Slevitch called the meeting to order with the following members present: Boileau, Crick, Daglaris, Eisenberg, Emerson, Fathepure, Fitzgerald, Gardner, Glenn, Haley, Hildebrand, Hoff, Jadeja, Joshi, Knapp, Lawson, McGlynn, Olsen, Parkison, Perkins, Pranger, Riley, Yates, Warren, Weiser and Yough.

Also present: Artinger, E., Colquhoun, C., Essmiller, K., Foss, S., Francisco, C., Harp, E., Hepworth, A., Hess, J., Hoffner, B., Johnson, C., Kuwitzky, C., Lacombe, V., Latham, L., Lutter, E., Mautino, S., Nicklas, G., Ormsbee, C., Peaster, R., Shear, H., Whitman, M., and Xie, A.

Absent: Barker, Gonzalez and McMaughan.

**HIGHLIGHTS**

Special Reports:

Christine Johnson – Research Misconduct……………………………………………...…

President’s Report and Comments on matters of interest to the faculty – Jim Hess……………….

Provost’s report on Recommendations made by the Faculty Council and Comments on matters of interest to the Faculty – Provost Mendez……………………………….…

Vice-Presidents’ Reports and Comments on matters of interest to the faculty…………………...

Faculty Council Chair’s Report……………………………………………………………………

Reports of Liaison Representatives

Emeriti…………………………………………………………………………………….

Staff Advisory Council……………………………………………………………………

Graduate Council.…………………………………………………………………………

Student Government Association…………………………………………………………

Graduate and Professional Student Government Association…………………………….

Reports of Standing and Special Committees

Academic Standards and Policies ……………………………………….………………...

Access and Community Impact ……………………………………………………………

Athletic, Health and Wellness ………..………………………………….………………..

Budget …………………………………………………………………….…………….....

Campus Facilities, Safety and Security ………………………………….……………...…

Career Track…………..………………………………………………….………………..

Faculty ………………………………………………………………….…………………

Long-Range Planning and Information Technology ………………….……………...……

Research ……………………………………………………………….………………...…

Retirement and Fringe Benefits ……………………………………….……………...……

Rules and Procedures ………………………………………………….……………...……

Student Affairs and Learning Resources …………………………….…………………....

Slevitch welcomed everyone to the meeting. Slevitch established that a quorum was present and brought the meeting to order. Slevitch asked those present to sign the attendance sheet. Slevitch asked everyone on Zoom to please put their name in the chat so their attendance can be recorded. Slevitch asked anyone who has a question to raise their hand or type their question in the chat. Please direct your questions to Perkins who is watching the chat. He will then communicate the questions to the group. Slevitch reminded everyone to please set their microphones to mute. Slevitch stated the first item of business was the approval of the April 8, 2025 minutes. These were electronically distributed and are available on the Faculty Council website. Slevitch asked for corrections or objections to the approval of the minutes. Seeing none, stated the minutes are approved. Slevitch stated the second item of business is adoption of the agenda which was also electronically distributed and is also available on the Faculty Council website. Slevitch asked if there were any corrections to the agenda. Seeing none, Slevitch asked for a motion to adopt the agenda. Gardner moved and Hildebrand seconded the motion. Slevitch stated that it had been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. Slevitch asked those in favor to say “Aye”, those on zoom to enter their vote in the chat. Those opposed do the same. Motion passed and the agenda was adopted. Slevitch stated we have one special report today and introduced Dr. Christine Johnson Associate Vice President for Research.

**Special Report:**

1. **Christine Johnson – Research Misconduct Policy**

Johnson introduced herself. She is the Associate Vice President for research and serve as the institution's research integrity officer. That's abbreviated RIO. She served in this capacity for a 3-year term years ago and is now doing it again. She just finished her second 3-year term. Her point being she has some experience living and working with our current policy. Erika Artinger from the Office of Legal Counsel is joining via Zoom. Johnson and Artinger have been working on revisions hand in hand. Artinger has a PhD in Genetics and came through a research program before becoming an attorney for the university. Johnson presented the following PowerPoint to the Council members.

 

Why do we need to update our policy? There are federal regulations, specifically Federal agency polices related to research misconduct and allegation of research misconduct. Nearly every Federal agency has a regulation related to allegations of research misconduct. However, it's the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) that has the most detailed and the most prescribed policy. Any institution of higher education that receives federal funding from a Public Health Service Agency (PHS) Agency, like NIH or CDC, has to have a policy at the institution that very much corresponds, not with just broadly Federal agencies, but specifically with the office of Research Integrity at VHHS. We knew a year ago that a new “final” ruling would be coming from the Office of Research Integrity. OSU belongs to the Association of Research Integrity Officers (RIO). It’s a nationwide association and good to be a part of it. The final ruling was expected to be out right before their annual meeting in September so it could be discussed among those attending the meeting. The previous final ruling had been issued either 9 or 14 years ago. There have been no changes in RIO for many years so we know there would be relatively substantial changes coming. To continue receiving federal funding, we need to have a revised policy in place by January 1. There are required components that have to be in place. Nearly every section in our policy corresponds to a section in the new final rule that needs to be in place. About this time last year, Johnson came to the council and stated that OSU was out of compliance in four areas. There were recommended changes, and those areas were updated to the old final rule. These changes were not sent forward after the Faculty Council approved them because we were waiting for the new final rule. Johnson stated that our policy on allegations of research misconduct differs from other university policies because it focuses on process whereas some university policies do not focus as much on process. Johnson discussed a few of the changes, see slide 3. We have revised our policy accordingly. In many ways, the revisions improve the description of what should be included and due process. It clarifies some things that are going to help cases as they proceed. Johnson spent months reviewing the changes and met with Kenneth Sewell. They made more revisions and then sent the document to the Office of Research Integrity for a quick review and feedback. We received a “thumbs up”and an indication to proceed. Artinger and OSU Legal provided a review of the changes. They looked at these through the lens of making sure we were not putting ourselves in too small a box, that we weren’t constricting ourselves and that we had some latitude to be able to make some decisions and have it be a more fluid policy. Johnson stated there is some redundancy and that’s done intentionally because at any point when a group progresses through after preliminary review to initial inquiry or formal investigation, we want the process to be really well described or prescribed within that section. Johnson stated that the Center for Health Sciences campus has its own policy on research misconduct. Faculty Council members have the revised document. Slevitch opened the floor to questions. Knapp asked Johnson's prediction on how “final” this “final” rule is. Are we going to have another one soon? Johnson doubts there will be any changes in the next five years. OSU needs to have a policy in place that we can follow. The broad reason why institutions have policies like this is to protect the scientific integrity of the scholarly record. We want to make sure that when our peers and the general public are reading our disseminated scholarship, it's got validity behind it. That's critically important for the lifeblood of research at institutions of higher ed. So that's why we have this policy again. And every time Johnson has a case that comes to her, we need to make sure that what is in the scholarly library of dissemination is accurate and valid for our peers and for the public. It's protecting the integrity of the scientific record. Knapp asked if there is an obligation to report at some level on an annual basis how many cases you handle. Johnson stated yes. We do have to report annually to the Office of Research Integrity how many allegations come through, how many proceed to a preliminary review, how many proceed to an initial inquiry and how many proceed to a formal investigation. We need to report on the outcome of all of these and if there was any federal funding involved. Knapp asked if anyone could access this information. Johnson stated yes, it is published by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI). Slevitch asked for additional questions, seeing none asked for a motion to accept the recommendation. It was moved and seconded to accept the recommendation. Slevitch asked for a vote. All those in favor please say Aye. Those on Zoom please record your vote in the chat. Motion passed.

Slevitch thanked Johnson and introduced President Hess.

**President’s report and comments on matters of interest to the faculty – President Jim Hess**

Hess congratulated the faculty members on the end of a great semester. Hess understands that it’s sometimes a grind given all the other responsibilities faculty members have. Hess stated everyone does a great job of shepherding students to the finish line whether that’s an undergraduate or graduate degree. Hess has appreciated the time spent with the Faculty Council officers this year. Hess stated we had great commencement ceremonies. He had the opportunity to do all of them. Hess appreciated the opportunity to be an active, engaged participant in the ceremonies.

