

INSTRUCTION COUNCIL

MINUTES

Thursday, June 27, 2024
126 ITLE or Zoom

<https://okstate-edu.zoom.us/j/94152939415?pwd=YzdXM2MwTnF4bTZqUoRnNy8rU1FYUTog>

PASSCODE: 649494

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

In attendance: Shannon Baker, Laurie Beets, Chad Blew, Kyndal Campbell, Aaron Christensen, Cynda Clary, Andrew Doust, Craig Freeman, Richard Frohock, Jami Fullerton, Diane Jones, James Knecht, Matt Lovern, Marlys Mason, Rita Peaster, Carisa Ramming, Jerry Ritchey, Adrienne Sanogo, Candace Thrasher, Ronna Vanderslice and Chris Francisco, Chair.

1. General education update and discussion - Chris Francisco

C. Francisco presented Instruction Council (IC) members with a General Education status update. The deadline for the draft of the GenEd trails is July 8, 2024. Trail drafts will be sent to IC, as well as a group of college/department advisors who are not involved with Freshmen orientation, in an effort to gain feedback regarding workable degree sheets.

The Strategic Priority trails are a little different than GenEd trails. The GenEd trails we are developing this summer are from faculty who teach GenEd, who are invested and understand the perspective. The Strategic Priority (area) trails were developed by groups that were selected more for their research areas. A number of the Strategic Priority trails will require additional revisions to make sure the pools of courses make sense, as well as to simplify the paths that students are offered so that advising is a little less complicated.

- Farm to Fork trail is ready
- Leadership trail is close to ready – students are required to take a D (diversity) designated course and a G (global competency) designated course that would lend well to leadership
- One Health trail should be ready by fall
- Energy trail should be ready by fall

R. Frohock added that he sees a significant number of first semester students taking Introduction to Philosophy, which has an “H” designation. C. Francisco will discuss with the department head of Philosophy, Shannon Spaulding, adding philosophy courses to the trails.

C. Francisco stated that all trail proposals received had eye catching names, however we need to be cognizant of what appears on the transcript. R. Peaster clarified that only 30 characters are allowed on the transcript. Adding “general education” to the GenEd trails was also discussed. Students may resonate with the more informal names, while recruiters will be looking for more formal wording. We need to show students that these trails consist of interesting material, and they will benefit from the courses. Possibly we could use the informal name with the formal name in parentheses when approaching the students with these trails, but use only the parenthetical name on the transcript. If other ideas occur, please share.

C. Thrasher discussed the intricacies of the CourseLeaf program. Through general education discussions Academic Affairs met with Registrar’s Office (RO) to discuss the next curriculum cycle. The CourseLeaf software has its challenges for this transition. We have been forced to stop any new modifications from being submitted within the CIM programs so that we can publish the 2024-25 catalog. Once the catalog is published, we will work with the RO to update the general education block for all undergraduate courses. When complete, we will open up CIM programs again for departments to submit curriculum requests for the 2025-26 catalog. Catalogs should be published August 1st. In mid to late August, the software should be ready to accept changes, provided all updates to the general education block have been made. Fortunately, OSRHE is moving through our submissions much faster. Once we achieve our internal approvals, receiving

acknowledgement from OSRHE is quick. Modifications are typically approved within one (1) week, new certificate approval is approximately two (2) weeks, and new program approval takes somewhere between six (6) to nine (9) months. If there are modifications that are needed during this down time you are free to create a mock degree sheet and submit it for approval. Once the system is open, someone from that department will need to input the information. D. Jones added that on the course action side, we can proceed as normal. She also clarified that she is working with the College of Arts and Sciences for new course numbers, and she will gradually work in everyone else.

2. Instructor qualifications – Chris Francisco

OSU policy 2-0906 regarding verification of instructional faculty qualifications contains some intricacies that do not make sense, such as annual verification of qualifications. Once the department verifies the instructor's qualifications there should be no need to verify annually. Currently hired instructors qualify for these positions based on their degrees. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) has changed its requirements, allowing more flexibility for the institutions to determine what makes sense for us. With that being said, we will continue to operate with the more conservative approach – hiring individuals with the proper qualifications for the position under the more stringent standards, with the caveat that it is possible to hire someone without the standard qualifications if there is justification as to why. C. Francisco would like to receive all justifications or “Tested Experience Forms” for review prior to allowing the exception. Link to the form is listed below: <https://adminfinance.okstate.edu/site-files/documents/policies/verification-of-instructional-faculty-qualifications.pdf>

Please make sure your department heads are aware of this policy and route the exceptions to C. Francisco. It is the intent of C. Francisco to have this particular policy revised prior to the HLC visit in April, 2026.

3. OSRHE policy update – Chris Francisco

There has been some transition within the personnel at the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE), and Dr. Stephanie Beauchamp is serving as interim Vice Chancellor. Recently there was a 2.5 hour Council on Instruction meeting where policy revisions were discussed at great length. One of these policies was the Repeat Policy, and the concern was that the policy was not programmable. It was C. Francisco's understanding that the repeat policy allows students to be able to take a course four (4) times and use the highest grade for GPA. They may continue to repeat the course again for as many times as they choose, however those grades will all affect the GPA.

