Minutes

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), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Bin Liang (SOC), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), David Meinke (PBEE), Stephen Nemeth (POLS), Peter Richtsmeier (CDIS), Jennifer Shaw (IBIO), Mark Sisson (ART), Gil Summy (PHYS), Lan Zhou (STAT)

   ASFC Absent: Ed Burkley (PSYC),

   Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder

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

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

5. Standing Committee Reports

      i. Gelder: the Committee met and discussed relevant issues. No specifics to report.


6. Old Business.
   a. Budget Issues, Dean Danilowicz
      i. Dean: the State has a $900 million deficit; A&S has applied for increasing College student fees and tech fees; we expect A&S budget to be flat next year; once approved, we can release searches after June 1st;

   b. Equity representative on RPT Committees
      i. Dean: distributed a handout (*Some References on Implicit Bias*), and explained that implicit biases could be a major potential problem against women and other minority groups. A&S is planning to bring in a research team either in May or August to work with department heads and faculty representatives from departments on relevant issues (e.g., spotting implicit biases in evaluation process, how to train other groups and improve on these issues) in a two-day workshop; Dean further distributed another handout (*Diversity Comparisons and Goals*), which compares existing minority and women faculty lines of A&S with 10 other peer universities (including OSU) and projects “goals lines” (lines aimed to reach) for 2025. Dean pointed out that it is agreed by department heads to aim for
moving up the percentages of minority and women faculty lines and rankings among peer institutions. The bottom line of the handout displays how many lines are expected to be added by 2025. Dean pointed out that these targets are difficult to reach in reality over the next 8 years as we are not going to open as many searches. We will be working with department search committees on search ads to improve candidate pools;

ii. Gregg, Barchini, & Fathepure sought further clarifications on the handout (e.g., are numbers raw numbers or percentages, what’s the category of “two or more”?): Dean explained the chart and pointed out that the categories (e.g., being “Hispanic”, being “two or more”) are ‘self-identified’ categories which the university utilizes in counting these categories.

iii. Meinke asked possible variations across different disciplines (e.g., is there more or less diversity in one field than others?): Dean used engineers as an example with 80% male faculty. Though efforts have been made nationally, little has changed. Likewise, chemistry and physics struggle as disciplines. Nevertheless, this should not stop us from trying, and more diverse pools would help.

7. New Business
a. Proposed Changes to A&S RPT Documents for New Titles:
   i. Gregg: provided an update on the new titles of non-tenured faculty, and distributed the proposed revision of A&S Personnel Procedures (to comply with the new university policy), and explained proposed changes by the Committee;
   ii. Crauder: compared this proposed document with the university policy and other departmental level documents, and pointed out a number of places that need further clarifications, including (1) Representation (p.3): the ability of non-tenure track personnel to serve on personnel committee for non-tenure track matters. Departments such Math and Theatre demand non-tenure track personnel presence in such cases; (2) The concept of Tenure (p.6), despite the language “non-tenure track faculty will have all the rights and responsibilities of tenured faculty”, non-tenure track faculty don’t have the right to sabbatical based on the university policy; further, the university policy stipulates that the rights and responsibilities of non-tenure track faculty will be determined by departments (e.g., whether to invite them to faculty meetings), a difference from the language above;
   iii. Gregg: suggested to meet with Crauder to go over these issues and meet with other Committee members afterwards;
   iv. Dean complimented the work by the Committee, and shared personal view on rights and responsibilities of non-tenure track faculty. As more and more non-tenure track faculty are hired, Dean feels that one good way to embrace their skills and knowledge is to allow them to have rights equal or close to equal to tenure track faculty. Dean utilized curriculum decisions as an example: as non-tenure track faculty teach more courses, it does make sense to have them involved in these decisions.
   v. Fathepure asked about various new titles (p.7): Gregg explained that these are the new titles adopted directly from the university policy;
   vi. Lewis asked about adjunct and visiting professors: Gregg explained that according to the university policy, visiting professors are not eligible for promotion; Lewis/Meinke suggested to add clarification in the document (e.g., who is not eligible for promotion);
   vii. Loeffert asked about if there has been discussion at A&S to make grants/resources to non-tenure track faculty? Dean: there hasn’t. But we have decided to open up the community engagement award to include all returning faculty. It is a good suggestion, and we need to discuss the possibility of opening up other awards to non-tenure track faculty.

b. Representatives for New Temporary Committee:
   i. Dean: A&S is given money by the Provost Office to work on “retention” in college. We will begin a future faculty program which sets up four permanent post-doc positions (1 in
Arts & Humanities, 1 in Social Sciences, and 2 in Sciences). The goal is to bring in individuals from underrepresented background for a 2-year position (with a 1-1 teaching load), with the potential to transition into a tenure track position. We’d like to start in fall 2018, and need to form a special committee to draft a policy on how to implement this program (e.g., recruitment, selection, evaluation, mentoring). Three department heads have volunteered and we need three other faculty members.

