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

Also present: Alexander, H., Atiyeh, H., Bach, M., Baker, S., Clausen, D., Colquhoun, C., Cooley, A., Croff, J., Francisco, C., Harias, Harp, E., Hiltz, S., Horton, M., Krishnan, G., Labrecque, J., Lacombe, V., Lathan, L., Lawson, J., Meints, K., Nicklas, G., Patrauchan, M., Peaster, R., Ramirez, J., Ritzatdinova, F., Royer, T., Sanborn, H., Thomason, K., Whitham, M. and Wray, K.

Absent: Boileau, Gonzalez, Hildebrand, and Riley.

**HIGHLIGHTS**
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Michael Beckner – OSU Police Chief …………………….………………………………

Budget Committee Report – Brad Lawson, Merle Eisenberg and Howard Sanborn………
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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 ……………………………………….……………...……
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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 if those on Zoom can hear OK. Seeing positive response, 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 February 11, 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. Yough moved and Gardner 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 two special reports today and introduced Michael Beckner, OSU Police Chief.

**Special Reports:**

1. **Michael Beckner – OSU Police Chief**

Beckner introduced himself and stated he’s been at OSU about a month now. He was at Southeastern Louisiana University prior to coming to OSU. I'm the new police chief here. I want to come, introduce myself, and rest assured that we work well with faculty. I've always had a really good relationship with the faculty. Y'all are the forgotten folks on campus sometimes. Everybody thinks we're here for students completely, but we're also here for faculty to make sure you have safe classrooms, and that you're able to deliver messages to the students and get them out of class. A little bit about me, I have about 30 years in law enforcement at the University of Alaska Anchorage as interim chief and then went to Augusta University or Medical College of Georgia for about a year, waiting on Southeastern to hire me as their chief. I spent the last 4 and a half years at Southeastern. Now I'm here at Oklahoma State and looking forward to the Big 12. Matter of fact, we had a faculty member at Southeastern sent me an email before I left telling me how to do the pistol thing because we do line up there, and it was the pistol thing here. He sent me detailed instructions on how to do it.

Beckner stated we have 33 officers. If you all have a student or something that you think may need some services, please reach out. Nothing is stupid to call the police about. It's very important that we have all the eyes and ears we can on campus, so we can make our students successful and intervene before something happens. I am very transparent. I believe in transparency. In the fall there'll be a monthly or quarterly thing that comes out. At Southeastern. I called it the chief’s brief. I put our stats in there about what the police have done over the last month so y'all will see what goes on campus. If something major happens I'll be the 1st one to jump out there and say that something's going on and I want to make our relationship really good. Beckner stated that we have 33 on this campus and about 6 on the Tulsa campus right now so not very many. It's hard to keep people staffed, but we're doing the best we can. We want to make sure that we have a safe environment. Beckner opened the floor for questions. Knapp asked based on your observations up to this point are there specific issues that you see concentrating on in the near term about campus safety or anything else. Beckner said they are going to look at the blue phones on campus. There's an app out there that's owned by Motorola, and it has a portable blue light phone on it. This is good for students and faculty. You hit it and it notifies us on the computer and tells us where the location is, and we can go to that location. If you have to get to safety, it actually follows you and we know where to go to come to you. The app turns essentially into a blue light. This is something that we're looking at for all the OSU campuses. This will be a good thing. Another thing we need to look at is having our officers walk through buildings more. It's a big thing I want to do. If you come out of your class, I don’t want to you to say, is there something going on? I want you to say, hey, how are you doing today? Beckner feels this is super important. We need to have a presence in buildings. This is one of the 1st things we're working on. Building relationships. Beckner stated that this is a very safe campus compared to other ones he’s been on. We're in a very safe town and have a good relationship with Stillwater PD. We will be doing a lot more training with Stillwater. If we do have something on campus, we can address it quickly. Beckner said anytime you need something shoot him an email. The website has his cell phone number and it’s available 24 hours a day. If you have something come up, or if you see something that an officer is doing something good, please give me a call so we can praise our officers for what they do? Slevitch stated that once we have the app situation figured out, we’d like to have him back. Beckner stated that he is going to the Student Government Association tomorrow night to talk to them. Once we start working things out, and work with our brand management to get everything approved, we'll send notifications out. If we get the app, we will let the faculty and students pick the name from 4 or 5 choices.

1. **Budget Committee Report – Brad Lawson, Merle Eisenberg and Howard Sanborn**



Lawson stated that Sanborn will start the presentation. Sanborn thanked everyone and state we really appreciate the time to present the information today and want to give a thanks to Faculty Council, particularly the leadership who offered a lot of support for this. Sanborn also wanted to thank the President's office, the Provost's office, Institutional Research andthe Chief Financial Officer. A lot of people provided a lot of information to us as we've thought through it. The members of the Budget committee really have invested and thought deeply about how to approach this in a reasonable and ambitious way. Sanborn will get us started, talk a bit about the background and then turn it over to some of mycommittee members.