Hess stated that we are in the last two weeks of the legislative session. Our Constitution requires the Legislature to adjourn on the last Friday of May, in this case, May 30th at 5 o'clock. That does not prevent them from having a parallel special session. That's what the Governor would have to call, but he doesn’t think there's any interest on anybody's part in having a special session. Hess stated that our state has a lot of challenges and priorities. We are blessed that our legislative partners have embraced the existential moment for the College of Veterinary Medicine. Based on the given circumstances of our state, this is the best and probably last opportunity for this problem to be addressed. We are still on everyone’s priority list, which is exactly where we want to be going into the final two weeks of the session. Hess is encouraged because the Speaker of the House, Kyle Hilbert, is a former OSU Student Body President and have been our greatest advocate for this initiative. Hilbert was gracious and spoke at every graduation ceremony. In the next two weeks we will be sprinting to the finish line on our request for funding for the Animal Teaching Hospital in the College of Veterinary Medicine.

Hess thanked everyone for their patience and cooperation during the big concert adventure. Hess stated that we will not be having four nights of concerts again. Doesn’t mean we won’t be doing one. We probably will. There are opportunities to do more concerts in the future, but we need to make sure it is not disruptive to our academic mission.

Hess wanted to brag on the fact that OSU had three Goldwater Scholars. It’s great to have one, but we had three. This is a testament to all faculty.

Hess hopes to have a big celebration in June about where we end up in the legislative session. Hess opened the floor to questions.

Haley asked what the main reason was not to have another concert. Hess stated the main reason was the interruption to students. We displaced student parking so people could tailgate or RV. This creates an opportunity for noise disruption during the day. Hess feels it would be better if we stuck with Saturday and Sunday events. Hess stated the final number that OSU made on the concert is about $3.2 million. We learned a lot throughout the process and if we want to do something similar in the future, we’ll have the opportunity to do better contractually and how to coordinate an event of this size. Hess congratulated all the facilities and public safety people on how things were managed. Knapp asked what we should do differently moving forward regarding the College of Vet Med to avoid arriving at this point again. Hess stated that he has received numerous questions from the media on how we got to this point. Hess stated that it’s not anyone’s fault. There have been a lot of other priorities since 1983 where money was to be spent at the state and university levels. Hess said we arrived at this place by not recapitalizing it and to avoid this in the future we will have opportunities to upgrade technology as it changes. We will start with state of the art everything and keep up with advances as they happen. The core facility itself should solve our problem for another 40 years. The key here is to maintain the facility. Knapp asked if there was a maintenance capacity built into the budget. This is a big problem with new buildings. We will have to plan for the operational part of this new facility. Hess stated part of the $295 million is for equipment and the core facility itself. We will also need some power infrastructure and distribution of that power. This is a lot of money. Hess stated we will be diligent in making sure when we have a new facility that we keep it maintained and yes, we are budgeting for ongoing maintenance.

Slevitch thanked Dr. Hess for the updates and introduced Chris Francisco who will be giving the provost's report for Provost Mendez.

**Provost’s report on recommendations made by the Faculty Council and comments on matters of interest to the faculty – Chris Franscisco for Provost Mendez:**

Francisco started bythanking everyone who was able to make it to Commencement over the weekend. It was good to see so many of you there. I know that means a lot to the students to see you there and being able to be congratulated as they're walking off the stage.Francisco stated that we have a very good working relationship with the Faculty Council. Franscisco thought Dr. Slevitch had one of the best Commencement speeches I have ever heard. It's pretty good to get applause from an audience when you're talking about giving advice to start a 401 k immediately when you get your 1st paycheck. And talking about the magic of compound interest which he liked very much. Slevitch stated she asked faculty members what advice they would give. Francisco stated even better that we had the combined wisdom of the faculty. Francisco reviewed the recommendations. The first recommendation dealt with faculty pay. We had a friendly amendment last time when Dr. Mendez was here talking about how we would frame it and take it to the executive team. That proposal agrees to work in good faith on it as financial circumstances allow us to progress and make that a priority. That's certainly something that everyone agreed to, including the executive team. We'll work toward this as we talk about budget models going forward and how we can make retention and rewarding faculty a priority. The other recommendation came from Dr. Weiser and the Retirement and Fringe Benefits committee on the faculty sick leave policy to get it aligned with the staff sick leave policy that was modified earlier in the year. This was brought to the Council of Deans last week and passed unanimously. It will move on to the executive team now.

Francisco stated that we are moving forward with our HLC site visit. It will be coming up in 11 months. Francisco, Mendez and Dr. Chung will be meeting with President Hess to discuss what’s going on. Francisco stated that all the evidence is gathered at this point. We have way more than we can use and will begin to cull things down. There is a writing team that will be working this summer to draft a report. This fall there will be email communications going out informing the broader campus community about what’s going on. There will be sessions to walk through our arguments for each of the 4 criteria that HLC will judge us on. This will allow faculty the opportunity to see what we are talking about, ask questions and offer suggestions. Formal updates will be given to both Faculty Council and Staff Advisory Council toward the end of the fall semester. Francisco stated their intent is to have a mock site visit in January. We will bring in a couple of peer reviewers from our peer institutions to take us through the process, see where our strength and weaknesses are before the actual visit in April. Francisco stated the final draft is due sometime in March.

Francisco stated there has been some discussion about the course minimums that had been communicated from the Provosts office to the Deans and out into the colleges. Francisco stated these course minimums are not new. He believes it’s University Academic Regulation 5.12. It says that courses should not run unless they meet the following minimum. He believes the lower division course is an enrollment of 20, upper division undergraduate course is an enrollment of 12 and a graduate course is an enrollment of 8. Those have not been enforced very widely. They have been enforced from time to time, and the enforcement is kind of varied with colleges and departments, and whether there's a lot of teaching power, whether there's not a lot of teaching power. We have asked colleges to go through their enrollment data and try to identify those courses that do not meet those minimum values and make a determination as to whether it makes financial sense and pedagogical sense to run those courses or whether there can be some alternatives that are found. There is a process for a college to request an exception to certain courses. You may say we have 10 students who need this capstone course to graduate, and if we don't run this course they won't be able to graduate. That would be an exception request that the college would make that would come through the process. We would evaluate and try to see what we could do about it. We would encourage folks to be creative in what they're doing. If you have a graduate topics course that would normally get 3 or 4 students, are there ways to teach a course that would be a little broader where you could still accommodate a broader group of students while targeting it to the students who really need that material. I had a course a few years ago where my students really needed something, but I didn't have enough students to really run something. So, I taught a broader version of it and incorporated some master's students in it. The homework was really where the students differentiated themselves. Anything that you could do to sort of be creative to expand that audience. I know some units have been talking about trying to combine some courses that they would have offered otherwise. I know none of these are ideal sorts of solutions. We'd like to be able to do one on one or one on 2, or one on 3 instruction at the graduate level if we could. Anything that we can do to be asfiscally responsible as we can with that teaching power. I know it's not an ideal situation, but we want to look at what we can do.We also don't want to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We're not going to necessarily say just because you have 19 students in this course, you can't run this section. If there's a good case to be made why it makes sense to run that section versus some alternative that exists there. I realize that's not something that's been widely enforced in the past, and that's something that causes concern when folks look at it and say, I'm not sure I can get to that minimum,but I do think this is a good time for us to look at that and see if we can make some choices that will help us financially, and will still provide a good experience for the students.