ii. Shaw and Barchini asked more about the nature of these positions (e.g., teaching and/or research orientation, variation across disciplines) and the expected roles of the special committee: Dean explained that the recruited post-doc has to have desire to be a faculty member, care about teaching (e.g., working with ITLE), and devotes 50% time to research. Shaw volunteered to be a member.

iii. Fathepure further asked about the goals and extension possibility of the 2-year position: Dean: the goal is to mentor them to be faculty, and there is a possibility of third-year renewal.

iv. Shaw: Is there mechanism for spousal-hire incentives? Dean: my preference is that only if the spouse/partner is coming from an underrepresented background. With regard to spousal hire program in general, Dean explained he has approached the Provost with the issue of spousal hire program, and talked to other peer institutions with such experiences, explained how it might work using examples from other institutions, and expressed his support towards such programs.

v. Barchini expressed the concern that with increasing support of diversity, we don’t want to patronize underrepresented faculty members who desert full credit. Dean: the research team that we are bringing in will help train us on those issues.

vi. Meinke suggested to have these policies (once drafted) to be clearly articulated and circulated, and to add warning that this is not a patronizing effort. Barchini encouraged talking to women faculty from various departments. Dean: I hope that when the training kicks off, it is not just women or underrepresented members to participate. Rather, we’d like to have a wide participation so that perspectives from all groups are included.

vii. Meinke/Shaw further asked about the role of special committee: Dean: it is to set the mechanism how to proceed (e.g., open competition). This program is geared towards increasing diversity. The State law (759) prohibits targeted hiring. Other institutions tried other methods (e.g., skype interview) to better deliver the goal of increasing diversity.

viii. Liang asked about clarification on “retention of students”: Dean suggested that this program is to train post-docs to be excellent teachers who can serve as role models for students.

ix. Heisterkamp asked if A&S has plans to incentivize existing faculty for the same purpose: Dean: the University has called for great effort on improving retention, and a significant part of it has to do with teaching. Students often have little contact with tenure-track faculty in their first year. To improve teaching, for example, A&S has been encouraging ITLE participation by faculty via reimbursing the department for ITLE fees. Nevertheless, there has been little participation. We need to think about other mechanisms.

x. Graham: when these post-docs transition to faculty, we expect the accumulating effect? Dean: hopefully. That’s the plan.

c. Statement on Immigration Ban:

i. Finchum: some Council members inquired about the possibility of coming forth with a statement on behalf of A&S Faculty Council on the immigration ban by the executive order.

ii. A number of Council members expressed their strong opinions on this possible statement, shared similar experiences/statements from other organizations/institutions (e.g., reading a passage from an open letter as an example), and urged A&S Faculty
Council to come forth with a strong statement (opposing the damaging executive policy), and demanded the signed statement to be delivered to President Hargis.

iii. Other Council members expressed the concern that a strong statement might alienate other members (faculty, students) on campus, and the messages should be opposing the policies, not Trump himself. Others pointed out that alienating people has been done by President Trump, and it (alienation) is unavoidable to some degree whatever we put in the statement/letter.

iv. Dean: reminded Council members that there will be a panel on “Bans, Moratoriums, and Protests: The New Normal in Immigration” on Monday, 6th.

v. Other Council members suggest that the statement should be focusing on how the immigration ban would adversely affect research/teaching on campus. A number of concrete examples (e.g., conference overseas, funding overseas, faculty, students, their family members travel) were offered by Council members to show that the immigration policy has already adversely impacted faculty, graduate students, and their family members.

vi. Council members also asked about how an open, strong statement would adversely affect the university in the big picture, such as funding and other resources, given the conservative nature of the State: Dean: given the anti- Higher Education background, it would put the University in a difficult position to openly oppose the policy. It would be easier to express concerns about specific adverse effects of the policy in the statement/letter instead. The statement/letter can be strongly worded, but needs to be constructive. The President is restrained in terms of what he can offer. But as faculty and students, we can offer explicit examples, which would be more influential to politicians.

vii. Council members pointed out that the action needs to be taken immediately, and explained the necessity of having a strong statement/letter.

viii. A question was asked about any existence of potential relief measures for students who are adversely affected. Dean: not yet. It is in discussion.

ix. Procedure on how to proceed next was discussed: a number of Council members volunteered to take the lead to draft the statement/letter; once completed, the statement/letter will be circulated among all members, and then be voted on; once passed (by the majority), the statement/letter will be signed electronically and delivered;


10. Adjournment
    a. Motion to adjourn made by Shaw and second by Meinke; meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.