There are a lot of reasons why this is so important. We all know, of course, we have an ambitious faculty. They contribute to knowledge in their fields. We also need to make sure that we're attracting and retaining faculty as we build programs over time. Challenges of having some of our ambitious, best, and brightest professors doing the good work that makes them attractive not only to us, but to other campuses. So how do we retain faculty is partly what's drawing us to address this now. I think there's a lot to speak to about OSU, and why it is a place to do the research that many of us do. It's a great place, in particular to do some of the important public facing research that is necessary and timely. And I think the faculty that we want here are the ones that are building connections into communities, building connections with industry and create opportunities through those connections for our students and for our graduates. Faculty, of course, do a lot of their own work on campus to support the shared governance mission of OSU. They do a lot of work, of course, in their disciplines. They do all this work across so many fields, and we do it very, very well. And I think that is something that in of itself is important. But of course, a lot of this is centered on the student, and what we do with our students through teaching them in the classrooms but also mentoring them outside of classes in student labs with student groups. The thing that Sanborn thinks is very important for us to remember with a faculty like the one we have that is ambitious, that does the work across all these departments that does the mentorship that participates in shared governance is that in OSU, in particular, we have an additional set of responsibilities that relate to our Land Grant Mission, which is predominantly a mission, a charge to service, a charge to outreach, to extension. The issue there is that not only do we have to conduct the research, involve our students, but apply those lessons in service of our state and our community. A lot of us do this. There's that extra responsibility where we want people here that spend the time that invest the time but of course have to now actually go out and do that work. In terms of the numbers which Merle Eisenberg will present in a bit, what we're proposing to do is shift the conversation to allow OSU to be better competitive with some of our peer institutions. Mindful of all the work that our faculty are doing. Considering some of the data that we've received and ultimately speaking as a colleague, as a department head, to really do the work, to make it as hard as possible to keep the good people that we want to keep from leaving. Make it as hard as possible for them to even consider other offers. If they want to make their academic home here, to spend the time with their students, to invest in our students, to invest in our communities. We want to make it as easy as possible for them to make their homes their academic homes at OSU. With that said, Sanborn turn it over to Merle Eisenberg.

Eisenberg’s portion is to describe some statistical background of how we put these things together. The provosts’ office and Institutional Research were fantastic by getting us a whole series of numbers. I can only give you a bit. Otherwise, we'd be here all day to show you all the data. But we're happy to answer questions about why we chose certain data sets, and how that works. The first thing we did was have conversations with Land Grant universities, but we used the Big 12 as our main comparison. There are all sorts of reasons why we should or shouldn't do this, but this ends up being the best way to think about these things. Similarly, as we think about this as a conference, and one of our goals is to be one of the preeminent Land Grant Institutions, we felt this was the way forward. I'll give you one snapshot of data before I turn it over to Brad, who will then walk us through what you can see on the last page of the handout, which are a series of proposals we put together. If you just want some big picture numbers, and we have this broken down again, thanks to OSU in particular, by rank, by faculty and by department. To think big, over half of departments have a discrepancy when it comes to faculty salaries of over 10%. If you're just looking at raw numbers by department and rank, we're based talking about 702 of 876 faculty members are below the Big 12 average in some way, shape or form. The number one thing to note about that, as I show you on slide six of the PowerPoint, is that this increases as you've been at OSU for longer. The more loyal and true, the longer you've been at the university, the more you're actually hit by this pay discrepancy. There are ways in which you can fix this more easily at Assistant Professor Level than you can at a Full Professor. You can see 74% of Full Professors at the university are paid worse than 10% below the average. And that's just a minimal number. The average of the average works out something like 25%. There are some departments where it's up to 50% lower than the overall average. It's significant and this is something that we want to address. Eisenberg turned the presentation over to Brad Lawson who will point out how the committee put this information together as a package.

Lawson stated this was definitely a committee effort. This was data driven. We tried to let the data drive whatever we did, whatever proposals we came up with, so I certainly appreciate the Committee on that. Now leave it to an accountant to talk about the numbers. There are two different issues or two different ways you can approach this. We broke it down into a structural issue and then a compression issue.

The structural issue would just be an overall comparison between OSU faculty versus our peers. We can talk about different peer groups. There are always different comparisons you can make but we stuck with the Big 12 comparison, because that's the data that we have. There are other comparisons you could use Land Grant Institutions, etc., so structural would be us compared to our peers. The compression issue is, like Merle pointed out right at the higher ranks. You see the discrepancy grow. This is more of a comparison within ranks of OSU, comparing assistant faculty all the way up the ranks to full faculty. We approached it in these two different ways. First, we recognize the scope of this. We're not talking about small dollar bills, and I don't think anybody would argue this. If you look at the annual salary expense for faculty, it's a little over $96 million dollars. It's like every other university. Salaries are the biggest expense, or one of the biggest expenses for any university. Same thing here. To pull us up to the Big 12 average, we're talking just under $11 million dollars or 11% increase from where we are at the moment. Again, certainly not small dollar amounts. Certainly not an easy thing to address. This also excludes benefits. For our calculations just to keep things simple, we try to be clear to say this does not address benefits. It's just straight salary issues. With this proposal, we want it to be very clear that we want to make sure we don't trade off benefits for salary. We don't want to end up having a decrease in benefits to raise salary, because then, ultimately, you're not really gaining anything by doing this. First off for the structural proposal or solution we suggest two possibilities not saying either one of these would be easy.

