Minutes of Arts & Sciences Faculty Council Meeting
Wednesday, December 7, 2016, 3:32pm || Suite 1600 Student Union

Minutes

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

2. Roll Call

   Attendance
   ASFC Present: Isabel Alvarez-Sancho (FLL), Lee Brasuell (TH), Babu Fathepure (MICR), Allen Finchum (GEOG), John Gelder (CHEM), Yongtao Du (HIST), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Bin Liang (SOC), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), David Meinke (PBEE), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Stephen Nemeth (POLS), Peter Richtsmeier (CDIS), Jennifer Shaw (IBIO), Mark Sisson (ART), Gil Summy (PHYS), Carla Goad (STAT)

   ASFC Absent: Leticia Barchini (MATH), Ed Burkley (PSYC), Doug Heisterkamp (CS), Apple Igrek (PHIL),

   Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder

3. Approval of the November Minutes
   a. Motion to approve made by Graham and second by Richtsmeier; Minutes approved.

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

5. Standing Committee Reports
      i. Gregg: a Committee meeting will be called in the new year to discuss issues related to RPT document with regard to Non-Tenure Line Faculty Positions.
   

      i. McKinnon: distributed a revised draft version of the College of Arts and Science Space Planning Advisory Committee, in which the changes are lighted (with regard to how Space Planning Advisory Committee members are selected) (see the handout for the details).
   

6. Old Business.
   a. Updates on Budget, Dean Danilowicz
      i. Dean: CAS is proposing fee increases (academic and technology fees) to help renovate teaching rooms and labs; departments are encouraged to take saving measures, including getting rid of unnecessary telephones, encouraging voluntary staff reduction (from 12 months to 9-11 months), consolidating labs, and replacing administrative course release with IDC/travel incentives; except three searches, other lines are not released at this moment due to uncertain financial budget.
      ii. Liang: there is no uniformity with regard to fees and the fees vary from college to college? Dean: that’s right. CAS proposed $10 increase per student credit hour, and $2.50 increase for technology fee;
iii. Gregg: without an increase of their stipend, the fee increase may create a hardship on TAs and graduate students, as they largely support themselves (unlike the undergraduates who are supported by parents). Dean: it may. We talked to CAS student council members and they supported the fee increase. The fee increase will add up to $240 per year to graduate students.

iv. McKinnon: How does it work with the block scheduling (e.g., the same tuition between 9 and 12 credit hours)? Dean: the block scheduling has something to do with tuition, and the proposed fee increase depends on students credit hours.

v. Richtsmeier: What’s the status of tenure track lines? Dean: we released three searches but others are on hold until we have more information about the budget, probably until May next year.

b. New titles for Non-Tenure Line Faculty Positions: wait until the February meeting next year.

7. New Business
   a. & b. Concurrent Teaching Programs, HLC Requirements and Possible Certificate Programs:
      i. Dean: CAS encourages departments to be entrepreneurial and seek opportunities to generate funds. There are two possible opportunities. One is to develop teaching teachers program. Oklahoma is probably the last state that does not have such a program, and Regents is expected to approve this soon. There is no mandate from CAS. Many of our departments may offer 18-hour programs to high-school teachers who can teach college-level courses at high schools.
      ii. Shaw & McKinnon: asked about how such programs can generate funds. Dean: the university waives fees for the first three-credit hours, and the state reimburses us for a variable amount of fees. A second option is for our faculty/graduate students to offer courses in high schools, and students would pay reduced rates, but the state will reimburse us. Either way, it would generate funds for us. We are making the departments to be aware of this and encouraging healthy conversation about these opportunities.
      iii. Finchum: I’m not sure why high school teachers are going to take our courses, and who’s going to pay for these courses? Dean: many states have systems to cover it but I’m not sure how Oklahoma is going to handle it at this moment. Graham: some schools encourage professional development.
      iv. Alvarez-Sancho: Foreign language does not have a graduate program. How does it work? Is special approval needed for a certificate? Dean: the 18 hours need to be in a discipline, and could be pure content or pedagogy if it is specific to a field (e.g., how to teach foreign language). Crauder: faculty with graduate instructor status would have to propose graduate level courses.
   c. Incivility and Safe Zones:
      i. Finchum: President Hargis sent out emails with regard to incivility activities on campus. We need to be aware of this and some measures are being proposed to deal with this.
      ii. Gregg: is it (incivility) actually happening on campus? Lewis/Finchum: some students have experienced harassment already.
      iii. Dean: We can take some proactive measures to deal with it (see Dean’s report below).