Francisco opened the floor for questions. Lawson stated he thought there was a distinction between graduate and PhD courses. Master level being 8 but he thought he saw PhD courses being a minimum of 3. Francisco thought regulation 5.12 only said graduate. They were looking at the UAR when sorting it out. It is the recollection of some that the regulation is for graduate only. Francisco would not be surprised if some colleges or units had documents where they made this distinction. It’s a sensible distinction to make. In some sense it’s a question of what sort of case you can make. Is it appropriate for this particular course to run with 6 at the doctoral level and why you are doing it. We’ve managed to find a course that allows 6 students to take it. This may be an argument the college would want to make, and we’d certainly listen to. Lawson asked if they would have to apply for an exception for every PhD course if it’s not hitting the proper level. Registrar Peaster stated it’s a straight 8 for graduate level courses. Francisco presumes there is something written down in another level of documents that suggests something like this. Knapp asked for an update on the status of the Gen Ed requirement reorganization and what the plan is going forward. We got delayed quite a bit and are going to try to get through the whole process in the fall. We did get the first 6 trails through the Board in late April. We have 2 more that we are getting ready to go to Instruction Council this week. This will give us a total of 8. In discussing the timeline with the colleges, with our student success, advising team with undergraduate admissions and all the communications they do, and the training that they do internally, we felt that it was going to be very difficult to train everyone to advise students properly this summer given how quickly we need to get this turned around. We had at some point during the year thought let's just wait till fall to try to get them to the Board. We had some good conversations and were able to get through it earlier. What we decided is that we would do a soft rollout of the Gen Ed trails in August, especially because a couple of the trails won't be approved in time for the start of orientation. They'll only be approved, probably in June at some point, so we would have half the students would be missing out on that. What we decided to do is we will try to take these 8 trails all the way through the State Regent's notification process. Get those in the degree inventory by the end of June so we can get them in the catalog. We will be working with brand management and with other partners on campus to unveil the website that exists in skeleton form now. We can't release the website until we have approval. We're not allowed to advertise programs until we get State Regent's approval. Unveil that website, make some videos and have some communication with students. We want to unveil this the same way we did the ideal grad initiative in August. When students are starting to come back in the fall, talk to them about it. We think a lot of that advising was going to take place in the 1st semester of their freshman year anyway. They would be selecting those trails then and easing into them in the spring semester. We're also going to develop some machinery that will allow us to email students that say this semester you're enrolled in the following courses. These courses are part of these trails that you might want to look at. You've already got a head start on some of these trails. We can go through the Slate system to send targeted emails to students to let them know what trails they've already started and that they can pick up if they want to. That's the plan we have. As I said, the 6 that we've already done. We have a couple others: 1 on migration and 1 on energy that we're looking forward that we are trying to take through the process to Instruction Council on Thursday of this week. We are hopeful that we'll have another 10 to 12 that we'll get next year. We have proposals that came through that we're a little behind on because of delays. We have another 7 or so that Tammy and I have been working through that. We'll try to edit some this summer and get back to faculty on and get those through. I suspect we'll have one more call that might be more of a targeted call for particular topic areas, but also open to ideas, if faculty want to pitch. Knapp asked what the expectation is for incoming students. Francisco stated for incoming students, they will start hearing about it in August. They won't be advised about it this summer, because we thought it was just too much to try to get everybody up to speed at that point. I just don't think it was going to be viable, given the amount of time that we have. They will be able to select those certificates at any time, and we'll have our communication blast starting in August. Knapp asked if all of the incoming freshmen are expected to pick up a trail. Francisco stated no one has to pick up a trail. It's optional for everyone. If students want to continue their Gen. Ed. path by just checking the boxes like they always did, they are welcome to do that. We feel this will appeal to students. When Virginia Tech did something like this, they had over 90% of students adopting it within several years. One of the things I think is really important for us is to be responsive to student feedback. We had a survey of students that said we have no idea why we do Gen. Ed., and we think it's completely incoherent. This is a way to try to bring forward a path to let them see a more coherent view of these classes. That's the intent. But they don't have to do it. Perkins stated there are several members on Zoom who are asking similar questions, are there particular dates or deadlines in terms of the decision to stop a course from running? For example, we have found that undergraduates, this is my experience in our college, will often register for courses relatively late. Often the week before the semester begins, or even during the week, as opposed to grad students who have a tendency to enroll shortly after the registration window opens. Francisco stated that is interesting, because I have the opposite experience in my home department. Francisco stated yes there are deadlines that the colleges have. I don't have them off the top of my head. I know the colleges were supposed to be doing this process now, where they were evaluating what they think the courses look like as of Monday just to get a sense for where things are. The 1st deadline was not until I believe June 9th is the exception deadline. And then June 16th is when courses are supposed to be canceled that encompasses upper division and graduate courses with the caveat that you can use projections for graduate courses when you expect first year graduate students who have not gotten the ability to enroll. Some of that will rely on projections. I believe lower division courses were somewhere around the beginning of August. I don't have the exact deadlines with me, but the colleges all have the memo with the deadlines. Francisco stated if we wait any longer for upper division and graduate courses then it defeats the purpose. In order to use this as a fiscal savings you have to reassign the person something else. If you wait until August 10th to do all this then how do you reassign that person another course. They either get a course off or have to teach something else the next semester and it doesn’t help. The idea is to get a sense earlier and help students figure out if they need to change their schedule and work something else out. Perkins asked a related question; graduate programs can vary significantly in size. Is there any discussion of this when setting a universal minimum. For the time we are trying this, we went with what is in the policy. We felt that was the fairest thing to do. Some of this will come out in the exception requests that colleges choose to make. If you say, I have a large PhD program, I can accommodate this. I have a small graduate program. I can't accommodate that, and I need something for these students to take. That's certainly something that we're happy to consider. I can't make any guarantees about it. I haven't talked with the Provost in detail about it. I think the other thing to take into consideration, as I mentioned, is if you have a lot of TAs in your department to have a fiscally efficient way to teach lower division courses, we must have courses for those students to take. They're students first more than they are employees. It would be untenable for us to bring them here, tell them to teach lower division courses, and then not give them anything to take to get to their degree. All of these are things that would have to be considered. Eisenberg asked who is managing the trails to make sure they are executed. Is it the departments? For example, you have X number of courses on a trail that’s been proposed in a department. How do we ensure that all those courses are actually being offered. Francisco stated this is something they will coordinate centrally at the start as we are getting this going. Each trial will have a managing department. This department is responsible for any changes that need to be made to the trail. If there's an assessment that needs to be done on the trail, because these are all going to be certificates there will be some assessment component, not a major one, but a small assessment component. That'll be done in the unit. Eisenberg asked if it’s being managed in the unit is the person who’s managing it being given some type of course release or pay at that point. Francisco stated this is handled within the unit the same way we handle workload for undergraduate or graduate programs. We have had a lot of discussions about workload with the deans and will continue in our retreat as well. Francisco feels this is something worthwhile to incorporate into a faculty member’s workload. He doesn’t think it will take a large workload to manage a trail. There will be some workload, assessment and communication but he does not think it will be a huge workload. Haley stated one of the big concerns in the A&S Faculty Council is the correlation between the graduate research program and the graduate TA slots and graduate enrollment. There was some reassurance from the college that they are looking at this holistically. On the academic side are you looking at the corollary consequences if you cut a certain class it will have on the entire program and things that seem completely unrelated. Francisco stated it’s all integrated. I spent the first 6 years of my administrative career as associate head in math. I was scheduling all the lower division courses and the TAs there, and it was a nightmare if you didn't have the right graduate courses for them to take that lined up properly with the courses you needed taught in their TA assignments. We have mostly TAs, we have very few GRAs in math and that was something we always had to manage very carefully, because you can't have them conflicting. You can't put all your graduate seminars between 10:30 and 2:30 on Monday, Wednesday, Friday, because that's when all the lower division courses are. So how do you move those around? How do you ensure that you have a topic that works for enough students? We reduced the number of topics courses we had some years ago, because we were getting 3 and 4 students in them, and it was not something we felt we could manage fiscally. We did try to find broader topics that we could use, and we tried to encourage some students who were doing only independent study courses to try to enroll in one of those other courses so we could have a broader audience for it. Haley stated there is an issue with enrollment for especially PhD programs. They can fluctuate in which there are only 7 incoming students that year and they all go to the same program. It's basically guaranteed that every first-year graduate level course will be under enrolled. Francisco stated that he hasn't talked specifics with the Provost yet, but I'm fairly confident I can say we are not going to make it so that none of your first year PhD Students has a course to take. What we want to see is how we are managing that sort of thing if we're going under on a couple of courses here is there a way we can balance that some other way. Hoff hears nervousness and uncertainty in his department regarding the degree of enforcement. Also, what are the criteria for a good case for an exception. It is somewhat undefined as to when an exception will go through. Francisco stated that he and the Provost have looked at this and are not unfamiliar with the sorts of pressures there are. Francisco cannot guarantee that we’re going to agree on every decision but they do come at it from a different perspective. They are open to the sorts of arguments that we are talking about. Hoff stated it sounds like a call for a good faith effort on the part of the department to see if some of those courses can be adjusted. Francisco stated the more good faith we see in making these sorts of adjustments, the more good faith we’ll feel comfortable with on the fiscal side. They made an effort. Francisco stated he did not want the perfect to be the enemy of the good. He doesn’t want to slash every single course and then say, oh, now these students do not have anything to take, we do not have anyone to teach these courses, etc. We are going to make a good faith effort on both sides. We are going to see how this works. You will probably be unhappy with some of the decisions and probably feel that some of the courses are running that shouldn’t be but that’s probably how it should be in the end. He hopes to get to a reasonable spot. Perkins asked why the dates for this are coming from the Provosts office and not the colleges. Francisco stated that it is a university academic regulation, and it’s intended to be enforced university wide. Francisco stated we recognize that there are going to be cases where you have 7 people in a first-year Physics PhD class and it may not be reasonable to say cut it off at 7. That is probably part of a long-term discussion. Some units teach the core PhD courses in a two-year sequence, so you always have enough to make one of those years of courses work. The reason we are pushing everything through the colleges is we want the exception request to go through the college. They have a better sense of exactly why these things are lined up the way they are, and the college has a good sense of is this a case we want to make given our college budget and how much can we afford to do this. Lacombe asked what the rationale for this number was. Francisco does not know but believes it’s been in the UAR for at least 30 years. Francisco feels this is something that is reasonable to discuss after we go through this exercise. Do these numbers make sense pedagogically? Did they cut off some courses that we really should have been running? Did they not make enough of a difference on the fiscal side? Could we have been more efficient if we’d done something else. He is very open to having these discussions and we can revise the UAR if we decide that it’s not working. Eisenberg asked if someone was collecting the data. Francisco stated that IRA (Institutional Research and Analytics) are already collecting all this data then we will figure out the best way to analyze it. Haley stated that departments are different with some having huge enrollment classes that require a lot of TAs, graduate students. Could there be some leeway to compensate in some sense for teaching. Example from Francisco: I'm teaching this person class with 2 FTEs, because I've got 2 TAs and one faculty member. Now I have 3 classes at the graduate level that have 7 people in them, and maybe those average out. I think that's a reasonable argument to make. I can't tell you exactly how it'll be evaluated. But I think it's a reasonable argument to make. Due to time constraints, Chair Slevitch ended the questions. Francisco did state that if you have questions about your specific situation, please direct those to the colleges since they are managing the exception process. He is talking all the time with the Associate Deans and Deans about how they are managing this. If you feel things are not quite right feel free to contact him.

