1. Chair Finchum called the meeting to order at 3:32pm.

2. Roll Call

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

   ASFC Absent: Ed Burkley (PSYC), Peter Richtsmeier (CDIS),

   Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder

3. Approval of the Minutes
   a. Goad requested a correction on attendance;
   b. Mienke requested a correction on his question with regard to College Allocation Policies: “would the proposed Committee be allowed to evaluate administrative space as well?”
   c. After corrections, motion to approve by Roos. Seconded by Shaw. Minutes after corrections approved.

4. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion to approve by Meinke, seconded by Roos. Agenda approved.

5. Standing Committee Reports
      i. Gregg: we need to address the clinical faculty issue.
      ii. Lavine: University Faculty Council is looking into this issue and there is suggestion that multiple categories of clinic faculty would be utilized. OSU Faculty Council meets next week or so. We can wait and see the timeline of the University Faculty Council.
      iii. Finchum: Loeffert attends the Faculty Council meeting and will inform.
      i. Heisterkamp: for the foreign language requirements, the Committee voted for the 6-hour requirement for the BS degree and the 9-hour requirement for the BA degree; the Committee is processing wording on course and program action forms, and has some difficulty with the Pre-Law option (e.g., the standard) and welcomes any suggestions;

   a. Issues Concerning College Allocation Policies
      i. Shaw: shared feedback from Biology Department. Many questioned if this draft policy is going to create another layer of bureaucracy, and commented that the new College
Committee potentially duplicates work of departmental committees. There was concern about the College Committee makeup and equal representation given its small body (with only two faculty members). A preference is to leave issues/discussions to each department.

ii. Roos: how was the issue handled before?

iii. Danilowicz: it was handled ad hoc before. It is the decision of this Faculty Council whether the draft policies are worth implementing. If the Council leaves the decision to the Dean's Office, Dean would handle it.

iv. Igrek: how does an internal policy at the department level help an issue between two or more departments?

v. Dean: Internally, a department document would help you prioritize as a department, but it does not help externally.

vi. Roos: how does this Council handle warfare between two or more departments?

vii. Crauder: used Murry Hall as an example. When it became available, because there was no input, the decision was left to the Dean’s Office. If there were a set of guiding principles, it would have been helpful.

viii. Meinke: it would be misleading to hope for a formula such as the draft policies. We cannot create a document that generalizes all information. You are asking the committee (without complete representation) to evaluate circumstances where they don’t have all the information. It is not helpful to real issues.

ix. McKinnon: it would be more beneficial to have a consulting committee on an as needed basis.

x. Sisson: expressed concerns that the draft policies won’t deal with larger problems. An example was provided in which space in a far-away building was provided to the home Department but it was not helpful to the faculty nor students. Would the draft policies give faculty/departments additional leverage?

xi. Dean: the issue is whether we should have an ad hoc committee such as the one being proposed by the draft policies. It depends on what you value in shared governance. The less input from faculty and department heads, the more power that the Dean has to make decisions. I prefer to have feedback from stakeholders. The question is if there is a way to get a small enough group that is functional yet still able to provide feedback.

xii. Barchini: expressed concern that she might not have expertise to judge space requests from other fields.

xiii. Shaw: What do Deans in other colleges do?

xiv. Dean: we don’t know what other Deans do, but it’s likely that Deans just make their own decisions. Our template (which was used to generate the draft policies) came from University of Washington. Dean shared a couple of other examples of space use issues and emphasized once again that he preferred feedback/input.

xv. Meinke: how would faculty input potentially change your mind? Some faculty are willing to commit to the work and make effort, but it is not clear how their input would be useful.

xvi. Lavine/Finchum: The proposed committee could quantify the downside of (responding to) requests. Is it possible that some of the issues could be clarified with improved budget situation?

xvii. Dean: it might clarify some, but it will come back.

xviii. Fathepure: the departments involved with specific space use issues should be part of the discussion.

xix. Alvarez-Sancho: Point #7 (of the draft policies) seems unclear. On what basis would the Committee evaluate this? Is there a rubric to use?

xx. Dean: A rubric would be helpful.

xxi. Finchum: This proposed College Committee is still advisory, and at the end of the day the decision will come back to the Dean. Also shared an example of space use and mentioned that physical facilities of the building and location of the building matter in decision-making.
Roos: I don’t see how this proposed College Committee prevents two department heads from going to the Dean with an unresolved issue.

