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

Also present: Clausen, L., Colquhoun, C., Francisco, C., Hawkins, C., Horton, M., Lacombe, V., Maynard, R., Mendez, J., Peaster, R., Royer, T., Sewell, K., Shrum, K., Spaulding, S., Thomason, K. and Washburn, E.

Absent: Fathepure and Gonzalez.

**HIGHLIGHTS**

Special Reports: No Reports………………………….…………………………………………..

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

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, established that a quorum was present, and brought the meeting to order. Slevitch asked everyone 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 question(s) 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 October 8, 2024 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. Hoff moved and Lawson seconded the motion. Slevitch stated that it had been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. Slevitch asked those in favor to enter their vote in the chat. Those opposed do the same. Motion passed and the agenda was adopted. Slevitch stated we have no special reports today and moved to the Presidents remarks and comments. President Shrum, the microphone is yours.

**President’s Report and Comments on matters of interest to the faculty – President Shrum**

Shrum stated at the last meeting she discussed briefly faculty salary compression and that we were going to be looking at new budget models, looking at what other universities do. Shrum stated they are working to find some time this semester to meet with the Faculty Council Budget Committee. She understands they have some presentations for her and hopes to find a time this semester to meet with them. In the vein regarding budgets, Shrum wants to talk a little bit about what they are doing in the upcoming legislative session. Some back history: as they looked over the budget model from last year, OSU waived roughly $90 million in tuition revenue between in state and out-of-state students. This is certainly not an inconsequential amount of revenue that we waive each year. Shrum stated that greater than 85% of those waivers have gone to critical workforce majors as identified by the State of Oklahoma. Thinking about how we moved toward this type of model, the major Higher Education budget cuts around 2008 really lead to a shift in how we were budgeting. Shrum thinks the strategy at the time was to allow colleges to increase fees and to focus on increasing out-of-state tuition. As time has gone by and with growth, it’s become more and more important to have a good mixture of out-of-state and in-state students. At some point, OSU got to where we were not competitive for out-of-state students from a tuition standpoint. We made the decision to start waiving out-of-state tuition. At the same time, we really had not increased in-state tuition. Our revenue model was to make money on out-of-state tuition, and then we started waiving it. Now, while we do create a surplus in revenue, the $90 million could be going back into faculty pay and to facilities to support research, as well as providing the infrastructure to continue providing the services and education that we do. We’ve been looking at how to correct this problem. As we look at the models moving forward, Shrum feels it’s important for us to talk about what we want to do in the legislative session this year. Shrum stated that OSU gets their state funding from three different agencies. 1. The OSU Medical Authority is a separate state agency that supports the OSU teaching hospital. There is a trust that owns it, and it’s set up to support the Center for Health Sciences teaching, research and provide a place of practice. 2. The OSU Vet Med Authority was created in the last two years and the money that goes here is passed through to support the teaching hospital for Vet Med. The third source for the system is through the Higher Education Regents. Shrum stated that each of these entities will have an ask that will be taken forward to the legislature for funding. The Medical Authority and Vet Med Authority will be asked for funding for those hospital related entities. Shrum stated that we will be asking for $75 million in excellence funding that can go towards replacing the tuition waivers so we can invest this in faculty and infrastructure and research. Shrum stated they met with the State Regents, and this has made it into their legislative request. This is in partnership with OU. OU has similar issues and we’ve been trying to work together to toward this Excellence Fund. This will be going through the State Regents and it’s in their budget. Shrum stated that this is the first year that the State Regents have put into their budget a separate item for OSU and OU. Shrum thinks this is really important. They met with the State Regents because they are looking at making some adjustments to their funding formula. The funding formula has been in place for a long time. They have done some incentive pay through the legislature to Higher Education. When you look at how much increases and where the money goes, it does not benefit the research universities as much as it does the other institutions. When