**Vice Presidents’ Reports and Comments on matters of interest to the faculty:**

None

**Faculty Council Chair’s Report:**

Slevitch stated that in the last 3 weeks I received numerous concerns about the board, every illegal virus across campus and a lot of faculty reached out to me with concerns. We discussed it with the Administration and what the possible response might be. From a legal standpoint there isn't much that can be done in this case, but a counter message has been discussed. I'm hoping that something will come out of this discussion.

Slevitch stated that we went through a termination hearing. It’s been over six years since we’ve held a termination hearing. As a result, we have identified certain gaps in the current policy that I hope will be addressed next year. The policy definitely needs revisions. Now that the process is completed, we can see where the gaps are and what needs to be addressed and updated.

Slevitch stated that she and Perkins went through Commencement and handed out a lot of diplomas.

Slevitch mentioned the committee preference survey will be out in the next two weeks. Please be on the lookout for the email. Please complete it yourself and encourage your colleagues to do the same. If they are interested in a specific committee to complete the survey. This is what we use to fill vacancies on the various committees.

Today Slevitch received an update regarding long-term care insurance from HR. They stated that that insurance benefit is old. Due to competing priorities, specifically the implementation of Page Up and the new benefits administration system they are currently using is going to be changed. Because of this, implementing a change does not make sense but it remains on their agenda for future consideration. Slevitch is hopeful that it will be addressed next year.

Slevitch stated that we had a discussion regarding the Health and Wellness committees’ recommendation that the university should provide on-site health care services by a certified athletic trainer. It is still pending.

We also had a discussion regarding the evening bus schedule. When reading the report, it appears that the timing of the evening classes is going to be changed instead of running the buses longer. Right now, the last bus runs at 6:20 and graduate classes end at 7:30. This presents an issue because a lot of these students do not have cars. They are international students and cannot get to the places where they live. It looks like the issue will be solved for now until we can find more drivers. Lacombe stated that is the issue right now, the lack of drivers. Lacombe stated it sounds like the Provost is willing to accommodate the role of credit courses at least in the evening. Francisco stated they have approved deviation requests for anyone who has asked for this reason as long as it’s not interfering with GU classroom which generally it is not. For clarification, Slevitch stated that whoever is teaching the evening courses students need to be done by 6:20. Francisco stated it goes through the department through the deviation request process.

Slevitch stated that on behalf of the entire Faculty Council, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to our departing members: Ravi Jadeja, Jim Knapp, Wouter Hoff, Mike Yough, Charlotte Barker, Brad Lawson, Aric Warren. Thank you all for your service. Your dedication and thoughtful contributions made a huge difference. I hope you leave Faculty Council with the feeling that we did something good. That we contributed to making the lives of faculty and students better. Slevitch welcomed the new members to Faculty Council: Aihua Xie, Hannah Shear, Erika Lutter, Rui Du, Eric Harp, Virginia Charter, Joe Bennett and Jill Joyce. Welcome everyone.

**Report of Liaison Representatives:**

* 1. Emeriti – Tom Royer

Carolyn Gang opened April 7 and May 5 evening dinners. Our April dinner hosted Burns and Ann Hargis in a Q&A that was moderated by Gary Clark. It was a very entertaining program, and the dinner was attended by 100 + attendees. In our May dinner, Dr. Gina Peek discussed the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI) update and noted that Dr. Robin Fuxa was named new Director of OLLI. We then heard from Dr. Kevin Wagner regarding various water issues including natural pollutants and other environmental sources. Our 2025 Member Directory has been distributed. We welcomed three new members, Laurie Lucas, Lynn McElroy and Sam Ott. Our June 2 Evening Dinner will host Senior Vice Provost Chris Francisco on the topic of “New Directions for General Education at OSU.”. We acknowledged the passing of Wes Watkins, Hermann Burchard, Pauline Kopecky and Bernard Eissenstat. Monthly Summer activities will revolve around informal social gatherings at Hideaway.

Submitted by Tom Royer, Emeriti Liaison to the Faculty Council

* 1. Staff Advisory Council – Aaron Lively

Staff Celebration Day will be May 20th from 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM in the Wes Watkins Center. Be sure to thank the staff in your areas for all that they do!

* 1. Graduate Council – Veronique Lacombe

*Proposed OSU Policy Updates to Comply with OSRHE Policy Revisions (Phase 1)*

To ensure alignment with Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (*OSRHE*) policy revisions, OSU has been revising its related academic policies in several phases. For phase 1, the proposed changes for the following OSU policies were reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council:

* UAR 6.13 Academic Forgiveness
* OSU Policy 2-0820: Academic Forgiveness for Undergraduate Students
* OSU Policy 2-0220: Awarding Honorary Degrees
* OSU Policy 2-0114: Awarding Posthumous Degrees

*The following Academic Program Committee items* were reviewed and approved at the April Graduate Faculty Council

*• New Graduate Programs:*

* One Health, MS
* One Health, GCRT

*• Graduate program modifications:*

* Effective Teaching in Elementary Schools, GCRT
* Effective Teaching in Secondary Schools, GCRT
* Geography, MS & PhD
* Electrical Engineering, PhD

10 additional program modifications were approved through an expedited review process by the Academic Program Committee.

*Graduate Faculty* **-** 11 new or renewal applications were reviewed and approved at the level of Associate 1-3 by the Subject Matter Groups 5, as well as by the Graduate Council.

*International students -* Dean Morgan reported that the SEVIS status of students previously marked as terminated has been restored to active.

*Plan of Study* – The number of submitted graduate applications is increasing each year. Although application processing times by admissions officers of the Graduate College are roughly equivalent to peer institutions, the goal is to increase the capacity to handle applications in the near future.

*Bus schedule -* Due to a shortage of drivers, there is currently a lack of evening bus service. The Provost’s Office has expressed a willingness to accommodate class schedules accordingly.

*Graduate Education Month* - The 2025 Graduate Awards Ceremony, scheduled on April 30, recognized graduate students and faculty members for their accomplishments.

Eisenberg received an email from a colleague at another university, and he said rather than changing work status they are actually revoking work visas. People are receiving emails about this. He asked if Lacombe had heard about this. Lacombe responded she has not. I've heard there is a policy now that they're trying to implement where exactly what you said. They can't actually leave the country, because if they leave the country they can't get back in, because of the visa issue. Eisenberg said the visa issue is different than the work status. Exactly. Slevitch stated this would be a good question to ask Elizabeth Walker.

* 1. Student Government Association – Sam Hiltz
	2. Graduate & Professional Student Government Association – Marcia Sun

**GPSGA Informational Sessions and Leadership Transition Initiatives**

This year, GPSGA launched a month-long series of informational sessions designed to engage General Assembly members interested in leadership roles. These sessions helped participants better understand the experiences and responsibilities associated with serving as a GPSGA board member. In the past, GPSGA experienced challenges filling the entire elected board positions, with mid-semester resignations often occurring due to workload and shifting priorities. Throughout the past year, the Ex Officio helped ensure continuity and offered vital support in managing campus and executive responsibilities and in encouraging the current GPSGA president in stepping into the leadership role and during time of absence due to traveling abroad. At the board’s request and based on the GPSGA Constitution, the Past President continued serving as Ex Officio to offer help and guidance in key activities and events. For the incoming leadership team, the election results will be validated and shared in the upcoming announcements.

