FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

**3:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 12, 2013**

# Council Room, 412 Student Union

**AGENDA:**

 1. Roll Call

 2. Approval of the January 15, 2013, Minutes

 3. Approval of Agenda

 4. The President – Remarks and Comments

 5. Special Report:

 A. Jamie Payne – HR – Faculty Background Checks

 6. Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations:

 Provost Sternberg, and/or Vice Presidents

 7. Reports of Standing Committees:

 a. Academic Standards and Policies: Ed Harris – Up Date

 b. Athletics: Robert Cornell – No Report

 c. Budget: Rodney Holcomb – No Report

 d. Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security: Robert Emerson – Up Date

 e. Faculty: Matt Lovern – Up Date

 Recommendation: Revision of 2-0902, “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Process for Ranked Faculty”\*

 Recommendation: Revision of 2-0110, “Procedures to Govern Workload Assignments of Faculty Members”\*

 f. Long-Range Planning and Information Technology: Nick Materer – No Report

 g. Research: Dan Fisher – No Report

 h. Retirement & Fringe Benefits: Stephen Clarke – Up Date

 i. Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Bob Miller – No Report

 8. Reports of Liaison Representatives –

 9. Old Business

 10. New Business – Change in school year considerations

 11. Rules and Procedures: Kemit Grafton – Election

 12. Adjournment

*Refreshments will be served at 2:45 p.m.*

*\*Attached*

 **Amended by Passed Failed**

**Recommendation No.**   13-02-01-FAC 1.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Moved by:**    Faculty Committee 2.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Seconded by:**  3.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

        **Passed**         **Tabled**         **Failed**  4.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Title:**     Revision of 2-0902, “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Process for Ranked Faculty.”

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Hargis that:**

Revisions to Policy & Procedure 2-0902 as proposed in the Final Report of the RPT Review Task Force be accepted with the following three modifications:

**1. Page 2, “Academic Unit Standards,” last sentence of 2nd paragraph.**

Adjustments in the workload expectations for faculty members may occur over time in keeping with changing institutional and personal priorities, but these must be agreed upon and documented in annual appraisals.

**2. Page 3, “b. Assistant Professor.”**

b. *Assistant Professor.* The assistant professor rank is recognition that the faculty member has exhibited the potential to grow in an academic career in accordance with the institution's mission and the academic unit's objectives. An assistant professor should have earned the accepted highest degree in his or her field or, in exceptional cases, should have demonstrated potential via professional experience judged by the unit as beneficial and desirable for the particular appointment. In the period between appointment as an assistant professor and promotion to associate professor, terms expressed in the unit criteria, the letter of offer, the position description, and the annual evaluations provide guidance regarding professional development of the faculty member to peers and administrators charged with judging progress toward promotion.

**3. Page 12, 2.2d.**

d. With the exception of peer review letters, all materials in the documentation file should be available for review by the faculty member. .

**Background and Rationale:**

The RPT Review Task Force met during 2011-2012 with the following purpose: “The task force will be charged with recommending procedures that (a) ensure the highest possible level of academic excellence, (b) are fair to all involved in the RPT process, and (c) take into account the varying needs of the different academic units at OSU.  The task force is not intended to examine the “level” of the standards, but rather, how to set standards and implement them in an equitable way,” (<http://academicaffairs.okstate.edu/task-force/74-advcouncil-rpt>). The task force surveyed faculty, held open forums, and made suggested revisions to policy in accordance with that input. The Final Report was received by Faculty Council in November 2012. We commend the chair of the task force, Dr. Carol Moder, and the task force members for their diligent and thorough work; it is sincerely appreciated.

The additional, minor changes suggested above reflect careful consideration of the RPT Review Task Force Final Report by the Faculty Committee in consultation with colleagues. Our first suggested change (1) reverts to a previous draft of the RPT policy proposed by the task force in which the faculty member and the unit administrator shall “agree” on any changes to workload rather than simply “discuss” them, and that such changes shall be documented. Our second suggested change (2) could allow for individuals to be hired at the assistant professor rank, tenure-track, in exceptional circumstances where they have not earned the “highest accepted degree in his or her field” but have otherwise demonstrated potential through professional experience that is particularly relevant to a given appointment. Our third suggested change (3) removes a sentence that is no longer relevant to the RPT review process; as currently proposed, faculty will no longer sign forms waiving their right to see external review letters.