Shrum met with them she requested they consider, as they start to look at the funding formula, that they go to a tiered system where OSU and OU are in an R1 category, and our funding formula looks different. She also asked them to consider four year schools in a tier and the two year schools in a separate tier. These tiers would have separate funding formulas. One of the things Shrum found out, which is important, is as they are calculating per student funding, they look at how we are compared to OU. The funding that goes to extension is rolled into that per student funding. Shrum has asked them to pull this out of these calculations. She does not want funding removed from extension, but extension funding does not go directly to student education. Shrum stated if you are comparing apples to apples when compared to OU, we need to be compared based on our funding for teaching and research just like OU. Shrum is hoping as this starts to play out, we’re not trying to take money away from OU, we are just simply trying to say let’s compare funding as it should be based on teaching and research. Once we see this, we will be able to have more conversations about the level of funding at OSU. What we hope through this excellence funding is that it would be a recurring $75 million into our revenue stream annually. Hopefully we will have a way to increase this over time. If we are successful in doing this, Shrum feels this will go a long way towards addressing some of our needs as we continue to grow. The state would like us to continue to grow our student body and we need to address some of these issues in order for us to continue to grow. Shrum opened the floor for questions. Hoff is super excited about the updates. At earlier meetings, President Shrum had mentioned a goal to provide funds for more need-based scholarships through donations. Hoff asked how, over time, this will roll out. Will OSU then provide scholarships instead of waivers? Hoff asked if the tuition funds will still come to OSU just not from the student but from an endowment. Hoff feels this would be a great way to give waivers without losing tuition. Is this correct? Shrum stated that is correct. We still have this strategy going forward with our campaign. But in the immediate term, while we’re trying to raise dollars, we have to address this if we want to continue to grow. Over time we will move both strategies forward. So yes, the idea would be that at some point we are able to bring students here and be competitive on a scholarship basis rather than a waiver basis. Great point. Knapp thanked President Shrum for laying this out for everyone. Knapp feels that many of us do not fully appreciate the way that the budgeting process works within the state. It sounds like you are trying to lead us in the right direction by acknowledging the fundamental differences between these institutes of higher education. Knapp said thank you for leading this charge. Shrum stated that she likes to compete with OU but not when it’s to the detriment of both universities. Shrum and OU President Harris have had conversations that we need to distinguish ourselves. We aren’t competing with other R1s in the state. We are competing for students nationally with other R1s and we have to compete on a funding level. What has been happening is we all get lumped together. If the state wants to give funding toward Engineering, we see a lot of Engineering programs start to be approved. When you look at where the money goes within the system, it doesn’t impact our budget, even though we have a larger percentage of students and represent a larger budget within in the State Regents. It doesn’t move our needle. Shrum feels the State Regents and the new Chancellor are very interested in this. The first time she met with President Harris there was a proposal for us to create a model where everyone would agree to measurable outcomes. Shrum believes what would happen in this system is money being drawn away from the regional schools and potentially the two-year schools with this funding formula. Shrum’s concern at the Legislature is that there are more regionals and two-year schools located in districts for Senators and Representatives so if we were successful in implementing this, she feels it would hurt us later. Instead, the conversation is about how to let those schools thrive. If there are others that have aspirations to be an R2 or whatever they want to do, incentivize them based on this. But let’s separate out the R1s so that Oklahoma can be competitive with other states for students that we are actually competing for. We are not necessarily competing for out-of-state students with our regional schools. Slevitch thanked Shrum for the update and stated that we are learning a lot, and we appreciate all your efforts in this regard. Slevitch stated that at the last meeting between the President, Provost and Faculty Council officers, Shrum agreed to meet with Faculty Council committees starting with the Faculty and Budget committees. Slevitch stated we will be working on scheduling and making it happen. We do appreciate your efforts to connect with us.