First, just increasing salaries immediately up to the $10.8 million to get us up right up to the average. And of course, Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) adjustments after that to keep us competitive, keep us at the average with 12 schools. Obviously, that's a big hit. Immediately. Another approach is really to spread that out over 5 years. The number we put together was a 2.5% COLA adjustment plus what we are calling a step up of 1.5%. Do this for the next 5 years and you can see that it really kind of gets you up to the same place over just a longer time period.

Lawson stated as far as the compression issue and trying to find a way to adjust or address this would be focusing on the incentives part. This is internal to OSU. As you move up the ranks. Currently what we have are amounts associated with promotion. As you go up a rank, or as assistants are reappointed, there are fixed amounts associated with that. Another approach is to adjust that and then increase the amount as people get higher up in rank. Also, instead of focusing on a fixed amount associated with each promotion level, go to more of a percentage. One of the biggest changes with this is revamping the 5-year review process. One way to say it is put more teeth into that process. Once you hit tenure, we all go through it. Right now, there's no fixed amount associated with that process and one way to address this would be as part of the 5-year review process basically tie financial rewards to that process.

To be clear on this, this would be the incremental difference, for this approach would be $4.4 million. However, this would not be an immediate hit that's going to be spread out as people hit those different milestones and hit the 5-year review process. The difference between the 2 methods is the $4.4 million. But this amount is going to be spread out over a longer time period.

Lawson stated there are more details in our summary sheets.
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Lawson opened the floor for questions.

Fathepure asked when you move from assistant to associate this should happen in 5 years. In the move from associate to professor somebody can stay 20 years and never get professorship. Lawson stated this is where the 5-year review process becomes more important. Faculty can stay an associate for the rest of their career. But if you tie the financial incentives to that 5-year review process, then that's how you can bump people up at that point.