8. Dean’s Report:
   a. Curriculum change to the orientation class, Dean Danilowicz
      i. Dean: There are two issues on diversity being discussed at the last department heads meeting, which would affect how we approach diversity within CAS. One is to a proposed change to CAS orientation courses. There are 10 units in the existing orientation courses, 6 of which are required. We’d like to make ‘diversity’ module a required unit (therefore 7 required units after change). The majority of department heads seemingly approved this,
but I’d like to have ASFC to propose and vote this change. This would be a change to the curriculum.

ii. Fathepure: asked more information about the orientation course and shared the experience of his department (e.g., having guests to talk about such issues with graduate students). Dean explained the orientation course (number 1111, 1-credit hour course, meeting 15-times during the first semester of our majors), and concurred that such incivility incidents may occur and have occurred to graduate students.

iii. Alvarez-Sancho shared an incident in her class and asked for advices how to handle such incidents. Dean: echoed such concerns and shared his belief in proactive measure on university campus. Crauder: a number of incidents have been reported since early November. It seems that the best way to handle your incident is to call them out privately (not to handle it in front of the whole class), and assess their responses. If necessary, further bring the issue to student conduct. There are cases in which the troublemaker has had a record with the student conduct already. McKinnon: it could be a violation of Title 9 or Title 7. Crauder: that’s true.

iv. Meinke: on changes to the orientation class, is there a concept to help students distinguish false new from true news? Dean: information literacy is very important. I’m not sure if it is in the 1111. Reinforcement is needed for students to learn, and it is up to us to reinforce these learning goals.

v. Sisson: I’m surprised to learn, and it is still in our faculty handbook that faculty can be terminated because of ‘moral turpitude’. I heard that it meant to be used against gay faculty, and wondered if that’s the case on other campuses. Crauder: this is true, and I bet it is pretty standard across campuses, though I’ve never seen it being utilized.

vi. Alvarez-Sancho shared concerns about some racist slogans being used against minority students under the protection of freedom of speech. Crauder: used “preaching Bob” as an example; as legal counsel pointed out, there are lines not to cross. For instance, it is one thing to make general statements, and it is another thing to single out individuals (e.g., pointing fingers at certain individuals).

vii. Lewis: Is there any move to declare OSU a sanctuary campus? Dean: I’m not aware of any. I wish our campus to be more proactive. This change of orientation curriculum is CAS move. More proactive moves at the university level should be handled through faculty council.

viii. Graham: Are there plans to expand the safe zone training? Dean: Amy Martindale is working on more general sessions. Besides staff training sessions, department heads want to have more sessions. Lewis: we are doing more training on graduate students in our department.

ix. Lewis moved to recommend the curriculum change (to make the diversity module a required unit of the orientation class), McKinnon seconded, and motion passed.

b. Proposal of a training program to train equity advocates from each department, Dean Danilowicz.

i. Dean: the second issue involves changes to search committees and RPT procedures. One example would be student teaching evaluations, where we see higher scores for males than females, for Caucasian faculty members than underrepresented faculty members. The concern is that there is inherent bias in the present evaluation system. Some other universities have changed their evaluation procedures: at the department level, an equity advocate is trained to bring up such issues at the personnel committee meetings; otherwise, these issues might not be discussed. This is a way to level the plane field. I’d like to propose a training program to train at least one equity advocate from each department. I’d like to have some discussion and gather feedback on this idea.

ii. Meinke: please make the data available to us, because the concern is that this proposal might do more harm. Dean: there are a lot of data out there. For instance, for identical CVs
except names, male names are always associated with better candidates than females. The equity advocate would remind the committee of such data.