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

Mendez stated there was just one recommendation. It is to UAR regulations 3.10 and 3.11, prohibiting curricular duplication scenarios. This recommendation has moved its way through the system and will go to the Council of Deans this Thursday. Mendez expects this to be implemented by the next Faculty Council meeting and then we’ll be back to a clean slate until we have more recommendations. Mendez stated that she and Eric Polack, Interim Senior Vice President of Administration and Finance, had recently traveled to Washington DC to meet with EAB. They had sponsored fiscal officers, CFOs and Provosts of R1 schools. They met with some colleagues and heard a lot of innovative things that other universities are doing. We met with our team at EAB as well to see what we can be doing this year to position ourselves well as the search for our new CFO is going on. We are making this request for new funding. We are experiencing enrollment growth. We are doing some workshops with the Deans and will include the Faculty Council Budget committee. Mendez feels we will have a good chance this year of doing some preliminary data to benchmark where we are to hopefully be successful with this request. We would know where we need to target, not just in terms of faculty salaries and retention efforts that we’ve talked about but programmatic growth and strategic initiatives. It was a great time at EAB and she looks forward to sharing information in the coming weeks and months about what we will be doing. Mendez opened the floor to questions. Knapp asked how her recent trip to China went due to the climate for international travel. Knapp stated they were just asked as faculty to sign an agreement or identify all the IT equipment that might potentially travel. Knapp asked her to share her recent experience with the council. Mendez stated that yes, she did travel to China. They were going to a celebration for our partnership with China Agricultural University. Five people from OSU went on the trip. They all had the same briefing on “best practices” and “recommendations”. She stated that all five people did things a little differently. She opted for what she determined to be the safest route. She did not take a computer. She turned off her email. They were gone Wednesday, Thursday, Friday then the weekend. She was a little more out of pocket than she liked. As Provost, she had a little more scrutiny on the trip. She had to meet with the FBI beforehand and they gave her their recommendations on whether anyone should have access to her email and what they then could access. So, she really locked it down. Others on the trip did Wi-Fi and other things. She abided by all the rules that were given to her. Knapp asked if there is a mechanism whereby the university could post appropriate information for people who are going to travel. It may already be out there and he’s not aware of it. Mendez asked Dr. Sewell to jump in with comments. Mendez did state that this China trip was a test case as well. They were given clean laptops if they wanted to bring them. The Ag Econ department purchased a burner phone for their department head because there could be an opportunity for this department head to travel more frequently to China or that faculty would go and teach at China Agricultural University. Mendez knows that there was a test case for this. Sewell stated that there is quite a bit of information on the OSU Global webspace for international travel. Sewell stated they are collecting this information for a single website on things related to research security. There will be an entire section on international travel. Sewell does not believe this website is live yet but knows it is under construction and pretty close to going live. Sewell stated they have been talking a lot about various aspects of research security and international travel making sure that people have access to information and what they need to do ahead of time. What’s inadvisable and what’s advisable by country. We want all this information available in one place for everyone.