Also discussed at COI were confusing issues with the Institutional Admissions policy. The 15 unit core requirement mentioned in policy 3.9.2 section A versus a 17 unit core requirement in policy 3.9.3 section A.3 leads to the question of which one is correct. There was a call to vote on this policy yesterday, and C. Francisco announced that he could not vote on it in good conscience until his questions were addressed. The admissions policy was eventually pulled.

The OSRHE Reprieve and Renewal Policy specifies currently enrolled students. We receive requests on a regular basis from former students where we would like to be able to allow reprieve or renewal, and we have been allowing these, so we will need additional clarification if the intent was to preclude these requests.

OSU was also interested in the Corequisite Policy and whether our corequisite setup for our STEM classes meet the new State Regents recommendations for Coreq. C. Francisco was informed that our Coreq does fit what they are defining as Coreq. OSRHE is viewing our setup as mandatory supplemental instruction.

4. Institutional Research and Analytics information – Chris Francisco

Prior to the IC meeting, L. Burns submitted an email to the members regarding enrollment. “Enrollment for new freshmen continues to beat all models and expectations...” For the last three years, one could have taken the orientation registrations as of May 31, added 20 to 50 students to it, and have been able to correctly estimate the census number. A reasonable estimate for Fall 2024 on that basis would be 5040 students; however, the official projection is still 4900. The number of students who have already attended orientation plus those registered for a future orientation has gone over 5000 students. Shared details from Student Affairs has given us a good understanding of their data, and a reasonable plan has been set in place for housing. This increase in enrollment is due to Admissions' terrific job of recruiting, more scholarship money available, energy with President Shrum and some of the strategic changes that have been implemented as well. We have also kept our tuition at a lower rate than many of our peer institutions.

5. Curriculum

Information Items Only: N/A

Course Action Summaries: N/A

Program Modifications:

College of Arts and Sciences

Geophysics, Minor

Change to existing minor

- Add GEOL 1214 as alternate to GEOL 3413 or GEOL 1114
- Remove GEOL 4103
- Add GEOL 4443 or GEOL 2103
- Total credit hours will remain at 24
- Reason for requested action: Updating curriculum to remove a course that is no longer offered and adding a course that will serve as the introductory course for Geology majors.
- *Initially approved by Instruction Council on 10/19/23. After approval, the course listing was restructured, and the total credit hours remain at 24.*

Motion was made by A. Sanogo and seconded by M. Mason to accept the above-mentioned College of Arts and Sciences Geophysics Minor program modification, and Instruction Council members approved.

College of Education and Human Sciences

Aerospace Administration and Operations: Professional Pilot, Minor

Change to existing minor

- Adding language to define the application process
- Total credit hours will not change
- Reason for requested action: To clarify that students must complete the competitive application process to declare the minor

Motion was made by A. Doust and seconded by C. Freeman to accept the above-mentioned College of Education and Human Sciences Aerospace Administration and Operations: Professional Pilot Minor program modification, and Instruction Council members approved.

6. Other

- A. Doust mentioned that he has received multiple complaints from faculty regarding the AI detection software being discontinued. The Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence (ITLE) team will be providing a significant amount of AI information this year. When it comes to detection software, the evidence suggests that it is not adequate to depend upon within classroom proceedings. If it is incorrect even an eighth of the time, we cannot allow it in an academic integrity hearing, as the failure rate is too high. Some instructors want the information as backup for additional proof they may have. AI systems will continue to improve and be able to mimic human language. As that happens it becomes more difficult to detect because it is a moving target. The reliability is just not there yet. C. Thrasher explained that the International Center of Academic Integrity (ICAI) is encouraging instructors to rely upon their own expertise, just as they did prior to AI, to identify signs of academic integrity violations. We need to move beyond the tool and talk to the students about the integrity of their work. There are ways to have those conversations, and perhaps investigate other options besides moving the concern to an official academic integrity case. If the student actually prepared their assignment, they should be able to have an intelligent conversation with the instructor about their writing style or references they used and answer any questions the instructor may have. As more people use tools like Chat GPT, the better the system will

become because it is feeding off all the language used. AI is literally everywhere and is not going away. C. Thrasher volunteered to present the ICAI materials and best practices to colleges and departments regarding AI.

C. Thrasher has also discovered that if students perform a quiz in Canvas, the instructor can go into their log to see the student's writing process. Canvas will track every change that is made.

Discussion concluded with thoughts on ways the university can present AI to students and how the university can rethink and assess work with AI. ITLE is creating excellent content on ways for students to effectively use AI. This is an opportunity for us to use this as a tool in preparation for industry. R. Vanderslice added that our industry partners are requesting our students be better prepared to use embedded AI within whatever content is needed. Adding that as part of the curriculum is being requested, but to use it ethically.

C. Thrasher expressed the need for caution regarding our detection services. Instructors have been known to use miscellaneous online AI detectors. It is unclear who owns the data once the work is submitted to the program. Taking the students work without their permission and running it through the online AI detector could cause data security concerns.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:03am

Minutes were recorded by K. Campell