Haley remarked the percentage makes a lot of sense for the question he would like to ask. But with the compression did you take into account when calculating it, people who have awards that are contributing to their salary but should be a part of the base salary. Lawson asked if he was referring to chair positions. For example, Haley has a teaching award that comes with a $2,000 a year in perpetuity, an increase to his salary. But if this folds into part of the overall salary, then it ceases being like an additional $2,000. I think the data that we were using for these calculations. It includes the base salary plus any chairs, professorships, appointments. I don't know if the data includes additional awards. Probably it's just the overall top line. Eisenberg stated it's probably just the top line number, but that's something that we should write to note down, and we can't get to every situation. What we're trying to do is basically create a system of giving everyone a baseline raise and then also put a merit system on top of that for additional promotions. Eisenberg thinks this is the way that it would function. Knapp stated they've made a strong case of what the benefits would be of pursuing this proposal. Knapp asked what happens if we don't do it. Sanborn stated the issue is, if we're just looking at Big 12 peers, never mind the types of schools that some of our faculty have as options, where inflation has been, where funding is at certain other schools doing nothing is falling behind. Sanborn thinks the stakes here are pretty high, because we have a great faculty, and we can draw the right faculty for OSU. But in the long run, if we don't address what Merle and Brad are talking about, which is that fundamental structural issue about the difference between what we're making here at OSU and what the schools that we are like, the schools that we might even be outperforming we’re not meeting the baseline and are falling even farther behind. Some of the changes with research universities and Carnegie classifications there'll be a lot of ambitious schools to be where we're at that. If they do those investments that ae now going to have greater competition for faculty that we want to attract and keep. Eisenberg stated there's a specific way to address this for incoming faculty. For Assistant Professors, you can raise the package, but at some point, if you just keep raising those packages then there's tons of situations where the salaries are inverted in various departments. There are situations where an Assistant Professor is making more than an Associate just because they happen to start 3 or 4 years earlier. You get into this really dangerous situation, where you're not rewarding those who have been here longer and doing all the work of the university. Knapp made the comment, and I know it wasn't part of your analysis, but if I've read it correctly, you're looking at 870-900 faculty. We just added another more than 800 career track faculty to the general faculty. I realize your analysis doesn't take into account the career track faculty. But it's another piece of this. Lawson stated in this presentation we didn't have that, and we probably should have. It is in the proposal that we have. It's in the comment we made very clear. In the analysis we don't have the data on career track faculty. Knapp understands they have to start somewhere. Royer stated our peer institutions were doing a more effective job of professor salaries. We're falling farther and farther behind at the professor level. What do they do? What are our peer institutions doing that’s different from what we're doing that allows them to advance their senior faculty salaries compared to what OSU is doing. Lawson stated you're going to ask me to speculate because I don't have the data. Royer didn't know if they checked or if they’d been looking at the salary structure of our peer institutions to see what they're doing and how they're addressing things. Lawson stated we didn't look specifically, or I didn't look specifically at how they were doing it. We just have the number of what they have. Eisenberg stated this is a good point and something we can explore certainly within the Big 12. We can reach out to our counterparts and ask them. Lawson stated one thing we realized very quickly getting into this analysis that we did is every department, every business school is different. Lawson suspects that when you get into it every business school is going to address it in a different way. Atiyeh would like to know what the main causes of salary compression and structural issues over the years have caused these disparities over the years. Lawson asked for clarification on the question - are you asking what we think are the main causes. Atiyeh answered yes. What are the main causes and why has this not been taken care of earlier instead of having this big compression now. Eisenberg thinks part of this depends on what aspect you're looking at. But part of the question is we've been able to offer introductory packages to new people that have created some of the structural problems. The Budget Committee has worked on this in the past, but this is the first time we comprehensively put it together as an idea, although I know that this has been circulating around for several years. Lawson stated addressing the Assistant Professors, keeping up with the market, probably a little more salient, more in front of you, easier to address than addressing internal. Atiyeh said unfortunately, this is going to cause compression for them as they progress in their tenure. Atiyeh stated you're addressing Assistant Professor now, giving them competitive packages to attract them to OSU, however, nothing is done to address the compression at the Associate and Full Professor level. This will catch them up as they basically get tenure at the institution. The question is why no real effort is there to address this. To basically have it resolved once and for all, instead of having to have this issue accumulating, and get worse year by year. Atiyeh thinks this is a good start and hopes this will bring some positive changes through this discussion. Sanborn stated we are proposing something, but there have been efforts to address this with funds available. We could talk about the aftermath of the great recession and inflation and how that's changed more recently. Sanborn thinks that's what created the conditions where we're at. He believes there have been individual efforts at the administration to try to address this very problem. Not just at the Assistant Professor level but at the Full Professor level. I think the way we've approached this thinking of it as a partnership, as we try to make this case. Now what we're trying to do as good stewards of the faculty trust here is, bring it together to help try to solve this problem to your point once and for all. There have been efforts over time, but the climate is what it is. Now moving forward, I think there's opportunities with the type of faculty we have, and the leadership we have to move forward and address this and fix it for as many professors as we can. Slevitch asked those on zoom to please type your questions and refer them to Stephen Perkins, because we have difficulties hearing you. It's going to be easier for us to address them. And another comment that I have. Personally, this is our effort to address the issues in a systematic way. So that, again, is what we are trying to do. And I believe we have several questions on zoom. Perkins stated the first one is kind of a reiteration of what you were mentioning. Are we proposing similar adjustments for career track faculty? The individual didn't hear if this was answered so. Lawson stated a similar analysis has to be done for career track faculty. Again, we didn't have the data to do that analysis with what we did. But in the proposal, the summary sheets that we have, we do specifically mention career track faculty as well. Perkins stated the second question. Do you get the sense that other universities in the Big 12 are more aggressively looking at raises, COLA and compression. My fear is, if OSU does nothing, we will only exponentially get further behind. Lawson stated again it's asking me to speculate because we did not look at other universities and what they're specifically doing. I'm not sure. We just know where we are at this point. And that's what the data says. At this point. Hoff stated it's kind of outside the scope of the committee, but I guess the elephant in the in the room will be, where does the $10.4 million dollars come from? For example, one can make dramatic changes in the student/faculty ratio that there are more students than faculty. I don't think we want to do that. So, then it becomes a very difficult challenge for our administration to try to come up with the funds. That's a big and important ask. I don't know if this is a question. Lawson stated it's an important comment. And I'll be honest, people much smarter than me get to figure this out. Because when we started this that was kind of the mindset I had individually. How do we solve the problem? Where do we get the money? Then at this point I realized this is a proposal and recommendation. It’s not an easy thing to address. I freely recognize that. This is just a proposal in different ways that we can address it. Slevitch asked for additional comments or questions. Seeing none asked for a motion to approve the recommendation. Yough moved and Fathepure seconded the motion Slevitch stated that is has been moved and seconded that we approve the recommendation. Slevitch called for a vote and asked those on zoom to record their vote in the chat. All in favor say aye. All those opposed say no. Motion passed and the recommendation is approved. Slevitch thanked the committee for their hard work and introduced Interim President Jim Hess.

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

Well, first of all, let me commend Doctors Eisenberg, Emerson, Ivy, Perkins, Lawson, Sanborn, and Shear for their work. It’s important work, because you've identified concisely the real issue that we're facing on faculty compensation. I greatly appreciate the work and the time that you all put in on it. I want to address some of the questions that were raised about money in a few minutes. I was really nervous when the new chief was in here and he said pistols firing wearing a weapon. It kind of caused me to pause. But he's a great addition to our university.