In our view, the proposed RPT document meets the goals with which the RPT Review Task Force was charged as described above; namely, to promote academic excellence, fairness, and recognition of the diversity of needs of the academic units at OSU. The RPT document we submit for Faculty Council consideration is much stronger than that which presently is in effect. *Specifically, we highlight the following components of the proposed RPT document that address the critical role of shared governance in the equitable application of standards across campus for RPT review.*

* Page 2, “Academic Unit Standards.” As explained in this section, consistent with national best practices, it is the responsibility of the academic unit to establish the criteria for the reappointment, promotion, and tenure of its faculty. This responsibility requires that academic units carefully consider the meaning of “an appropriate record of sustained excellence” through faculty discussion and revision of existing unit criteria, if necessary. The criteria put in place must be supported by a vote of the tenure and tenure-track faculty of the unit and must gain approval of the dean and the provost.
* Page 5, “College-Level Committee.” This section details the requirement for each college to have an RPT Committee. This committee will ensure additional faculty review of dossiers submitted for evaluation and help to maintain the equitable application of standards as supplied by the unit.
* Page 6, “Dean.” As explained in this section, the dean has several critical responsibilities to ensure an equitable and high-quality RPT review process. The dean has the responsibility of ensuring that unit standards within the college are clear and consistent with college and university expectations. The dean also is responsible for providing his/her assessment of whether unit standards have been rigorously and fairly applied to each RPT dossier and whether the actions recommended by the unit and college-level RPT committee are warranted based upon the documentation in the dossier.
* Page 6, “Provost”. This section details the responsibility of the provost – after having considered unit, college-level RPT Committee, and Dean input – “to be certain that all applicable standards and policies that have been approved by the University have been applied fairly to each individual” in the process of providing his/her own assessment for personnel action.

In summary, it is our view that the clear delineation of responsibilities outlined in the proposed changes to 2-0902 make this a stronger, more effective document that promotes excellence through shared governance.

 **Amended by Passed Failed**

**Recommendation No.**   13-02-02-FAC 1.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Moved by:**    Faculty Committee 2.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Seconded by:**  3.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

        **Passed**         **Tabled**         **Failed**  4.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Title:**     Revision of 2-0110, “Procedures to Govern Workload Assignments of Faculty Members.”

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Hargis that:**

Policy & Procedure 2-0110 be modified as suggested below, most critically including Section 3.01: “All faculty member activities in teaching, research, extension, and service shall ~~typically~~ constitute the equivalent of twenty-four (24) workload units, as defined by each academic college (see Section 4), in a nine-month academic year. Twenty-four workload units per nine-month academic year is equal to a 100% workload.”

**Background and Rationale:**

Initial revisions to 2-0110 were proposed by the Provost’s Task Force on Faculty Overload and Workload and were reported to Faculty Council in Summer 2012. The Faculty Committee met to consider the report and made recommendation 12-10-01-FAC to Faculty Council in October 2012 to support the revised policy. As stated in the “Background and Rationale” for that recommendation:

The current policy is no longer sufficiently broad to encompass all activities in which faculty engage that contribute to workload. It also does not define what constitutes a 100% workload, necessary if overload is to be considered. Finally, the current policy is difficult to implement in a standard fashion across departments or units. The suggested revisions address each of these issues.

Recommendation 12-10-01-FAC passed by majority vote and was transmitted to the Council of Deans for review. Faculty Council received the revised document in January 2013 for further consideration, at which point the Faculty Committee met to consider the revisions from the Council of Deans. It is the view of the Faculty Committee that the revisions suggested by the Council of Deans have largely improved 2-0110; we agree with nearly all of the input. There is only one revision with which we disagree, and we strongly and unanimously disagree. In 3.01 we are concerned that the insertion of the word “typically” into the workload statement may create situations in which the intent of 2-0110 is circumvented.

We are concerned about the proposed addition of “typically” for two main reasons. **First**, it is essential to define what constitutes 100% workload in order to equitably define what constitutes “overload”. Overload was defined in conjunction with the proposed changes to 2-0110 with a new policy, “OSU Policy to Govern Overload Pay”. This new policy was passed by Faculty Council in October 2012 (12-10-02-FAC); it has since been approved and is in effect as of January 2013.

The Faculty Committee believes that a clearly defined 100% workload is essential, but why set 100% at twenty-four workload units per nine-month academic year? This standard was set by the Provost’s Task Force on Faculty Overload and Workload based upon their research into practices at other universities and recommendations of the American Association of University Professors (e.g., Statement on Faculty Workload with Interpretive Comments, June 2000). The Faculty Committee agrees with the task force that twenty-four workload units per nine-month academic year is an appropriate standard.

