accommodate other departments.

Dean Danilowicz generated a discussion. Here is a summary of what was said.

- Alvarez-Sancho expressed concerns regarding compensation to tenure-track faculty in comparison to the proposed compensation for teaching faculty. She pointed out that tenure-track faculty have terminal degrees and many research, service, and teaching responsibilities.
- Dean Danilowicz expressed reservations about some departments criteria for hiring teaching faculty.
- Barchini emphasized that Alvarez-Sancho’s comments were far-reaching. There is a very significant discrepancy between OSU compensation of senior faculty and that from other institutions. She declared that an institution seriously committed to research should make a clear effort to
appropriately compensate excellence in research. (Implicitly, she raised questions about the value this institution gives to terminal degrees.) It is not reasonable to expect success in retention if the institution does not engage in effective efforts to make the faculty an integral part of the community, valued, and happy. She asked the Dean to convey to the Provost the fact that the faculty is angry.

- Kien said that the faculty had no raises in four years. He asked the Dean if there will be a raise program this year. The Dean said that he did not hear about a raise. He observed that we did not have a raise in three years. He acknowledged that the discrepancy in compensation with other institutions is real and on average OSU pays $16,000 less.
- Graham talked not just about salary compression but also about salary inversion.
- Loeffert agreed with the concerns. He emphasized that it is unreasonable to keep on asking for faculty involvement on various initiatives and not address compensation. There is a limit to the faculty’s understanding attitude.
- Dean Danilowicz explained that compensation is in the mind and discussion of the Deans but they have not been able to agree on an approach to address the problem. He also mentioned that four years ago a raise program was initiated by the higher administration, but due to budget cuts, it was discontinued.

(9) Closing
Motion to adjourn made by Barchini.