**Additional Highlights**

* **GPSGA’s Participation in the Undergraduate Research Symposium: Celebrating Graduate Education Month and Highlighting Mentorship:**
As part of Graduate Education Month, GPSGA graduate students served as feedback providers at the OSU Undergraduate Research Symposium, emphasizing mentorship and academic engagement. Many first-time graduate student participants were recruited through campus-wide outreach and GPSGA communication platforms.
* **Into the Streets Participation:**
GPSGA actively participated in OSU’s *Into the Streets* program, a campus-wide day of service aimed at connecting students with the broader Stillwater community. This initiative strengthened civic engagement among graduate students and provided opportunities for community building.
* **Guest Speaker and Q&A Session – President Hess:**
President Hess will address the final GPSGA General Assembly meeting of the semester on April 30 to discuss key concerns raised by the graduate community. Coordination for this visit is underway with the President’s Chief of Staff and Communications Director. Dean Morgan will also attend. This marks a special milestone for GPSGA, as it will be the first time a sitting OSU president has attended a GPSGA General Assembly session. The segment will be followed by an important Q&A session with our panelists: President Hess, Dean Morgan, and Dr. Lovern.
* **Capitol Cowboys Advocacy:**
GPSGA representatives participated in the *Capitol Cowboys* initiative, advocating for the construction of a new Animal Teaching Hospital and highlighting the importance of graduate education and student experiences to state legislators.
* **GPSGA’s Participation in Vice President for Student Affairs Search Committee:**
The screening and search process for the next Vice President for Student Affairs will extend into the summer.
* **GPSGA Funding Opportunities Sessions:**
The Ex Officio offered informational sessions for newly formed and recently reactivated graduate student groups, highlighting available resources and funding opportunities. This is an opportunity for various graduate groups and units to learn more about funding options and encourage broader participation.
* **GPSGA Group Growth:**
The GPSGA informal communication group, launched with 9 members two years ago, has grown to over 160 members. The platform serves as a space to share professional development opportunities, cultural events, campus disaster relief efforts, and research participation calls, helping foster graduate student connection to campus and co-curricular development.
* **GPSGA Graduation Stoles:**
GPSGA graduation stoles will be available for checkout through the Graduate Success Center for former and current GPSGA representatives, liaisons, and officers participating in commencement ceremonies.
* **GPSGA Graduate Highlights and Support Initiatives:**
In response to ongoing challenges and evolving job market conditions, GPSGA has launched a special highlight focusing on recognizing and celebrating graduating students, aiming to foster resilience and offer encouragement and advice to peer community transitioning into their professional careers.
* **GPSGA Phoenix Awards:**
The recipients of the 2025 GPSGA Phoenix Awards are:
	+ *Graduate Faculty Mentorship Award:* Dr. Anita Silwal
	+ *Doctoral Award:* Jimmy Uba
	+ *Master’s Award:* Shaolin Jahan Eidee
	+ *Teaching Assistant Award:* Mohmad Junaid Ul Haq
* **Summer Transition Planning:**
A summer transition meeting is being scheduled to support the incoming GPSGA board. Transition documents and resource materials will be prepared and distributed to ensure a smooth leadership handoff and continued momentum into the next academic year.

**REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:**

**a. Academic Standards and Policies: Mike Yough – Year End Report**

Yough reviewed the first of two recommendations that were distributed with the agenda. Slevitch asked if there were any questions. Seeing none asked for a motion to accept the recommendation. Eisenberg moved and Weiser seconded the motion. Slevitch called for a vote. Motion passed.

Yough reviewed the second recommendation, which was also included with the agenda. Yough stated that the committee had an issue with the repeat portion of the policy. Previously students could repeat up to 4 courses where they have received a D or an F. With all but the final grade, counting towards their GPA. Now there's no restriction on the number of courses that can be repeated.It can be repeated up to 4 times, and the highest-grade counts. The committee was a little bit concerned about the ramifications of this. The committee did feel like this is something that we really kind of have to pass in order to be in compliance. The registrar did note some of the consequences. Some of the registrar gave us a response that is the revisedrepeat policy is expected to positively impact many students by increasing their GPAs, which affects eligibility for graduation, academic standing, admissionsand readmission.The State Regents have verbally indicated that the policy should be considered effective immediately upon approval and implemented as soon as possible.Delaying implementation would not only disadvantage our students, compared to peers at other state institutions that have already adopted the change, but it also creates misalignment and GPA Calculations that can complicate transfers between institutions, and then finally, implementing the policy requires substantial work over the summer, identifying affected students, executing the automatedrepeat process and conducting manual transcript reviews for hundreds of students. For those reasons, we did recommend that this goes forward. I've spoken to Chris Franciscoabout tracking students that are potentially affected by this. Determining what these students look like in terms of their GPA, and are these students at increased risk of dropping out? This was a very productive conversation. I will say that we were hoping that this could be amended at a later point in time. I do have some hope after having talked to Chris Francisco about this the last week or two,there is going to be a change with the Vice Chancellor of the Regents, and we've been assured that there will be conversations about this repeat policy, that coupled with collecting data on this gives ussome hope that we can revise this policy moving forward. But for now, this does appear to be something that we do need to adopt.Slevitch asked if there were any questions. Seeing none asked for a motion to accept the recommendation. Weiser moved and Pranger seconded the motion. Slevitch called for a vote. Motion passed.

Yough stated as I roll off chairing this committee, I wanted to extend a couple of thank you’s. First of all, the nature of our work requires that we work very closely with the Vice Provost. I wanted to publicly thank Chris Francisco. He was very supportive and responsive. This resulted in open communication, and through this communication it was apparent that we were often on the very same page when it came to standards and policies that make sense in supporting our students. Second, I wanted to thank you Lisa. What we call in educational psychology, it's a closely related term, we call this academic press. I really felt that you encouraged our committee to accomplish a lot, but also with your support. I just wanted to thank you for that. It's been a pleasure working with you. And then, finally, it was truly a pleasure to get to know my fellow council members. It was a pleasure working with you and I just want to say I appreciate you all. Thank you very much. It's been a very pleasant couple of years chairing this committee. Slevitch said thank you and it was a privilege having you serve as chair of this committee.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE

2024-2025 Annual Report

May 13, 2025

**Members**

***Mike Yough*** (Chair), Educational Foundations, Leadership and Aviation; Faculty Council Member

***Kathryn Castle***, Emeritus Faculty Member

***Brandt Gardner***, Faculty Council Past Chair (Ex Officio)

***Deana Hildebrand***, Nutritional Sciences, Faculty Council Member

***Samuel Hiltz***, Student Member (SGA)

***Shelley Mitchell***, Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, General Faculty Member

***Carol Ready***, Languages and Literatures, General Faculty Member

***John Michael Riley***, Agricultural Economics, Faculty Council Member

***Miriam Tenkorang***, Student Member (GPSGA) in Fall 2024 (did not complete term)

***Jimmie Weaver***, Chemistry, General Faculty Member

**Meetings:** August 29**,** September 26**,** November 7**,** January 29, February 26**,** March 26**,** April 30

**Recommendations/Resolutions presented to Faculty Council:**

1. Revision to University Academic Regulations 3.10 and 3.11 (clarification regarding curriculum duplication)
	1. Status: Approved by Faculty Council on 10/8/25
2. Proposed Revisions to OSU Military Leave of Absence and Related Policies
	1. Status: Approved by Faculty Council on 4/8/25
3. Revised Proposed Revisions to OSU Military Leave of Absence and Related Policies (provision regarding jury duty added)
	1. Status: Proposed for vote to Faculty Council on 5/13/25
4. Proposed OSU Policy Updates to Comply with OSRHE Policy Revisions: Phase 1
	1. Status: Proposed for vote to Faculty Council on 5/13/25

**Additional Activities/Topics:**

1. Began implementation of Faculty Council Recommendation *24-05-01-ASP* by assigning representatives to Instruction Council (Weaver) and General Education Advisory Council (Yough). Representatives regularly provided summaries at monthly AS&P meetings.
2. Appointed a member to a task force assembled by Chris Ormsbee (Director, ITLE) to provide guidelines regarding online/face-to-face course equivalency. Ongoing.
3. Assembled a task force to guide an AS&P recommendation for integrated course objectives. Members include: Mike Yough, Professor, Academic Standards & Policies Chair; Chris Ormsbee, Director, ITLE; Adrienne Sanogo, Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Services, CEHS; Marissa McIntyre, Assistant Dean, Academic Services, Spears School of Business; Rebecca Sheehan, Associate Dean, Graduate College; Samuel Hiltz, Student Senate Council Representative; Marcia Sun, GPSGA Representative. Ongoing (see *Ongoing Efforts* below).
4. AS&P hosted OSU President Jim Hess during the April meeting (see *Figure 1*). The committee shared initiatives over the past two years and had a frank and engaging discussion regarding the general direction of the university with emphasis on academic standards and policies.