**Second**, we feel that the proposed revisions to 2-0110 give the necessary flexibility to deans and unit heads to meet the diversity of challenges associated with covering teaching, research, and service obligations *without* introducing the possibility of bypassing a uniformly defined, equitable 100% workload. Responsibilities for developing the College Workload Guidelines and approving the Unit Workload Expectations Policy for each unit reside with the deans. We believe that implementation of the revised 2-0110 via effective communication between the deans, unit heads, and faculty will promote a better understanding of workload assignments and an improved ability of units to document their productivity.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **GUIDELINES TO GOVERN WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS**  | **2-0110** **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS** **~~JULY 1, 1984~~ Under review** |

 |  |

INTRODUCTION

1.01 Oklahoma State University, as a comprehensive land-grant university recognizes that the activities of its various academic colleges and departments, while stressing the total university mission, will differ substantially from one another in their attempts to serve the citizens of the state of Oklahoma, region and nation. The goal of the university is to provide an environment within which high quality academic instruction, research and extension may be expected to occur. The faculty and administration of the university recognize that excellence is based on productive interaction between professionally competent faculty and adequately prepared students; and such excellence can be facilitated through the nature of the workload assigned individual faculty members operating within the parameters of the departmental structures. The state law of Oklahoma recognizes the constitutional rights of the university regents to prescribe the terms and conditions of employment for university employees. Individual workloads fall within this category. Therefore, the intent of the following statement is to establish guidelines whereby departments may, within the limitations of available university resources and with the approval of the responsible academic dean, develop and administer faculty workload policies.

The contributions of faculty as academic citizens propel the success of the University. The Workload Expectations Policy presented herein describes in general terms the categories into which faculty work typically is divided, for descriptive purposes. While the description of what constitutes a typical faculty workload will vary according to the need of a program, department or school, and college, the definition of “equitable” workload will remain constant across the university. All faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the university, college, and unit, and will be evaluated in terms of their contributions.

The descriptions of the workload policy are not meant to be confused with evaluative criteria, or with equivalent hours in a typical forty-hour work week, or any other common metric. Clock hours do not equate with course credit hours or with course hour equivalents. It should be recognized that the professional trajectory of a faculty member is developmental, in that each faculty member’s role shifts as he or she progresses and develops areas of excellence, while typically continuing to contribute in all areas. Growth and change will be negotiated between the faculty member and his or her supervisor, and should be reflected and recorded in each faculty member’s annual Appraisal and Development conversation and evaluative documentation.

CATEGORIES OF FACULTY WORKLOAD

2.01 Principles:

The major areas for funding of academic activity by the faculty are: (1) Teaching, (2) Research, and (3) Extension and Public Service. Precise demarcation between and among these areas is often difficult and sometimes impossible; in any case, all university activities of a faculty member must be considered as an integrated whole. Faculty activity in each of the areas may vary from semester to semester, according to the interests and abilities of the faculty member and the needs of the department, or those reflected through it by the college or the university. Therefore, faculty workload assignments will be developed by the department head in accordance with OSU and respective College Workload Guidelines and in consultation with each faculty member.

2.02 Definitions:

A. Teaching, or instruction of university courses for credit, is defined to include (without being limited thereto) preparation for and instructing all scheduled classes and laboratories, necessary review of the literature, academic advising, conducting seminars, supervising research for theses and/or dissertations (this may also be performed under the research function), arranging and guiding field activities, and other scholarly and creative instructional activities.

B. Research is defined as the thorough, systematic investigation (by search of the literature and/or laboratory investigation, surveys, etc.) to discover new knowledge or to synthesize existing knowledge in new and constructive applications. Research activity shall result in the following scholarly outcomes (without being limited thereto): professional presentations; writing journal or magazine articles, books, grant proposals, and other academic literary proceedings; and the procurement of copyrights and patents on creative production relevant to professional or academic endeavors. Other scholarly outcomes such as systematic, creative and scholarly productions shall be deemed the equivalent of research and shall include (without being limited thereto) writing and producing plays, holding artistic exhibitions and concerts, performing musical compositions, and creating other and similar art forms, performances and literary productions.

C. Extension and Public Service may include (without being limited thereto) all non-resident instruction (credit and non-credit), problem solving, and efforts to disseminate information to the university’s publics. Included is writing fact sheets, brochures and other materials, presenting classes and programs either in person or via various media, and practicing one’s profession for the populace of Oklahoma under the auspices of the university.

While performing assigned responsibilities in three basic funded areas, the faculty member often performs University Service. University Service may include representation of OSU on local, state, regional and national bodies, active participation in department, college, and/or university level committees, quasi-administrative assignments, informal counseling of students, whether professional, career or personal in nature, and sponsorship of recognized university student organizations. These service activities shall be consistent with the mission of the department, college and/or university and are part of the faculty workload.