I wanted, if I may, to give a few moments of reflection on my first month serving you all. First, I wanted to thank all of you for the graciousness in which you have embraced me. I know many of you who I have worked with over the years, and some who I knew when I was here in Stillwater an undetermined number of years ago. But I greatly appreciate the graciousness which you all have embraced me and encouraged me. I want to talk for just a second about this compression and compensation issue. If you'll allow me to do that. Y'all have done a great job of identifying where we are, where that delta that gap is, and one of the things, of course, that we need to work on when I say we I mean, all of us is that, as you all have noted, the Legislature has not been exactly encouraging on higher education appropriations over the last several years. I'm going to say, the last almost 8 or 9 years. And while that was going on and I'm not making a political statement about any particular person or any party or any of that. Okay, I'm just describing a condition. And the condition is that higher education needs to be more highly valued in our state, because that is how we get to an increased state appropriation. There are other agencies and departments in the State that received appropriations when we did not. And I'm sure at the time that that occurred, the Legislature had a certain set of priorities. I'm not being critical at all of any particular person or the particular elected official. I'm just saying that for all of us the value of higher education needs to be thought of differently by our elected officials in general. I know that for all of us, including me, that political engagement is sometimes not pleasant. Now for my friend Dr. Sanborn. He enjoys these things because he's a political scientist. I want to recognize Dr. Eisenberg, that history matters and there is a history here that matters. The history is this, it's one of the disadvantages of having been around a long time is that you get to witness history, and you get to witness history repeating itself sometimes in a frustrating way. I say that to say, this higher education in our State is not equally accessed by all of our population, and for us to benefit from higher State appropriations what we have to have is more people who desire a higher education experience, and a value of a higher education experience by our elected officials. We have a lot of work to do in that regard. I take it very seriously. Let me give you a specific answer to your questions when you ask your question about where does the money come from? I have an idea for you of something that I did at Center for Health Sciences (CHS). Fiscal officers hate this idea. I just want to be upfront about that. What happens when a full professor retires? You get an Assistant Professor. Does the Assistant Professor make what the Full Professor made? Hoff stated probably yes. Hess stated that's the wrong answer. In a dark world of salary compression, you might be right, but, generally speaking, there is a delta there. I'm all for people staying into the university as long as they possibly can. I'm not encouraging anybody to retire, because I think experience matters too. I remember when I worked for Jim Halligan he had a policy that he wanted to implement when he first came. He called me into his office with the then Chief Financial Officer and he said I would like to implement a policy, and it's called no rookies on rookies. Some of you all remember this. A lot of jaws dropped in the room when he said it. His idea was our most experienced and wise professors are Full Professors, and they don't teach freshmen. Generally speaking, it's not altogether true, but generally speaking, it's relatively true. He said we ought to have Full Professors giving the students the greatest experience they could possibly have to help them see the very best that we have to offer. Conceptually it sounds great, doesn't it. I won't ask you to raise your hands about how many of you would be enthralled about the idea of teaching freshmen, but my point is, when a Full Professor retires, the money, sometimes, generally speaking is not retained in the department. It goes into a black box somewhere. We had this salary compression issue at the CHS a number of years ago. There was a faculty member that I was blessed to know, named David John. He's long since retired but he was doing the work the folks on the Budget Committee did to try to get us to a salary range that was competitive with our peers. How did we do it. It was the first go around was as a Full Professor, retired. We captured the money inside the department to deal with compression issues. Now you are going to recognize what the problem with that is. It wasn't across the institution at large. It was within one department, so it was wholly dependent upon someone retiring within a department. But over time, you're able to make progress. I recognize your point that $10.4 million believe is a big number. As I promised you, I would be totally transparent with you. If I were to stand up here to tell you today that we're going to solve a $10.4 million dollars issue starting on July one, next fiscal year, you would say, liar, liar pants on fire, and you'd be right. but we will have the opportunity to make some progress along the way. It won't all be at once. What we really need, what I expect, and I hope when we start our budget process for the next fiscal year is for the faculty to be engaged in that process. It’s important to me. Using your mechanisms about who those folks would be, it shouldn't be up to me who they are, it should be up to you all. But there needs to be an engagement process for that. Where you get into trouble on the budget is when people don't understand it, don't understand the fixed costs and all the mandatory things that are required of us. If it looks like a black box, and nobody gets to look into the black box that's not helpful to a long-term trust relationship. Which is what we have to if we're going to solve problems together. I commit to you that that's exactly what we're going to do. We should appoint someone who has a high tolerance for ambiguity, because the budget process can be frustrating, but I look forward to having the opportunity to for you all to be engaged in that with us.