**Figure 1**

*AS&P Committee with President Jim Hess*

Note. April 30, 2025. Left to right: Jim Hess, Carol Ready, Jimmie Weaver, Samuel Hiltz, Mike Yough, Kathryn Castle.

**Ongoing Efforts:**

The Integrated Learning Objectives Taskforce is expected to have a recommendation for AS&P to consider prior to Fall 2025.

**b. Access and Community Impact: Ravi Jadeja – Year End Report**

**Access and Community Impact Committee**

2024-2025 Annual Report

May 9th 2025

**Members:**

Chair: Ravi Jadeja (Department of Animal & Food Sciences)

Other members: Babu Fathepure (Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics), Sara Mautino (Architecture & Arch Engineering), Thomas Dickey (Greenwood School of Music), Mimi Ward (Emeritus Faculty)

**Meetings:**

The Access and Community Impact Committee did not hold regular meetings this year due to challenges in finalizing member appointments; currently, three positions remain vacant. Despite this, we conducted one full committee meeting and ensured continued engagement by meeting individually with members, both in person and virtually, to discuss key committee matters and maintain momentum.

**Ongoing Efforts:**

The committee continues to work toward clearly defining its charge and scope. These ongoing discussions are taking place through individual member engagements and targeted input.

**c. Athletics: Aric Warren, Dr. Todd Meisner – Year End Report**

ATHELTICS, HEALTH & WELLNESS COMMITTEE

2024-2025 Annual Report

4/29/25

**Members:**

Chair: Aric Warren (Center for Health Sciences)

Faculty Council Members:

 John Michael Riley (Ag Economics)

 Jentre Olsen (School of Educational Foundations, Leadership, Aviation)

General Faculty Members:

 Doug Smith (Kinesiology)

 McKale Montgomery (Nutritional Sciences)

 Leslie Currell (Theatre)

Emeriti Faculty Member:

 Doug Aichele (Math – Emeriti Association)

Student Members:

 Cayden Brickman (OSU Student-Athlete)

 Jonathon Michael Thibeault (Intramural/Club sports)

Liaison Members:

 Ben Dyson (Associate Athletics Director; Compliance)

 Marilyn Middlebrook (Associate Athletics Director; Academic Services)

 Jack Henneha (Director of University Health Services)

 Todd Misener (Chief Wellness Officer)

**Meetings:**

This committee met each month during the Fall and Spring semesters, via Zoom

[Sept 24, Oct 22, Nov 19, Jan 31, Feb 24, Mar 24, Apr 21]

**Recommendations/Resolutions presented to Faculty Council:**

24-05-01-AHW The AHW Committee recommend that the University provide on-site healthcare services by a Certified Athletic Trainer to be available for Club, intramural, and recreational activities on campus.

Status: Action is accepted pending further discussions with the Division of Student Affairs, Department of Wellness, and the Center for Health Sciences, University Health Services, and OSU Sports Medicine. (per minutes from Oct 8, 2024)

* The following recommendation remains pending that requires administrative action.

**Additional Activities:**

This year our work has been centered around investigating mental health resource availability for faculty on campus. We have identified the following objectives that need further attention.

*Committee objectives:*

* *Faculty awareness of available resources on campus*
* *Are faculty mental health needs being met on campus with the current level of support and resources?*
* *Are faculty prepared to recognize mental health challenges of their students and are they comfortable in referring them for help, or know where to refer for help?*

Through our work, and in collaboration with the Department of Wellness, a significant need for enhanced mental health care has been identified.

According to the National College Health Assessment 44% of college students have at least one mental illness with 25% experiencing depression, 34% with anxiety, and 22% having both. On the OSU campus we have seen a 39% increase in mental health illness since the Fall of 2020. Additionally, the prevalence of faculty reporting depression or anxiety diagnosis is 32%, according to data from a 2022 survey. These diagnoses (depression and anxiety) have also led to negative work productivity in faculty and staff (44% of those faculty with depression report negative work performance).

Our goal is to generate data from faculty and staff regarding their mental health needs, receptiveness to receiving care on campus or virtually, and their abilities to recognize when students have challenges and crises that need prompt attention an appropriate referral for help. **With this data our committee plans to make recommendations to the administration regarding mental health resource allocation and training for faculty and staff.**

We have identified the **Healthy Mind Survey**. This is a validated survey that has been utilized on university campuses that we feel captures our objectives to help us identify and learn more about faculty needs for resources on campus, training, and additional virtual resources. The Department of Wellness has graciously offered to incur the costs the survey administration (approximately $6000).

**An informational campaign is needed to maximize the return.** This has to come from FACULTY! Discussed taking these ideas to the Department levels within the Colleges to get more faculty support.

Faculty Council Representatives need to get involved and carry this message to the Departments/Colleges so it comes from a faculty perspective.

Faculty have to feel the importance of this. Not only for themselves, but for their students. Use the Student survey data as the motivation for this.

**How do we create an environment designed to meet the needs of the student population and support student and faculty mental health?**

1. Date/timeline

**Action Item for the committee**: Distribute the ***Healthy Minds survey in Sept 2025.***

 **Additional Topics:**

* The committee met with President Hess and discussed upcoming issues centered around healthcare on campus that may serve as action items moving into the next academic year. [\*topics ‘a’ and ‘b’ should be discussed with the Retirement & Fringe Benefits Committee]
	1. **Medical care costs for faculty / staff (OSU employees) in Stillwater.** Medical care costs for OSU employees is high in the city of Stillwater. We discussed some strategies in approaching this, and the best strategy Dr. Hess suggested is first for him to have a conversation with leadership of local providers to find a middle ground on revenues needed and expenses to OSU employees.
	2. **Self-funded insurance plan for the University.** In this model, the University would do a better job of using our own physicians and health care specialists to provide care to lower insurance premiums paid by the University and its employees. We have physicians and specialists who are OSU employees that can offer and provide services at a different premium structure if employees opt for that plan versus other provider plans. Is this something that faculty and staff want as services offered by the employer, that in turn can help manage costs and expenses to the employees and the University?
	3. **University Health Services facility**. The University is in need of a new, larger University Health Services facility. One which is large enough to meet the needs of students, faculty, staff and the University community as a whole. In order to get our ‘team’ at their best (faculty/staff) a comprehensive service facility is needed. Having a facility that encompasses all health care needs will also help overcome the stigma that people may have walking into a ‘mental health clinic’. Faculty, staff, and students can feel comfortable going to a facility where the services to be received are more protected. Additionally, a new comprehensive health care center could work collaboratively with other departments on campus to help in carrying out the Land Grant Mission of teaching, research, and extension.

**Ongoing Efforts:**

**Action Steps:**

* August Faculty Council meeting – Share Survey plan with the Faculty Council. Committee members are available to speak to department / College meetings to encourage faculty involvement in the Fall survey.
* September 2025 – administer Healthy Minds survey to faculty and staff.

**Potential goals/objectives for 2025-26**

* Seek faculty / staff input on a more encompassing medical facility on campus that is staffed with university-employed physicians and specialists (OSU Medicine).
* Health care costs, benefits, and premiums that faculty and staff pay are high. Is this a factor in faculty recruitment and retention?

**d. Budget: Brad Lawson – Year End Report**

Budget Committee of the Faculty Council

2024-2025 Annual Report

May 7, 2025

**Members:**

**Chair**: Brad P. Lawson (School of Accounting)

Merle Eisenberg (Dept. of History)

Robert Emerson (Dept. of Civil & Environmental Engineering)

Toni Ivey (School of Teaching, Learning, and Educational Sciences)

Ron Miller (Emeriti Professor)

Stephen Perkins (Dept. of Sociology; Ex-Official Member)

Howard Sanborn (Dept. of Political Science)

Hannah Shear (Dept. of Agricultural Economics)

**Meetings:**

The Budget Committee met from noon to 1:00 PM on the last Tuesday of every month.