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

**Kenneth Sewell – Vice President for Research**

Sewell thanked Provost Mendez for meeting with the FBI and being part of the test case. This helped her understand what we need to do for everyone around international travel and the international concerns that we have with research security. In regard to research security, Sewell stated that last year we did a revision with plans to come back for more changes to our complaints of research misconduct policy. Since we did those last revisions, the Federal Government agency that handles this, the Office of Research Integrity, has published a new final rule on how universities are to respond to complaints of research misconduct and how we are to communicate with funding agencies when allegations are tied to federally funded projects. Sewell reminded everyone that research misconduct is not inclusive of every bad thing a person might do in the context of research. This is data falsification, data fabrication and plagiarism. It’s confined to these topics. We are working on a brand-new policy that will be more detailed than the previous policy because this is what the Federal Agency is asking us to provide. This new policy will be lockstep in sync with what the Office of Research Integrity asks for. We have tried to customize it and make it sensible for our context. Sewell just reviewed the first round of this policy. It will go to Legal Counsel then to VP Polak’s office. Sewell expects this to come to Faculty Council for review. This will be a highly detailed multiple page document and Sewell wanted to give everyone a heads up. We must do it this way in order to be compliant with the Federal regulations. Slevitch thanked Sewell and stated that the Faculty Council Research Committee can handle it. Slevitch opened the floor for questions. Knapp asked, regarding the plagiarism piece, whether there is going to be a university wide mechanism that we can run documents through without fees. His current understanding is we still have to pay a fee to use the service. Sewell is aware this conversation is moving forward. We are trying to go from a fee-based service to a subscription service that can be utilized on an at will basis. We haven’t figured out where the dollars for the subscription service will come from yet. He said he’d get back to us on this. Knapp stated especially whether it’s proposals, manuscripts or anything written. Knapp said the potential for being flagged for plagiarism, even self-plagiarism, is really off the charts at this point. Sewell agrees but stated one clarification to the term self-plagiarism. The new final rule has clarified that self-plagiarism is not plagiarism under the rules of the complaints of research misconduct. Sewell stated there may be certain standards with particular journals or within particular research communities about repeating language that one has published elsewhere. But the concept of self-plagiarism no longer falls under research misconduct. Hoff stated that in his department they have a qualifying exam where students need to write a research proposal. They created a site on canvas where students can check for plagiarism, if they have plagiarized. Hoff stated it may be as simple as an open course where everyone can enroll, submit documents and have Canvas do it for them. Sewell stated that he is not an expert on this particular issue. He does know that the databases that are accessible to the service we’ve been using that Knapp was referring to is iThenticate. Sewell believes the Canvas service is more associated with Turnitin. This service combs the web but does not necessarily grab Federal publications, Federal proposals or Federal grant documents which we definitely want for our own scholarly work. Hoff stated understood and thank you.

Dr. Sewell sent this follow up information regarding software and plagiarism:

*Jim Knapp asked the question about software that OSU faculty and graduate students can use to flag sections of text (in manuscripts, grants, etc.) that are at risk of being considered as plagiarized. As he mentioned that software (called iThenticate) is currently available to OSU users on a pay-per-use basis. He asked about whether we could move to a service that would not require faculty/departments to pay for it on a per-use basis. Here is my update:*

*Prior to Dean Morgan’s arrival as our new Dean of the Graduate College, we were pursuing the possibility of a partnership between the VPR Office and Grad College to fund subscription-level access to iThenticate. Although Dean Morgan and I remain very enthusiastic about the importance of a tool like this, there are some budget constraints that are preventing us from moving forward immediately without an identified source of permanent/budgeted funding. We plan to discuss this matter with Provost Mendez (copied here) very soon and develop what we hope will be a workable plan. More to come!*

**Faculty Council Chair’s Report:**

Slevitch stated that in the last few months she has received several inquiries from faculty, most of which are concerns about salary and salary compression. These have been addressed. Other inquiries she has received are regarding long-term care insurance and if OSU would be willing to provide it as one of our benefits. She forwarded this inquiry to the Retirement and Fringe Benefits (RFB) committee. Weiser, RFB committee chair, clarified that this is under review for next year. They have not committed to it yet. Weiser anticipates that it will be offered but what the price tag is he doesn’t know. This was dropped when our previous vendor stopped including this coverage and it hasn’t been reviewed since then. Slevitch stated based on multiple inquiries and the results of the benefit survey it looks like something faculty and staff are really interested in. Slevitch hopes they will provide it next year. Slevitch received several inquiries regarding new buildings on campus. She forwarded these to the Long-Range Planning and IT (LRPIT) committee. These inquiries are related to classrooms and offices that have clear glass doors/windows. They are transparent and do not have any frosting or blinds, which presents several concerns for faculty, including safety in terms of an active shooter situation or the inability to have privacy or concentrate because of constant interruptions. The committee is looking into and working on this.

Slevitch mentioned that she has met with the college level Faculty Council from Vet Med. We had a good conversation. This made Slevitch think that it appears that there is a certain disconnect with college level faculty councils. She hopes to meet with the other college level faculty councils to establish a mechanism that would provide good coordination, maybe a liaison, so we can work with them. If anyone has questions or comments, please let me know.