Professional Development is primarily a faculty responsibility although the university seeks to assist by providing appropriate opportunities. Professional Development is defined as the increase and expansion of professional expertise, skills, knowledge and abilities. The faculty member is expected to exert diligent good faith efforts to achieve such development. Professional development may be achieved by reading professional articles, journals, periodicals, books, or other literature that contribute information directly relevant to one’s professional career, attendance at seminars, professional programs, and conferences, using leaves of absence, sabbatical or otherwise, practicing the profession through consulting and other endeavors and activities especially related to enhancing one’s professional knowledge, skills and reputation.

GUIDELINES

3.01 The expertise, reputation, experience and talent of the faculty constitute the primary resource of the university. In keeping with the principle that activities of a university faculty comprise an integrated whole, departmental workload policies will reflect each faculty member participating in teaching and/or research and/or extension. All faculty member activities in teaching, research, extension, and service shall constitute the equivalent of twenty-four (24) workload units, as defined by each academic college (see Section 4), in a nine-month academic year. Twenty-four workload units per nine-month academic year is equal to a 100% workload. All workload assignments must be consistent with the availability of resources.

* In determining teaching load, departmental policies will respect those factors (e.g., level and/or type of instruction, number of students, extent and number of course preparations, and research or institutional requirements) which may cause variance in the nature and number of credit hours taught and classroom preparation hours required.
* Responsibilities for courses which are not typically measured by number of meetings, allocation of time, or specific constraints - e.g., special problems or independent studies courses, and the supervision of practicums, dissertations, or theses - will be assigned at the discretion of the department head after consultation with the faculty member.
* Unit Workload Expectations Policy shall specify equivalent workload contributions from teaching, research, extension, and service activities consistent with the College Workload Guidelines.
* Assignments will be guided by a fair and equitable apportionment of such responsibilities among the faculty of that department and will be determined in consultation with each faculty member.
* In considering individual faculty workload, sufficient time must be allocated to meet assigned responsibilities in the functions of teaching, research, extension and service. Consideration will also be given to the time demands of required university service and the need to facilitate faculty development.

PROCEDURES

4.01 Faculty will be directly involved in the development of department workload policy and in annual workload planning.

4.02 The procedures by which these guidelines will be administered are as follows:

A. The dean, in consultation with associate deans, unit heads and directors, and appropriate faculty counsel[[1]](#footnote-1), will develop the College Workload Guidelines. These guidelines shall:

* Serve as a general framework for the development of unit-specific Unit Workload Expectations Policies.
* Comply with the OSU Workload Guidelines as they apply to the recognized mission of the college.
* Provide for balanced and fair work assignments among all units.
* Respect variations in disciplines and unit expectations in teaching, research, extension, and service.
* Meet the approval of the Provost.

B. The department head, after consultation with the faculty of the unit, will develop a Unit Workload Expectations Policy. This policy shall:

* Specify equivalent contributions in terms of workload units for teaching, research, extension, and service. These should be aligned with workload norms within a discipline at comparable research universities.
* Provide for balanced and fair work assignments for all faculty members.
* Consider the variations in time demands due to course type, complexity, class size, and level of course preparation required.
* Benchmark workload assignments against peer institutions, and benefit from best practices in the discipline at the unit level.

C. The Unit Workload Expectations Policy must be submitted to the Dean for approval.

D. The Dean and department head will ensure that:

* Each faculty member’s duties, objectives and assignments for the academic year (or any portion thereof) will be defined within the scope of the Unit Workload Expectations Policy.
* Faculty appraisal will follow guidelines which are consistent with those agreed-upon duties, objectives, and assignments, and the level of achievement, with due consideration given both to the nature of the task and the relative units of time required and to other positive contributions to the department.

4.03 All other activities of faculty members not covered by these guidelines will be administered through the policy statement 2-0111 Guidelines to Govern Outside Professional Activities, Overload Assignments, and Non-Professional Activities of Faculty Members.

Approved by President Boger: February 17, 1983

Under review

1. Depending on the unit's organizational structure, "appropriate faculty counsel," “advice of the faculty,” and “faculty consultation” referred to throughout this policy statement shall involve obtaining input from (a) the entire departmental faculty; or (b) members of a special or permanent committee selected by procedures which have been approved by a majority of the faculty of the administrative unit involved, submitted to the dean for review, and transmitted to the VPAA for retention in a permanent file; or where necessary (c) duly elected members of boards, senates, or councils at the departmental, division, college, or university levels. Whenever deemed necessary this counsel may seek external assistance to aid evaluation. In formulating input the faculty or its committees shall have the prerogative to meet in the absence of the unit administrator. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)