iii. Brasuell: for a small department, how would it work? Dean: That’s a good question. Maybe someone from a different department would have to serve in such cases. Someone from the same discipline is preferred. I’m learning from other universities.

iv. Liang: do we have specific data in CAS? Dean: I don’t know we have. Liang: the proposed training and equity advocate might create some logistic issues. For instance, how would we ensure that the equity advocate from each department applies the same standard? Maybe we should consider diversifying means of conducting teaching evaluations. Instead of relying on students numerical scores, turn to other means such as peer evaluations.

v. Graham: I appreciate the concerns of CAS on this important issue. The concern about the logistics would be true to other services handled by each department. I would be interested in having these numerical numbers/data available at the college and department level. To have an equity advocate present at meetings and to steer the conversation (e.g., set and remind such data) would be very helpful; such conversation would preferably be dictated in a letter to avoid a token gesture.

vi. Alvarez-Sancho: shared an example where inappropriate language was utilized. Having an equity advocate there would potentially stop such instances.

vii. Nemeth: having an equity advocate present could potential restrict/narrow the debate. Dean: a bad example would be someone to present it in an overbearing way to squash the conversation. We need to figure out the best way to proceed.

viii. McKinnon: suggested putting up information under D2L and to have someone from the College to brief the information. Dean: I’m reluctant to have someone as a College representative, but not from the same discipline. Diversity trainings have not effectively changed the outcome of searches. Personally I would prefer someone from the department and have the department to embrace the idea of diversity.

ix. Richtsmeier: proposed an equity advocate from no department, someone with a neutral perspective and the information; in such a way, it would not be creating all burden on potential advocates from each department; Liang: echoed the idea. It would lessen the pressure on the proposed equity advocate in each department whose RPT might be adversely affected by his/her role as equity advocate.

x. Meinke: besides a few rational choices of variables, how could past studies control other potential variables (e.g., height, weight, age)? Graham: some studies utilized online teachings and switched TAs during the semester; however, student teaching evaluations still favored sessions perceived to be taught by males than females. Richtsmeier: there are a variety of inequities/biases, but we have agreements on some of them. Dean: there are national data. Using gender as an example, when we move up the rank (e.g., from assistant to associate, to full professor), more males than females were successful; this pattern was well documented. The issue then is how to work with the known entities (e.g., gender, race) based on the data. Liang: shared an example of instructors whose primary language is not English being criticized for their accents/English ability.

xi. Loeffert: to me, the issue is how to proactively protect women/minorities. Data is well documented for their disadvantages (e.g., salary, tenure & promotion). The issue why we fail to attract more women and minorities, to me, is a separate issue. For some reason, OSU is not attractive to them. An equity advocate would have positive effect, but we need to figure out the proceedings. Lewis: to echo Loeffert, to assume that people have the data, read the data and therefore know how to act is not realistic. Therefore, it is important to have an equity advocate to be involved.

xii. Alvarez-Sancho: it is true that there could be many other biases (e.g., height). But it doesn’t mean that we do nothing. It’s good to take proactive measures to start somewhere.
xiii. David: I’d like to see the data and why people at different ranks make their decisions for what reasons. We don’t want to jump to the simplest conclusion without looking at the data. For me, it would help me come to a proper conclusion.

xiv. Dean: it seems that we are receptive to continue the conversation. I’ll try to bring and show some data, on things that matter for tenure and promotion in the next meeting (in February), after getting more information from other universities.

xv. Dean: another issue with regard to diversity searches: other universities adopted three practices in their search ads which seemingly made a difference in the candidate pools, (1) faculty who must be willing to teach from multi-perspectives; (2) faculty who will work, mentor and conduct research with underrepresented students; and (3) what is the current status of faculty/student diversity. Even if your current status is not where you desire to be, the fact that you mention it (in the ads) shows that you are actually thinking about diversity issues. Statements such as these three make a difference to potential candidates, and practices such as these can be helpful to us.


10. Adjournment
   a. Motion to adjourn made by Liang and second by Brasuell; meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.