**Report of Liaison Representatives:**

* 1. Emeriti – Tom Royer

In our September program with Scott Petty, Pistol Pete No. 40, shared stories and history about our OSU mascot. It was well received

Our October Monday Night Dinner included a program with Dr. Melinda Cro, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Cro has been on the job here in Stillwater for about four months. She holds a Ph.D. in romance languages from the University of Georgia. Dr. Cro comes to us with 15 years of experience, most recently from Kansas State University. She shared stories about her perspective as a teacher and the role of the Arts and Sciences College in a Land Grant University.

The location of our November Monday Night Dinner program was relocated to the Stillwater Community Center due to weather. We had a Veteran’s Day theme, similar to last year. The speaker was Lt. Col. Michael Cheatham, the commander of Detachment 670, Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (AFROTC), Oklahoma State University. The AFROTC Color Guard also attended Like last year, a “flag” quilt made by Priscilla Gerfen was given to one of the Emeriti’s retired service members in attendance (name).

Member Gary Sherrer, past president of the Emeriti Council, recently traveled to Durant where he received the 2024 Distinguished Alumni Award from Southeastern State University. Congratulations to Gary on this well-deserved recognition of his achievements, success, and service.

Volunteers from our Emeriti Association are serving as Ambassadors on football game days at the Alumni Association. We provide teams who welcome guests to the “tailgate” celebration offered by the Alumni Association and assist with crowd direction and support. Joyce Sherrer does an outstanding job facilitating this effort by our Emeriti Association volunteers.

New Members of the Emeriti Association: Nancy Dryden Joe Groshong Joe Berry

* 1. scholarship Recipients

The recipient of the 2024-2025 Emeriti Association Scholarship is Madison Masters, a senior in Construction Engineering Technology. She is from Sapulpa. The recipient of the McCollom Emeriti Scholarship is Aidan Oehlberg, a junior Actuarial Science major, and he is from Tulsa. Both are the first members of their respective families to attend college. Congratulations to both!

Upcoming Emeriti Association Programs

The December Monday Night Dinner program, to be held on December 2, will feature the Stillwater High School’s Chorus, performing a number of the songs from their Christmas show.

Submitted by Tom Royer, Emeriti Liaison to the Faculty Council

* 1. Staff Advisory Council – Sam Morse – No Report
	2. Graduate Council – Veronique Lacombe

*Subject Matter Group Elections -* Dr. Erin Dyke was elected as Vice Chair of Group V (Education) and Dr. Yu Feng as Secretary of Group III (Physical Sciences and Technology).

*The following Academic Program Committee (APC) items* were reviewed and approved at the October Graduate Faculty Council

* + Program Requirement Change: Hidden Student Populations, GCRT
	+ Program Requirement Change: Online Teaching, GCRT
	+ Existing Program Online Delivery: Social Foundations of Education, MA
	+ Program Requirement Change: Educational Technology, MS
	+ Program Requirement Change: Educational Leadership Studies: Higher Education, MS
	+ Program Requirement Change: Human Development and Family Science: Applied Human Services, MS
	+ Program Requirement Change: Family and Consumer Sciences Education, MS
	+ Program Requirement Change: Human Development and Family Science, PhD
	+ Option Suspension: Human Sciences: Human Development and Family Science, PhD

*Fall 2024 General Graduate Faculty Meeting*

* Brandee Hancock, Deputy General Counsel, advised faculty on employment issues concerning teaching and research assistants.
* Updates were provided by Dean Morgan on the restructuring of matriculation in the Graduate College. The plan of study process and graduation clearance processes are being revised for efficiency. Graduate recruitment initiatives, specifically international recruitment, were discussed along with changes to the graduate calendar for the academic year.