Dean: the issue is that I don’t have enough information to make thoughtful decisions right now (without input). Decisions are too ad hoc. I’d rather to see some input such as on Point #7.

Meinke: Is there anything that we can learn from effectively resolved space conflicts?

Crauder: used the Business School building as an example. Issues would come up if they leave their current building when they move to the new building, and A&S has some control and is going to decide how to use the new space. The Dean’s Office would rather have a Committee to provide input.

Brasuell: Do we need a standing committee? Could it be an ad hoc advisory committee?

Dean: in its actual function, the ad hoc committee would/could serve for a long term.

Finchum: the Rules & Procedure Committee should look into the draft policies and see if any changes are necessary.

Igrek: motion to form an advisory committee that works on an ad hoc basis without a formal document.

Lewis: some criteria (e.g., student impact) are worth having in a formal document.

Barchini: lab space/research should also be emphasized

Finchum: if there is a formal document, it would have just a few guiding principles, including student impact, research and service, etc.

Graham: echoed that it would be helpful to have some down in a formal document that puts the mechanisms in play.

Lavine: any local solution that meets the guiding principles could be a good way to go.

Shaw: seconded Igrek’s motion. Motion failed to pass.

Finchum: the Rules & Procedure Committee will look at the draft document and discuss what that Committee thinks will be appropriate changes based on what we’ve heard today.

b. Issues Concerning Future Budget (Cut)
   i. Dean Danilowicz: shared with the Council two documents. The first shows the breakdown for where the money is in the College. Dean explained how to read the chart, and mentioned that twenty (faculty) searchers within the College are being held until we know more about the budget situation. The largest item is faculty salary. Even if we cut others such as phones, chemicals, travel money, or the entire Dean’s office and their entire staff, it won’t be close to the $3.3 million goal. Large impact will happen to GTAs and temporary faculty.
   ii. Gregg: the College runs pretty lean, which is fine during normal times. The problem is that we don’t have anything to give back with running lean.
   iii. Dean: There’s always a concern about the money spent on administration relative to faculty. Our budget is primarily in faculty. We do run lean administratively.
   iv. Dean: (when asked how many faculty there are in the College) we have 390 or 385 tenure-track faculty. The information is available in the academic ledger. The total budget includes state allocation and fees, and does not represent money from the foundation or grant money.
   v. Roos: how does it stack up to other colleges and the University in the aggregate?
   vi. Dean: I cannot answer it because you cannot get the information from the ledger. There is a national data set, national study of costs and productivities, which you can compare to other colleges. We participated in 2008 (last time), and our college compared to peers was severely underfunded per student. That was eight years ago, and we don’t have more data to compare.
   vii. Lavine: the real issue is when do the cuts end? If we know the answer, we can plan our cuts better.
viii. Barchini: If you cut GTAs and temporary faculty, what will happen to their teaching? Will faculty have a teaching increase?

ix. Dean: in the second document, I consolidated information from the document handed out last time, and put real dollar numbers (best estimates as some are difficult to estimate). One substantial change with regard to furloughs (which would imply an unpredictable reduction of salary only for staff) is to reduce one staff FTE per department to 0.75 FTE (9-month contracts). Unlike furlough (with unpredictable nature), this would be more predictable, permanent and planned.

x. Gregg: Would this entail laying staff off?

