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

2. Roll Call

Attendance
ASFC Present: Isabel Alvarez-Sancho (FLL), Lee Brasuell (TH), Babu Fathepure (MICR), John Gelder (CHEM), Emily Graham (HIST), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Doug Heisterkamp (CS), Apple Igrek (PHIL), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Bin Liang (SOC), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Stephen Nemeth (POLS), Peter Richtsmeier (CDIS), Jennifer Shaw (IBIO), Mark Sisson (ART), Gil Summy (PHYS), Lan Zhu (STAT)

ASFC Absent: Leticia Barchini (MATH), Ed Burkley (PSYC), Allen Finchum (GEOG), David Meinke (PBEE),

Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz

3. Approval of the March Minutes
   a. Motion to approve made by Gregg and second by McKinnon; Minutes approved.

4. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion to approve made by Liang, and second by Shaw; Agenda approved.

5. Standing Committee Reports
      i. Gregg: after meeting with Crauder, the Committee revised A&S RPT documents on proposed changes to A&S RPT documents for new titles; the revised document with revisions and inquiries marked is ready to be reviewed by ASFC;
      ii. Loeffert: the document will be circulated after this meeting, and ASFC will pass it in May (next meeting)
      iii. Dean: just to clarify, ASFC is not the deciding body of the document. Rather, ASFC can pass it onto the full A&S College faculty to vote on, given the substantial changes made to the document.
      i. Gelder: No report.
   d. Scholarship – David Meinke (absent).
      i. Loeffert (on behalf of Meinke): the Scholarship Committee did meet again to select the orange gown graduate for spring commencement and advised Amy Martindale's office on how best to streamline the A&S scholarship application and evaluation processes.

6. Old Business.
b. ASFC Special Committee: Evaluating Grant and Governance Opportunities for Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty:

i. Loeffert: a special committee, formed after last meeting, received information from the Dean’s office and discussed relevant issues. The primary consideration is ‘professional upper mobility’ for full-time non-tenure track faculty. A number of specific issues were pointed out, including the following (1) possibility to participate in ASFC; (2) possibility to be included in A&S travel and research grants (rationale: some expressed desire to pursue research and create new knowledge in addition to teaching at a major university such as OSU, but no equal mechanism is provided); (3) one pointed out that any administrative position at OSU would require tenure, which is not available to non-tenure-track faculty (which might create trouble to retention); (4) it is critical to provide resources to non tenure-track faculty in order to improve recruitment and retention. For instance, they receive no startup package/budget to purchase computers and software, while they play critical roles in instructions (Music department was mentioned as an example); (5) the issue of gender inequality (on top of salary gap between tenure/tenure track and non tenure track faculty) might be tied to discussion here (Music department’s recent meeting to elect a curriculum committee which ended up with all men was used as an example). The suspicion (though no data available) is that more tenure/tenure-track faculty are male, and more non-tenure track faculty are female;

ii. Alvarez-Sancho: pointed out that salary gap also exists among tenure/tenure-track faculty within the same rank due to gender and race/ethnicity;

iii. Loeffert: the goal is to fix short-term issues, such as possibility to serve on ASFC, and possibility to compete for travel and research grants; this will help improve recruitment and retention of non-tenure track faculty;

iv. Richtsmeier shared another example of how a clinical faculty (due to spousal hire) is equally as capable as regular faculty; Nemeth shared examples how clinical faculty could be treated unequally simply because of their non-tenure track titles;

v. Loeffert: it is likely that we will have more and more non-tenure track faculty in the future;

vi. McKinnon: in my area, non-tenure track faculty normally have a Master degree, and tenure track faculty possess Ph.D.; Dean: it varies, and there is no requirement of a terminal degree to be a tenure/tenure track faculty (two departments have such faculty); McKinnon: in my department, some tenured faculty long time ago held only Master degrees, but not anymore;

vii. Dean: all of these specific proposals are good, but we need to realize the consequences on tenure/tenure track faculty if these proposed were to be implemented (e.g., if merit-based salary raise was adopted, it would lower the percentages given to tenure/tenure track faculty). We need to look at both these proposals and resources;

viii. Shaw shared her experience as both clinical faculty and tenure/tenure track faculty and pointed out that there are different expectations/responsibilities associated with each (e.g., bringing grant money as an example); Heisterkamp would like to know the data (e.g., how many clinical faculty are interested in writing proposals); Loeffert emphasized the importance of retention of talent clinical faculty by opening up possibilities for them to present research based on miniscule support of either travel or research grants;

ix. Liang asked about what decisions are better handled at the departmental level. Dean: governance related issues could be better handled at the departmental level (e.g., to what extent non-tenure track faculty are going to be involved within each department); but resource issues need to be handled at the college level. Some of resource issues (e.g., computer/software) are relatively easier to handle, but others (e.g., merit-based pay, start-up package) would have more consequences to tenure/tenure track faculty members. Dean encouraged all councils to bring this discussion back to the departments and generate feedback.
x. Alvarez-Sancho: do we have data on gender/diversity? Is it true that there is less diversity among tenure/tenure track faculty? Dean/Loeffert: the suspicion is that there is a trend, but no accurate data. Alvarez-Sancho: there are more/bigger issues involved, as we see unequal pay within the same rank for women/minorities. Even among clinical faculty, there might be salary differences due to gender/diversity issues.