*Upcoming deadlines*

* 3MT competition November 12, at 3:30 PM, Student Union Theater
* Priority deadline to submit Thesis/Dissertation Oral Defense Form to Graduate College, November 15
* Last day to submit Thesis/Dissertation Oral Defense Form to Graduate College to meet semester graduation deadlines Friday, November 22
* Priority deadline for online submission of electronic thesis or dissertation, and submission of Signature Approval Page to Graduate College Wednesday, November 22
* Last day to complete online submission of electronic thesis or dissertation, and submission of Signature Approval Page to Graduate College Monday, December 2
	1. Student Government Association – Sam Hiltz
	2. Graduate & Professional Student Government Association – Marcia Sun

**GPSGA Assistance/Grant/Fund Information**

The [**Fall 2024 GPSGA Material Grant Application**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2188484) is open and the due date for applications is Saturday, **November 30**. Please carefully review the [**GPSGA Material Grant Information Page**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/pages/gpsga-research-material-grant-information)available on Canvasbefore applying**.**

The [**Fall 2024 GPSGA Travel Assistance Application**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2139615)is closed. Please note that the [**Fall 2024 Travel Assistance Exception Application Form**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2218388) **(applicable to applicants who received conference acceptance after October 31)** is now open, with a submission deadline of Saturday, **November 30**. Please carefully review the [**GPSGA Travel Assistance Information Page**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2139615)available on Canvasbefore applying.

Additionally, the [**Fall 2024 Post Conference Report for the GPSGA Travel Assistance**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2195180) and the [**Post Event Visual Report for the Co-Sponsorship Fund**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2207455) are now open. Please submit the relevant documents to support the applications to Canvas. All application forms and assignments are available on the GPSGA Canvas page. The Finance Committee will review all applications at the end of the semester, as previously conducted, and applicants will be notified via email of approval decisions after all applications have been collected and evaluated.

**GPSGA Committee Assignment - Fall 2024**

The committee assignments for all GPSGA representatives and liaisons will be available to view on the GPSGA Community Canvas page.All committee members will be contacted by the respective committee chairs for a one-hour online meeting related to committee tasks.

**GPSGA and OMA Leadership Session for OSU LeadWeek – Digital Badge**

If you participated in the GPSGA leadership session in collaboration with the Office of Multicultural Affairs for OSU LeadWeek on October 3 and would like to receive the digital badge for the session, please contact marcia.sun@okstate.edu.

**GPSGA Phoenix Awards**

The GPSGA Phoenix Award applications are open from **October 28, 2024, to March 10, 2025**. Late submissions will not be accepted. Please review the criteria and complete the form accurately. The application is available on [**GPSGA Community on Canvas**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2213852)via[**Microsoft Forms**](https://forms.office.com/r/uVkiQmgTuq). Please note only one attempt is allowed, and applicants can apply for one category only. For questions, contact sonika.poudel@okstate.edu.

**GPSGA General Assembly Reminder**

The third General Assembly Meeting for Fall 2024will be held on **Wednesday, November 20, at 5:30 PM** in **SSH 035.** An online option will be available for representatives/liaisons from Tulsa and OKC.

**REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:**

**a.  Academic Standards and Policies: Mike Yough – Update**

Yough stated that the committee met last week, and he doesn’t have much in the way of updates. The committee did talk about a tentative couple of issues to address in the spring. They will have an update by the next Faculty Council meeting.

**b. Access and Community Impact: Ravi Jadeja – No Report**

**c.  Athletics: Aric Warren – Update**

Warren stated the committee is scheduled to meet next week. They did meet in October and the minutes were submitted from that meeting. They plan to have representatives from Human Resources come to the November meeting to discuss health benefits specifically related to mental health resources and access to mental healthcare. Warren wants to get together with Weiser to find out more about what the RFB committee has done regarding a benefit survey. He wants to make sure they are not duplicating the same efforts. He will be reaching out to discuss this. The committee’s plan is to establish what is out there for faculty to utilize with regard to mental health and also access to other health care types of services on campus. This will drive forward our work for the spring semester.