xi. Dean: The total possible savings is $5.7 million, but there is great variability (plus/minus 30%). We have done our best to make items separate. We have to get up to 3.3 million as a plan, and it doesn’t mean that we will have to implement that. The issue is how we would like to provide feedback? I’d like to walk through the implications of each item on the document with a smaller group, and would like to receive feedback such as a prioritized list. The example of standardizing GTA teaching loads was used.

xii. Meinke: the only way that you save money is if you reduce positions. That needs to be explicitly stated.

xiii. Gregg: another issue is that you are going to cut into the competitiveness of the departments, in terms of receiving external funding. This should be factored in.

xiv. Lavine: Can we bring this (document) back to our faculty?

xv. Dean: Yes. This will be distributed to the department heads tomorrow. We will not function the same way that we do because of the budget cut. It will affect departments differently.

xvi. Gregg: People higher up the line need to recognize that there will be impacts, and there will be costs to the University and to the State. (Others echoed later how this could affect new faculty hires, with higher teaching load, no TA/RA, potential salary problems)

xvii. Dean: How would you like to provide feedback? I’ll get feedback from staff, students, department heads, council, from different perspectives and different stakeholders, before I make a decision. I’d like to receive the feedback and the recommended priority list by November.

xviii. Finchum: we need an ad hoc committee for this.

xix. Dean: I’d like to restore the faculty lines in each department. If we take that option off the list, we need to cut 3.3 million from 4.6 million dollars.

xx. Meinke: it seems that the only way to do it is through faculty furlough or not to hire new faculty, isn’t it right?

xxi. Dean: the top three items on the academic program efficiencies include reducing GTA, summer teaching and visiting faculty, which would save 2 million dollars.

xxii. Roos: how equal is this across colleges? Is it 9% for all colleges?

xxiii. Dean: In a sense, all deans have been asked to do the same thing but have received no explicit plans. For instance, Graduate College is preparing a 10% budget cut. I don’t know how this will be handled above me.

xxiv. Fathepure: Are the cuts permanent? If budget situation improves, do we get things restored?

xxv. Dean: Do act as if it is permanent at this moment. We have no idea when the budget will turn around. If budget improves, we will discuss our options and prioritize new spending.

xxvi. Meinke: please combine and integrate information from these two documents so that we know where the money is coming from. (Dean concurred)

xxvii. Igrek: Where does feedback go?

xxviii. Finchum: feedback should go to the ad hoc committee (or department heads)

xxix. Lewis: To what extent will you be able to individualize the cuts? For instance, to increase class sizes for some classes only, but not for others?
xxx. Dean: I’m willing to hear departmental suggestions. If the department comes up with an alternative plan with the same effect but with less impact on the department, that would be fine. But because we have gone through adjustments recently, there is not a lot of wiggle room for departments.

xxxi. Finchum: Do you still want to a smaller group so that you can speak to?

xxxii. Dean: Yes. You (faculty) give a different voice than your department heads. I’d like to walk through with the smaller group on complexities of these options on the list (to train the trainers) so that these contact persons may answer more questions from other faculty and provide more feedback, and recommend prioritized items. I’m not sure if there is a more effective way to do it.

xxxiii. Finchum: Do we have volunteers? Lewis, Meinke, Fathepure, McKinnon, Finchum and Loeffert volunteered to form the ad hoc group.

xxxiv. Dean: If a department has a lot of questions and would like me to answer, I’ll make myself available to them.

c. January Meeting (to eliminate)
   i. Finchum: After double-checking the Bylaw, we don’t have to have a January meeting, unless it is called for. We need a motion to remove the scheduled meeting.
   ii. Motion by Gregg, and seconded by Roos. Motion passed to eliminate the January meeting.

7. New Business
   a. Clinical Faculty Description in College RPT Document: already discussed
   b. Junior Faculty Awards Notification Issue (Scholarship Committee): It is on Burkey’s to-do-list and remains on agenda.

8. Dean’s Report: pass until the next meeting

9. Announcements: No

10. Adjournment
    a. Igrek moved to adjourn. McKinnon seconded. Meeting adjourned at 5:05pm.