I wanted to talk to you about a recent event that I know you all have read about. I didn't want you to think that I would come in here and not talk to you directly about our audit that was released, related to the Innovation Foundation. A most unpleasant experience. However, it's an isolated incident within the Innovation Foundation. The Innovation Foundation will look much different next week than it looks today. As a matter of fact, it looks much different today than it did yesterday. That's my responsibility to address the issues and fix them. We're setting about doing that immediately. There will be a budgetary impact to that audit and I'm happy to answer any questions about it. But my message is this does not in any way affect the long-term financial stability and security of Oklahoma State University. It is something that was unfortunate and it's been addressed aggressively. I'm doing it personally. I'm not delegating any of these unpleasant activities to someone else. Any personnel actions that were taken and any other unpleasant activity I'll be doing. If you look in the audit report, I put my name in every single place where it said, who is responsible for fixing this? It said, Jim Hess, Jim Hess, Jim Hess, Jim Hess, Jim Hess, one after another. The reason I chose to do that is because I think you would expect me to be responsible. We're fixing it, not delegating it to someone downstream who works in an office upstairs or downstairs. I'll be doing those personally because I owe that to you. You know that I'm accountable for any of these corrections and actions that need to be taken. I'm the accountable person. You can be assured that I'm taking it very seriously, and that we're going to get through this. It was some unpleasant public relations, wasn't it? But we're going to get through it, and we'll be stronger from it. Every time something like this happens in an organization you have the opportunity to learn from and to have systems in place to keep it from happening again. It's my pledge to you that you can count on me to be responsible for fixing any of those things that need to be fixed. Dr. Mendez has had a huge load given to her over the last few years. There are a lot of things that Dr. Mendez has had to be responsible for, and I need to be helpful here. I need to share the responsibility of a lot of things that have been pushed to Dr. Mendez, and so I am greatly appreciative of the things that she has done and those last several years, but I need to be helpful in the way we organize things. For me to be helpful in academic affairs, student affairs and research arenas. We do not live in a world anymore, in my personal view only, where a President can just be a figurehead. That is not the world we live in anymore. World we live in now requires the President to be engaged fully engaged in the research activity, student affairs and the academic functions of our campus. I'm absolutely committed to doing that. I'm going to commit whatever time it takes to do that. I've had a great time over the first month and the first cowgirl bless her heart has been to every single event. I want to tell you about what her special interests are. Her special interest is not athletics, it’s mental health. She's already started. She and I met with the SGA representative Monday morning. We have a keen interest in mental health issues for our students, our staff and our faculty. I don't mean a flyer or a reception. I mean issues about services to address people who are struggling with mental health issues. This is something all of us need to be aware of because when we're not aware of it, a tragedy strikes. We had a recent tragedy. I know that you are all aware of, and I have suffered in my family that same tragedy. I always got to ask myself this question. I wonder if I could have recognized in time who avoids that tragedy? It's a burden I get to carry every day. To address the mental health issues on our campus requires all of us to be keenly aware and sensitive to our surroundings, with our students, our faculty and our staff. We live in a high-pressure world. Now it’s much different. The first cowgirl and I are going to be taking on some mental health initiatives, and we want all of you all to engage with us so that we can avoid unpleasant, tragic circumstances that might affect all of us. You'll be hearing more about that in the future.

I won't repeat what our legislative priorities are. I told you that last month, but those are ongoing. I got up at 4:30 this morning to get to the Capitol for early morning breakfast with some members of the rural caucus, and I'm going back tomorrow for the same opportunity. Our legislative priorities are ongoing. It's a flat budget year, but that doesn't mean that we don't have work to do to get the very best we can. To make sure that our fair share and hopefully, maybe more than our fair share that would be ideal were to come to Oklahoma State University. These efforts are ongoing.

I wanted to remind you all because it's really important to me. I'm a professor first. It's the thing I love the most and I'm still teaching my classes this spring. I want you to see me as a colleague.

A faculty member, and I understand that we got all these titles and blah blah! Those are barriers and obstacles that I'm not interested in. I want you to see me as your colleague. I was before the day I was appointed; I will be every day I'm appointed, and after I'm done, I'm still going to be your colleague.

Do you have any questions you’d like to ask me. I promise to be brutally honest with you. Hoff stated you raised a very interesting plan to try to explain what this higher education thing is good for, and I have one remark and one question. Hoff thinks the challenge is that higher education is a long-term investment. So it's important but not urgent. And that's a difficult spot to be in, because you're never on the urgent list. Do you have a plan? How can faculty help. How are we going to relay that point? Hess stated I'm glad you asked me that because I should have said this, one of the things that I think we need to be higher ed in general, not just OSU higher ed is we need to be better at is explaining the economic driver that we are in this state. We're great at describing what Ag does. We're great at describing what certain types of business activity is to drive economic activity in this state. But we haven't done a real good job of describing what an economic driver higher education is in this State. We have 26 colleges and universities in this State for let's say, little over 4 million people. That's a lot of institutions for that population. Our Populist State history was a lot of places, including this place, were given choices. Would you like to have a prison? Would you like to have a university? Some days you might not be able to tell the difference, maybe. But Stillwater made a great choice. One of the things we're not telling our story about is what this state would look like without the economic driver of higher ed in it. It would look incredibly different. We haven't told that story very well and it would have been better if we had told the story when the State's revenues were escalating. That would have been a better opportunity to tell the story. Now that our state revenues are somewhat flat, headed south, not back up, we still have the opportunity to talk about the economic impact of our higher education institutions and our colleges and universities specifically, and what they mean to the State of Oklahoma in terms of economic impact. We did a study like this a long time ago, about 30 years ago, and it's time to revisit it so that we keep that in the forefront of our elected officials and our legislators’ minds. An investment in higher ed will pay dividends in the workforce and attracting new business opportunities from outside the state. This is the number one thing they always want to talk about when we're trying to recruit business to come to Oklahoma. Do we have a well-trained workforce? Unfortunately, that definition of a well-trained workforce sometimes doesn't include higher ed. It includes a different type of preparation in higher ed and I think that our opportunity, in answer to your question, is about describing what economic impact is in our state, and what it would look like if we weren't here. Gardner stated I know that money talks, and that's kind of what we're getting at here. How do we get the State of Oklahoma or the politicians in Oklahoma to value higher education more, or to see the value in it. Gardner stated there is the economic driver argument, which is a big one. There's another one that we don't talk about all that much, and I wonder if it might make more of an impression on certain politicians. That is that education is a stabilizing influence in our families and our marriages in the State of Oklahoma. On social indicators as a state, we're struggling. One of the ways to help is to get an education. The more educated our young people are, the more likely they are to be successful in their families, more likely they are to stay married and not divorce. I think that might be a message or a talking point that might sit in someone's ear for maybe a little bit longer, or maybe in a different way. Hess stated that's very well said. Divorce rates are higher for people with lower education levels. I think that's very well said. Thank you for that. Knapp stated you're making some strategic changes which are quite understandable under the circumstances. Are you at a point to comment on the future of the strategic plan that was put forward several years ago.