*Note – not all of+ the following need to be completed by every committee.*

**Recommendations/Resolutions presented to Faculty Council:**

25-03-01-Budget: Recommendations to Address Faculty Salary & Compression Issues

* 1. Status: Approved by Faculty Council on 03/11/25. Pending with Provost’s Office

**Additional Activities:**

* Throughout 2024-2025, discussed and analyzed OSU faculty salary data and Big XII comparison, which was provided by OSU Administration.
* On 03/06/25, committee met with then-Interim President Hess and Provost Mendez discuss faculty salary recommendation in advance of presentation to full Faculty Council.
* On 04/29/25, met with Chris Kuwitzky to discuss the university budgeting process and how the Budget Committee members can participate in that process going forward.

**Ongoing Efforts:**

1. Continue developing connections with Chris Kuwitzky and the rest of OSU administration.
2. Identify tangible and specific ways that the Budget Committee can fulfill its first mandate to “review the University budget, its preparation, and status…”.

**e. Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security: Patrick Daglaris – No Report**

**f. Career Track: Jennifer Glenn – Year End Report**

Career-Track Faculty Council Committee

2024-2025 Annual Report

May 6, 2025

**Chair:**

Jennifer Glenn (Industrial Engineering and Management)

**Members:**

Jim Burkman (Management Science and Information Systems)

Cristina Colquhoun (Library)

Evan Davis (Management Science and Information Systems)

Shirley Evans (Nutritional Sciences)

Alexandra Ford (Veterinary Pathobiology)

Reed Holyoak (Veterinary Clinical Sciences)

Sarah Johnson (Community Health Sciences, Counseling and Counseling Psychology)

Jennifer Labrecque (Psychology)

Jonathan Ludwig (Foreign Languages and Literatures)

**Faculty Council Members:**

James Knapp (Geology)

Mark Pranger (Creative and Information Technologies)

**Meetings:**

The Career-Track (CT) committee met virtually on the first Friday of each month.

**Recommendations/Resolutions presented to Faculty Council:**

None

**Additional Activities:**

1. Provided input to the FC Faculty Committee regarding inclusion of CT faculty in the following documents: November 2024 - January 2025

a. 2-0110\_Workload Assignments of Faculty Members 0814

b. 2-0902\_Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Process for Ranked Faculty\_AA\_2024-08-29

2. Met with Vice Provost Francisco: November 2024 and March 2025

* + 1. Discussed importance of developing a campus consensus on standardized appointment periods, contract periods, timeframes for promotions, etc. for CT faculty
		2. CT committee to work on surveying CT faculty regarding items in (a)
		3. Vice Provost Francisco can use results to inform university leadership and influence policy in this area

3. CT committee worked on survey development and collected university-wide CT emails: March – May 2025

**Additional Topics:**

* 1. Brainstormed on how to publicize/educate others on CT faculty positions: Fall 2024
	2. Investigation into CT faculty attrition: Fall 2024

**Ongoing Efforts:**

* The committee will work over the summer to finalize the CT faculty survey and email distribution lists. Planning for an early fall 2025 distribution.
* The committee will continue working with the Faculty Council’s Faculty Committee and Policies & Procedures Committee, as well as the Provost’s office, to integrate Career-Track faculty into the Faculty Council governance structure as outlined by the updated OSU Faculty Council Charter & Bylaws and updated OSU Policies and Procedures
* Plan to meet with President Hess early fall 2025.

**g. Faculty: James Knapp – Year End Report**

Knapp stated he will be terming off council and over the past two years the committee has been involved in trying to revise a number of university policies to bring them in alignment with the addition of 850 Career Track faculty members to Faculty Council. This was a major accomplishment of the committee’s work of the last several years. We began this year with high hopes of revising a number of different policies so there is one umbrella policy that addresses all of what we now refer to as the General Faculty. This included what’s called the policy statement, the RPT document 0902 and the workload policy. As time went on and the events of last year played out, it became clear that our best hope would be to try to get something across the finish line and we focused on the reappointment, promotion and tenure document. But as the semester drew to a close it became clear that the number of revisions that we are proposing to the document are significant and some still remain unresolved despite our best efforts working with both the Faculty and Career Track Committees as well as being in close communication with the Provost’s office. The proposed revisions to that document is 21 pages. It became clear that even were we to get this through Faculty Council it would be impossible to get all this through for the Board of Regents meeting in June. It would also be illegitimate to try to change the policy in the middle of an academic year which starts on July 1. In consultation with the Provost’s office, we decided it would be best to put this document out to the Faculty Council and work towards a final set of revisions over the course of the fall with the hope of a conclusion sometime in the fall semester. Let it go through the approval channels and hopefully it will be in place for fall of 2026. There is no action being requested at this point. There has been a lot of hard work that’s already gone into this document. It represents input from the Provost’s office, the Faculty committee and members of the Career Track committee. Knapp invited everyone to take a look at it and be in contact with your faculty councilors to bring the recommendation to Faculty Council. Slevitch encouraged everyone to look at the changes, consult with your colleagues and get back to the Faculty Committee.

Faculty Committee 2024-2025 Annual Report 09 May 2025

**Members:**

Chair: James H. Knapp (Boone Pickens School of Geology; Faculty Council)

Christopher Crick (Computer Science; Faculty Council Secretary)

Udaya DeSilva (Animal and Food Sciences; General Faculty)

Kathy Essmiller (Library; General Faculty)

Mindy McCann (Statistics; General Faculty)

William McGlynn (Horticulture and Landscape Architecture; Faculty Council)

Barbara Miller (Emerita Faculty Member)

Aimee Parkison (English; Faculty Council)

**Meetings:**

The committee met regularly from August through May on the third Monday of the month from 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. in PIO 313 and on Zoom. Some meetings were rescheduled to avoid conflicts with days in which classes were not in session. A special meeting was called on 14 April 2025 to meet with then-Interim President Jim Hess. Agendas, minutes, and supporting documents were kept for these meetings and are currently archived in Canvas.

**Recommendations/Resolutions presented to Faculty Council:**

1. The committee proposed revised language for the charge of the Faculty Committee to include a provision for at least one member from the Career-Track Faculty on the committee, which was approved by the Executive Committee on 03 December 2024 and by Faculty Council on 10 December 2024.
2. The committee, in collaboration with the Career-Track Faculty Committee, developed an extensive revision to OSU 2-0902 Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Process for Ranked Faculty, and brought this forward for discussion at the 13 May Faculty Council meeting.

**Additional Activities:**

1. Chair Knapp also served on the Career-Track Faculty Standing Committee for the 2024-2025 academic year to assist with the work of revising policies to include Career-Track faculty.
2. The committee reviewed two RPT files at the request of the Provost

**Additional Topics:**

1. Concerns from faculty about faculty retention at OSU
2. Extensive discussions about the impacts of changes in university leadership

**Ongoing Efforts:**

* Revision of OSU RPT policies in coordination with the Provost’s Office.
* Revision of Policy Statement to include clear provision for joint appointments

**h. Long-Range Planning and Information Technology: Melanie Boileau – Year End Report**

Boileau shared the following PowerPoint results from the AI survey.



Boileau stated they received a lot of good responses and feedback. Boileau stated that Chris Ormsbee presented to Faculty Council and gave tips on how to have assignments done in a certain way to make sure AI is used as a tool by students. Boileau stated there were a lot of statements from the survey that we should not allow AI at all in early education but maybe incorporating it later. We need to help students think critically and write on their own versus using AI. Another big take away from the survey was AI is here to stay and it’s not going away. It must enhance not replace learning. There were statements about collaborating with other institutions to see what practices they have in terms of AI in higher education.

Boileau opened the floor for questions. Eisenberg stated that the Humanities Faculty in particular have been discussing internally between departments because there is widespread frustration, especially in disciplines where the process of writing itself is the actual learning not just the AI generated outcome. Eisenberg asked if there were any next step action plans.