xi. Loeffert: raised the issue (based on others’ comments) that the new titles could be misleading (e.g., “teaching assistant professor” sounds like “teaching assistant”), and wondered if the University would consider more actions; Dean: the adopted new titles are classified through the regents and the HR system; clinical faculty should be able to use other titles as they fit outside the system (e.g., visiting professors), as long as it does not generate confusion within each department.

xii. Sisson: wondered where the push for clinical faculty is coming from, and pointed out that in his department, there is no such an issue (except long-term adjuncts); instead of creating this two-tier system (which we are trying to fix), why not just hire more regular faculty? Dean: it’s a money/finance issue (using Penn State System as an example where more non-tenure track faculty are hired than tenure track faculty now). Gregg also shared his experience in his department, contrasting how things were 30-40 years ago (higher teaching load, little incentive for external funding) with how things are now (lower teaching load, but higher tuition and external funding are required to subsidize teaching). Shaw also pointed out the funding rates have been declining due to increased competition; Igrek: given this reality, the two-tier system is created with different expectations and roles, and to some extent might mitigate the inequality argument but justify/cover the issues.

xiii. Richtsmeier: with regard to new title changes and confusions generated, maybe we can consider change titles of tenure/tenure track faculty (e.g., assistant professor of research); Dean: the new titles are outcomes of two and a half years of discussion, and there won’t be any more changes soon.

xiv. Fathepure: suggested that we should look for agencies that may help clinical faculty with their research; Gregg: there are some national granting agencies that offer opportunities to non-research entities, and OSU may lobby for these agencies to provide support to non-research faculty at a research institution such as OSU; Graham: in my field, such opportunities are often given to independent scholars and post-docs, but not to non-tenure track faculty who are expected to gain support from their institutions; Gregg: hopefully there will be some cultural changes, and OSU is not the only university going through this.

xv. Dean: shared his thoughts on how to experiment on such opportunities; and suggested setting aside a fixed amount of money for non-tenure track faculty to compete for travel grants, but the question is how much to be set aside (i.e., the scale to the amount available to tenure track faculty), and it’s likely going to be adjusted overtime; with regard to research grant, not sure how many non-tenure track faculty would be interested;

xvi. Loeffert: I’d like to make ASFC available to clinical faculty; Lewis: wondered how it would look like; Loeffert: no specifics yet; we’d like to have a proposal by next meeting; Alvarez-Sancho shared her experience from former institution, where there were service expectations for non-tenure track faculty which might help in reappointment. But such a practice created some issues to people who cannot serve. Dean: suggested that a simple way would be to have one representative from each division, a total of three; Brasuell: because some of clinical faculty chose not to do research and service, it is important not to penalize them if they don’t serve. Loeffert: don’t they have service components in their appraisal? Dean: it varies, and most of them are 100% teaching. Fathepure: wondered how election would work out, if they are supposed to be voted (concurred by Loeffert); McKinnon suggested a rotation system in which representatives from all departments can participate; Brasuell: in my department, we have two but only one is
available to serve; if rotation is adopted, that person would be serving automatically; Lewis: (in contrast) we have 21;

xvii. Igrek: one negative thing is that we are adding burden to non-tenure track faculty without pay increase; Loeffert: it’s a good point; nevertheless, compensation is not the only thing that retains people; from the discussion of the ad hoc committee, ‘upper mobility’ is important to them, and they’d like their voice to be heard;

7. New Business: None

8. Dean’s Report:
   a. Announcements:
      i. Dean: the budget for next year will be flat with no cut expected; any change to staffing will be due to enrollment, but not budget;
      ii. Dean: handed out a working draft of “Diversity Post-Doctoral Fellowships”, based on suggestions of an ad hoc committee, and explained key items of the draft (e.g., involving 21 departments teaching General Education courses, title (“diversity” is allowed to be used), qualification & preferences, application materials, review process and timeline); please bring this to your department and share, and we can discuss in the next meeting;
      iii. A few councils (Liang, Fathepure, Gregg, Loeffert, Graham) raised questions (on procedure, teaching load, mentorship, recurrence, 3rd year opportunity). Dean further explained: (1) the possibility of converting to a tenure-track line (though it will be an open search); (2) 1-1 teaching load, and pay rate as post-doctoral fellow rate; (3) mentor in both research and teaching; (4) this will be recurring (every time there is an opportunity, we will open up a search); (5) 3rd year will be offered to a good candidate during a search of a new tenure track line (otherwise, it would be a 2-year deal);
      iv. Lewis: at what point the department will weigh in? Dean: in the review process, the department representative will have a say (e.g., veto power) on selecting the finalists; once the finalists are selected, the interview will be conducted with the department, but the recommendation has to come from the review committee; Lewis: in my department there are five areas, but we still have only one representative, right? What if the representative is from a different area? Dean: don’t know the answer at this moment; Fathepure also asked what role a representative should play if the finalists are not coming from that particular field; Dean: the representatives from external fields can help rank the candidates; this will be a trial;

9. Announcements:
   a. Loeffert: the next Meeting will be May 3rd, and there will be officer elections; in the past, it has been “drawing out of a hat” when there are no volunteers; it is time for people to think about if they’d like to volunteer; it would be a 3-year appointment, and only tenured faculty are eligible to run as officers; Loeffert called for volunteers;

10. Adjournment
   a. Motion to adjourn made by Liang and second by Richtsmeier; meeting adjourned at 4:49pm.