Hess stated first of all, thank you for calling it a strategic plan. Thank you for calling it that because it implies that there is a plan with strategy. This is my personal opinion, and you might say it's hard to separate your personal opinion from that of the institution. So be it. I think it's hard for any organization to adopt something that is so broadly described that it's hard to achieve it. I'm pretty simple-minded person, and all the people who work with me will tell you that. My simple philosophy in life is if you want something to be different, then you better do something different. That sounds simple, but I know all of you all have encountered situations personally and professionally where you do the same things and expect a different outcome and then act surprised when you don't get the outcome that you want. The way I see the strategic plan, because conditions change, I always hesitate when I'm involved in these processes to take a long view of a strategic initiative is because the world is changing around us faster and faster and faster. The way I see the strategic plan is to say, here are the things that we know that we can execute on. We get pushed on metrics all the time. What is the number of incoming freshmen? What's the retention rate? What's the graduation rate? This is how folks like me and others in this room get measured? What's the number? I'm not as focused on that cause. I'm not sure the number really means all that much in any single moment in time. What matters is what's going on around that number. What's the experience for students, faculty and staff? What's the experience circling that number all the time? I'm not as focused on getting to a number -- if we have the largest incoming freshman class in history, I think it'll be great, but it's not my focus every day. I think emphasis and our opportunity is to take those pieces in our strategic plan where we know we can execute and deliver in the spirit of our Land Grant Mission. Where we can execute on those pieces of the strategic plan and execute well and have the resources to execute well. I have no interest in trying to execute on something unless we can do it great. There's no point in being mediocre. I want us to take the pieces of our strategic plan, identify those things where we can be truly excellent, and execute all those not be so focused on something that we may not be able to execute on. I don't have any problem with strategic planning processes. I think it's a great opportunity to set vision, but it has to be executable. We have to be able to execute on that and deliver on it. Knapp stated one specific issue that has come up before this body before is the enrollment targets. Knapps gets the impression he doesn’t know this firsthand, but this was largely driven by tuition waivers, or let's say, that it was a big piece of it. At our last meeting you said this was an issue you wanted to address. Hess stated it is and thank you for bringing it up. If you reach an enrollment target by discounting your revenue stream, that's not necessarily a great way to meet your enrollment target. We are heavily dependent on waivers at this institution. It's historical in nature. It's and it's nobody's fault. I'm not blaming anybody for anything, but we do have an issue we have to face sooner than later. We must figure out what is a reasonable amount of waiver activity to get to a reasonable enrollment number. here's a condition that I think all of you are aware of if you waive tuition to get to a number, and you're discounting the revenue stream but then you must hire additional faculty or adjunct faculty to teach that higher number, you slit both wrists at the same time. I think that's a problem we must face fiscally sooner than later. When students come, there are other drivers besides tuition. There's fee revenue. There's housing. There's an economic impact on our community which is very important to our community relationship. I'm very cognizant of this. We have some really smart people all around this room and elsewhere on this campus and I'll bet we can figure out from some historical data where's the balance between the maximum number of waivers and what its impact on enrollment is. I view fee waivers like the fed uses the discount rate. You can turn it up, and you can also turn it down. But we've never turned it down. You know why we've never turned it down? Because nobody wants to take that risk. My personal view is we must hit that balance between how much we can really afford in waivers to attract the student population. And what is that balance between the maximum amount of enrollment we can achieve with a reasonable amount of waivers. Thank you for your question.