**d. Budget: Brad Lawson – Update**

Lawson stated that the committee is going to be very busy and that’s exciting. The committee is hoping to prepare a presentation for administration soon. As he said before, the committee’s role is to advise and support. They will have some recommendations. President Shrum mentioned doing a presentation this semester but that may be a challenge since the end of the semester is right around the corner. If they cannot meet this semester then hopefully early in the spring. Knapp asked if the committee presentation will be shared with the Executive Committee prior to moving forward. Lawson stated absolutely. They will create the presentation. It will go through Faculty Council and up the chain. This will include the Faculty Committees work on budget related items.

**e.  Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security: Cristina Gonzalez – No Report**

* 1. **Career Track: Jennifer Glenn – Update**

Glenn stated that the committee meets the first Friday of every month. At the November 1st meeting, the committee met with Vice Provost Francisco. They had a great conversation, and he was able to clarify some of the committee members’ concerns. Fransico updated the committee on some of the policy work that is in process. The committee’s big initiative for this year is working with the Faculty Committee updating the Reappointment and Promotion (RPT) documentation to encompass update Career Track issues in that document. The committee is working on some initiatives with the Faculty Committee to continue to update these documents.

* 1. **Faculty: James Knapp – Update**

Knapp stated the committee is deep into the policy revision process. The committee voted to change the charge and bylaws of the committee. This was something that was deferred from two years ago because they were working through the addition of the Career Track faculty. The committee has proposed language changes to the charge of the committee that would ensure going forward that there would be at least one Career Track faculty member on the committee. This could be from either Faculty Council or the General Faculty. We are vetting this right now with the Career Track committee and hope to bring it the Executive Committee and the full Faculty Council by the December meeting. The committee is still working on a lot of other policy revisions.

**h. Long-Range Planning and Information Technology: Melanie Boileau – Update**

Boileau stated that the committee is working on two things. They are trying to put together a recommendation for the office/glass door concerns in the new Ag and Engineering buildings. The committee is scheduled to meet with the OSU Architect after Thanksgiving. We will see what is allowed then work on a recommendation. The other item we are working on is the needs assessment in regard to AI. It’s a work in progress. Boileau stated that the chair of the Policy and Planning Committee for the College of Arts and Sciences put out a similar survey. Boileau believes that Slevitch is going to reach out to that group and attend a meeting to get a sense of what their survey was asking. We do not want to duplicate our efforts. We should have a better update with a plan of action after we get this information. Slevitch stated they have been invited to their December meeting.

**i. Research: Wouter Hoff – Update**

Hoff stated the committee met with VPR Sewell. This was a brainstorming session focused on the concern that some of our strongest faculty tend to be hired away. The committee would like to bring this problem more into focus. We are in the “how can we collect the data” most effectively stage. After all the data is collected the next possible step is to try to recommend policies to reduce this from happening. Hoff stated that VP Sewell agreed to meet with the committee again in the spring. The committee is working on a first draft of what such data collection effort would look like. Following this, will be a back and forth with further communication before it proceeds.

**j**.  **Retirement & Fringe Benefits: Mark Weiser – Update**

Weiser does not have a report but wanted to make a comment to Warren, chair of the Athletic, Health and Wellness Committee. One of the things that Weiser has mentioned before is that they are revising the faculty leaver policy to parallel the staff leave policy. One of the issues in this policy was the definition of mental health care and include this in the policy. Weiser wants to get together with Warren to discuss these issues.

**k.  Rules and Procedures: Christopher Crick – No Report**

**l.  Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Heather Yates – Update**

Yates stated that the committee met yesterday. They are trying to fill two positions. One was on the financial aid appeals which they have covered. Yesterday they received one on the Open Educational Resources Board. The committee talked about the Meazure testing. They are still gathering information about this. They want to know how it works for faculty because it’s a recent switch in online testing.

**Unfinished Business** – None

**New Business** – None

Slevitch asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, December 10, 2024 in room 412 Student Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Crick, Secretary