

**FACULTY COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 7, 2002
152 HOPKINS HALL
330-530**

Present: 43

Guests: 4

1. Introduction of Vice Chair

Chair Mumy introduced Grady Chism, Professor of Food Science and Technology, as the new Vice-Chair of Faculty Council.

2. Committee Memberships

URSC

Dr. Mumy solicited volunteers for the University Recreational Sports Committee (URSC). He mentioned that if Faculty Council does not send a representative, they would be omitted from the committee in the future.

Faculty-Student Interaction

OSU OnCampus and the Columbus Dispatch have featured articles on the "Faculty-Student Interaction Initiative." Dr. Martha Garland has been issued to issue a list of "Best Practices" for Faculty-Student Interaction, and Dr. Mumy is accepting nominations for the committee

3. Old Business

STRS

The STRS issue has still not been resolved. Letters have been sent to Larry Lewellen and STRS on behalf of Faculty Council. Faculty Council is awaiting an update on the issue from Mr. Lewellen.

COMPH

The Steering Committee has formed a subcommittee to negotiate with the College of Medicine and Public Health on their proposal to eliminate the cap on clinical faculty. They are working to draft a letter in conjunction with Faculty Council and the Council of Graduate Students. Jack Rall, a member of the sub-committee gave an update on their meetings. He noted that at their first meeting they explained that the proposal needed further clarification and felt like a channel of communication had been opened. He hoped that they would accomplish more at their next meeting on November 18. Dr. Rall expected the proposal to go forward to the Senate at the January meeting.

4. Rule Changes

EOCA

This rule change has been tabled in the Rules Committee and will be on the January Senate Agenda pending corrections.

Bookstores

Dr. Mumy reported that this item would remain on the Senate Agenda for November.

5. ASC Realignment

Dr. Joseph Ferrar, Chair of the Committee on the Arts and Sciences, spoke to Faculty Council regarding the report from the committee. He noted three main issues the committee dealt with: whether the configuration in the report is a better configuration than we currently have; the distribution of Units in the colleges of the Arts and Sciences; and addressing the question of authority for the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

He told Faculty Council that they went through two stages:

1. Where we are at now. The current system is from 1967, when the larger college of Arts and Sciences was split into five smaller colleges. They interviewed all the current Deans and reviewed the organization structure of the University. The committee agreed that the colleges are doing well and that the current configuration is very reasonable; however the Academic Plan urges vast improvement in all programs.
2. Where we want to be. In order to improve to the place where the Academic Plan wants OSU to be, they felt that some restructuring might be in order. They talked to several Provosts and Deans at many of our benchmarks. Many agreed that the biggest advantage of having a centralized system is that the faculty and students united under the system speak with a common voice.

He told Council that the way they redesigned the Arts and Sciences reflects the importance that ASC should have in the University. Dr. Ferrar noted that the most contentious issue in committee was the budgetary authority of the Überdean, but that this would just be authority currently held by the provost and transferred to the new position.

Dr. Ferrar opened the floor to questions. He said that the curriculum for the colleges would now be centralized under one committee. There were several concerns about how these changes would help with rankings. It was noted that the current Deans feel that their ideas are not being heard, and there was concern that this change would not bring additional power to the arts and sciences. Many members of Council were concerned about the new reporting structure and organization of the Arts and Sciences. Some members thought that the ASC Faculty Council or the faculty as a whole should be handling this issue; however others thought that too many people might be uninformed to make the vote worthwhile.

Dick Gunther felt alarmed at the precision and timing of this report, because it was finished almost a quarter early and the cover letter suggests it could be implemented through executive fiat. He also noted that we are in the middle of budget restructuring and this proposal attempts to renew centralized budgetary authority. Dr. Gunther made a motion to adopt a resolution seeking more time for debate before any decisions are made. The resolution passed 34-2 with one abstention.