The first 2 items of the last slide seem pretty straight forward and could be action items. Which is to say, developing institutional policies that are more robust and putting in place potential training mechanisms for students. Maybe in a first-year writing seminar, or something like that. Boileau stated that the committee does not have a set of action plans past the completion of the survey. Hopefully this will lead to some plan of action. Boileau will be the chair of the LRPIT committee next year and hopefully keep the ball rolling on this topic. Francisco stated that the first and fifth strategies are inconsistent. He stated what they had decided to do in the past is allow faculty to set their own policies. Different faculty want to use AI in different ways. We've had several colleagues say, **“**I work in business and industry partners are telling me it's really important for students to learn how to use it in a particular way”. They set the policy in that way. Some colleagues in sociology say, “I don’t want students to use it at all”, and so they have that policy. Some in other disciplines have said, “I want them to use it in these circumstances, and not in these circumstances”. I knowChris Ormsby's group in ITLE has tried to give model syllabus statements that faculty could use. But I think we have tried very hard not to set an institutional policy on AI use, because we have very different views among faculty. Perkins stated maybe we're coming at this at the wrong angle. Maybe what we need to look at is the policies concerning general education and the consistent pressure to do out of class paperswith minimum page numbers and with the changing technology, it's just becoming impossible.There obviously are different disciplines, and if you have a non-gen ed course, like a business course, I could see where you'd want to use. AI. But we're mandated by the administration on Gen. Ed. to use writing. Francisco stated you are not required to use writing. Perkins stated we don't have to write 10 pages in upper divisions, Social Science courses. Francisco stated that there are two different other competency requirements you can use. You can use oral competency or visual competency.Eisenberg said then the question is if that's going to be the provision, is that going to be told to the rest of the faculty. Eisenberg stated there's no capacity to do an oral exam for a 200-person class. So, what are we supposed to do? Francisco stated he is more than happy to discuss what the requirements should be in terms of writing for general education. I mean, that's something that came up through a faculty group. If you all think that we should change that to allow in-class writing in general education, as far as I'm concerned that's a curricular sort of matter and faculty should say what they want to do on that. That's fine. I don't want to set a policy when I have a lot of different people telling me different things about what they want to do in their classes. I think at some point, if we say no one is allowed to use AI at the institution. I think that's just as problematic as if we say, everybody's allowed to use AI. Slevitch stated it's a bigger discussion, and for the sake of time she really hopes that this discussion can continue within the committee. Slevitch stated the big question is not, allow or not allow users to run, but maybe come up with some strategy that would allow ethical use of AI and assisting faculty and students in developing an ethical way of using AI. If there are no tools to control it, they're going to use it, anyway. If there are tools to control it maybe we should try them. Maybe we'll continue the discussion next year, and it looks like you brought up a very important point. It's all about policy. We need to check what policies are actually in place with regard to Gen Ed requirements. It looks like there are options that might be investigated. Slevitch stated that Faculty Council is the unit that actually has input in terms of policy and encouraged everyone to continue working on policies. Francisco stated if there are polices that need to be changed, he’s more than happy to discuss them.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

2024-2025 Annual Report

5/1/25

**Members:**

Chair: Melanie Boileau (Veterinary Clinical Sciences)

Charlotte Barker (Nurse Science/OSU-OKC)

Mark Pranger (School of Creative & Information Technologies)

Smita Mohanty (Chemistry)

Mark Perry (Music)

Stephen Perkins (Sociology)

Raj Murthy (Information Technology)

John Kirkpatrick (Emeriti representative)

**Meetings**The committee met monthly during the Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 semesters, with the exception of April.

**Additional Activities**

1. Concerns regarding glass doors in the new Agriculture and Engineering building
	* On November 25, 2024, the committee met with Jana Phillips, OSU Architect, to discuss concerns related to privacy.
	* Ms. Phillips proposed applying vinyl frosting to the side lights for improved privacy and design consistency.
	* Status: Project completion anticipated by Spring 2025.
2. Faculty Needs Assessment on Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)
	* The committee developed a 10-question survey to assess faculty perceptions regarding the impact of generative AI on student learning, academic integrity, and general education objectives. The survey also addresses the perceived need for administrative support and effective AI detection tools.
	* Created in late Fall 2024, finalized in Spring 2025, and distributed in late April 2025 to faculty across all OSU campuses (OSU-Stillwater, OSU-IT, OSU-OKC, and OSU-Tulsa).
	* Status: Survey results will be presented by the LRPIT Chair at the Faculty Council meeting on May 13, 2025.

**i. Research: Wouter Hoff – Year End Report**

Report of the Faculty Council Research Committee May 2025

The Faculty Council Research Committee worked on developing recommendations for OSU leadership to (1) gather sufficiently fine-grained data on the patterns, consequences, costs, and possible interventions for OSU faculty turnover, such that these data can provide a good estimate of the financial cost to OSU of faculty turnover, and can serve as a basis for possible future policies that can reduce this cost; and (2) to explore the possibility of creating new mechanisms aimed at enhancing communication at OSU across organizational levels to improve approaches to effectively institutionalize lessons learned during large external grants and to enhance success both in obtaining limited funding opportunity grants and in bringing them to success. These two documents were not yet sufficiently developed to bring to a Faculty Council vote but will be available for the Faculty Council Research Committee in Fall 2025. In addition, the Committee worked with Dr. Christine Johnson on an important update to the OSU policy on Complaints of Research Misconduct. These updates are necessary to bring the OSU Policy on Complaints of Research Misconduct in compliance with the new guidelines released by the United States Office of Research Integrity in September 2024 and will also clarify various parts of the OSU policy.

**j. Retirement & Fringe Benefits: Mark Weiser – Year End Report**

**Members:**

Chair: Mark Weiser (MSIS)

Members:

* James Huston
* Deana Hildebrand
* James Huston
* Cheryl Mihalko
* Tonia Sharlach
* Christa Louthan (HR ex-officio)
* Joe Haley

**Meetings:**

Scheduled monthly, held as needed.

**Activities:**

Last year, the committee reviewed the revision to the Staff Sick Leave Policy, 3-0716. Although it did not deal with faculty issues, this section of the P&P has a routing through faculty council and was directed to our committee for review and recommendation which was accomplished.

We extended this work to review the Faculty Sick Leave Policy, 2-0113, creating parallel changes and updating the language to mirror the Staff Leave Policy. Vote was delayed on this policy multiple times awaiting input from OSU legal but was eventually approved by the Executive Committee and Faculty Council.

**Ongoing and Efforts:**

We have begun a review of non-pecuniary benefits to retirees and expect to continue this in the fall.

With the change in OSU leadership, there are indications of willingness to more actively pursue Stillwater Medical Physicians return to tier 1 status under Blue Cross Blue Shield. We will explore if and how Faculty Council might be able to support this effort.

We expect to meet with the President in September, 2025.

**k. Rules and Procedures: Christopher Crick – Year End Report**

Rules and Procedures
2024-2025 Annual Report
May 13, 2025

Members:
Chair: Christopher Crick (Secretary)
Lisa Slevitch (Chair)
Stephen Perkins (Vice Chair)
Brandt Gardner (Past Chair)
James Knapp (Geology)

Meetings:
Ad hoc as needed

Recommendations/Resolutions presented to Faculty Council:
The R&P committee consulted with the Faculty Committee in developing the policy recommendations which they reported out.  See that committee's reports for details.

Ongoing Efforts:
A number of bylaw, charter and policy revisions are in the works.  In particular, work proceeds on reworking grievance procedure policies, as the current policy is decades old and outlines unworkable procedures.

**l. Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Heather Yates – Year End Report**

Student Affairs and Learning Resources

2024-2025 Annual Report

May 9, 2025

**Members:**

Chair: Heather Yates (Engineering Technology)

Babu Fathepure (Microbiology and Molecular Genetics)

DJ McMaughan (Public Health)

Simon Ringsmuth (Library)

Candace Schell (Teaching, Learning, and Educational Sciences

Roha Kaipa (Communication Sciences and Disorders)

Regina Henry (Emeritus)

Bella Ridner (SGA)

**Meetings:**

Monthly

**Recommendations/Resolutions presented to Faculty Council:**

No recommendations/resolutions presented to the Faculty Council

**Additional Activities:**

* Discussed Meazure Testing Platform
* OER Documents Presented to FC

October 2024

* Worked on relationship with SGA Student Representative

How we can help SGA

Need engagement from GSGA

**Additional Topics:**

Meazure Testing Services Conversation Requested

* Addressed by Provost Mendez in FC in March
* Presentation made by VP Ormsbee at FC in April

**Ongoing Efforts:**

* Online Testing and AI Detection
* Improved relationships with SGA and GPSGA

**Unfinished Business** – None

Before passing the gavel to Perkins, Slevitch stated that it has been a privilege to work with everyone. She is excited to move to Past Chair, but it is bittersweet because this group has been such a good group to work with. She feels she has learned a lot. She is grateful for the relationship she has built with everyone. Following a long-established custom, Perkins presented Slevitch with an engraved gavel. Perkins stated that it has been a real privilege to work with and learn from Slevitch. She has been a great mentor, and he looks forward to working with Heather Yates as Vice Chair next year. Perkins also thanked Gardner for his service as Past Chair. Slevitch asked everyone to join them in the Stateroom in the Atherton for a celebratory drink.

**New Business** – None

Slevitch asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, August 19, 2025 in room **126 ITLE**.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Crick, Secretary