Haley is there some sort of discussion of waivers versus scholarships? It’s the same thing as far as the student is concerned. But there is a difference between cash and discounting your revenue. There's probably pluses and minuses. Everyone looks at university ranking. It could affect those rankings. There’s definitely a perception when students are applying to places, they want to go to places that sound better on rankings and how many students get scholarships when they go there. That's a number that people look at. If that metric is higher, even if the effect on the students is the same it can be a factor. Hess stated if we can replace our waivers with cash scholarships that changes the landscape of this university forever. Let's just pick a number here and do some math, Dr. Francisco. Let's say you had a $1 billion dollar scholarship endowment, and you were able to earn on average over a 10-year horizon, 6%. What's that number on 6% of a $1 billion? It's $60 million a year. $2 billion will get you a hundred $120. That solves this problem forever. But your point is exceedingly well made. The answer to this problem is replacing the waivers with a cash scholarship. Now, what does that mean? It means that, like my conversations with the OSU Foundation, our biggest priority needs to be cash scholarships. That's what we need more than anything else. I know that $1 billion, $ 2 billion sound like big numbers. And they are. But we do have the ability to do it. If we all put our shoulders to the wheel, we can raise a billion dollars and replace $7 million dollars’ worth of waivers with cash. How long do you think it would take me to make a decision about $10.4 million if we had $60 million? One of the things I've had the opportunity to learn over the last month is, I've had a lot of folks, a lot of conversations, just many conversations about conditions and I haven't had a single one described to me that money won't solve not one. If we can get to the point that you raised. Replace the waivers with cash all of our lives will be much, much different. This has to be our fundraising opportunity and our biggest fundraising challenge. There are some donors that we have who are very interested in scholarship programs because they see that as the biggest change driver or the institution.

Thank you for that. That's really the answer. Emerson asked if Hess has had conversations with the legislature about this. My pessimism about this whole thing is that we would get that money there and then it's well, we're just going to cut your budget even more because you've already got it. Hess doesn’t think that's pessimism. He thinks its triumph of hope over experience. Hess thinks that one of the things that we can be assured of with the economic cycles being where it is, is we're going to have a budget reduction, no matter what happens. It's going to happen. We must prepare ourselves for that and to be brutally transparent and honest with you we have some work to do to prepare ourselves for the next economic downturn. That's why I want you all to be involved in our budget preparation. We have some decisions to make. Speaking to your point directly, my belief is at least in the current political environment all bets are off. If some other folks get elected in the current political environment, I do not believe that the legislature would cut our budget if we embarked on an aggressive fundraising effort, and we're able to help ourselves. I think they would reward that behavior, not punish it. We are blessed to have the new Chancellor of higher education. He’s a close personal friend of mine. He's been a president of university. He's been a State Senator, practicing lawyer, legislative lobbyist. He understands politics, and he will be the best Chancellor we've had since the Constitutional Amendment, 1941, to create State regions. He will be phenomenal. There will be no greater champion. He believes the flagship Universities OSU and OU have not been treated fairly in the appropriation process. If you look at history, he's right. The two-year colleges and the regional colleges have been better funded than the flagship universities. The reason why, of course, is, both OSU and OU grew their enrollment at a time when the state appropriations were flat. Other institutions did not do that. They actually were decreasing in enrollment. Their enrollment was going down, and their appropriation was staying the same. They were able to have more state appropriation to spend on fewer students, whereas we grew while appropriations were flat. This has exacerbated our problems. But I have confidence that the current leadership in the Oklahoma Legislature would never punish us for an aggressive private thought.

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

Mendez stated we have no recommendations on the list. It's always good when we've sent the recommendations through, and that they've been approved.

Mendez stated one question that had come to us was about our measured learning platform for online exams. Chris Ormsby has plenty of resources that they send out in their Tuesday memo. Mendez stated she thinks there was some confusion about what was going on. At the beginning of last semester, we began using the platform Examity for online tests. Examity was bought by Measured Learning. Who at the same time bought Proctor U creating a conglomerate of proctored exams. OSU has used either Examity or Proctor U. We were going through an RFP process at the time but because Measured Learning bought the two that we had already been using, we continued with our contract and stuck with Measured Learning. Mendez stated it is a little different from Examity. ITLE in their Tuesday memo has plenty of information. They have the website with all the FAQ training tips to tell your students. Mendez gave an example, my son, is a high school concurrent student. He used Measured Learning. He used Examity for one test last semester then switched to Measured Learning. He had some problems in the middle of the semester with it. They were having some scheduling issues. We know that it's glitchy but it’s not on our end. It's on Measured Learning's end. They're doing the best they can of addressing all of that. We've got all the FAQ’s on the ITLE website. They let us know when they are having issues and we push that out to the faculty. I'm up here, not with a great solution yet, but to say, if you are having any issues, you can contact the help desk. But there's a Measured Learning IT support as well. I know faculty have had to reach out to that directly to get some of those answers. I think my son had 4 exams, one on Examity and two completely fine on Measured Learning. The one that they had some issues with the instructor just did a live zoom and zoomed all the kids during certain blocks to take the test. It was less than ideal but again, all the resources on the ITLE page.

Mendez’s other update was in the campus news yesterday in reference to the Vice President of Student Affairs. We've had four candidates, the last candidate finished today. They now will meet with Jim over the next couple of days. The search committee is convening on Thursday or Friday to compile their recommendations that they'll send to Jim and I. We feel really good about this search. We're happy with the pool of candidates. Shannon Baker co-chaired this with Karen Chen. It's been a great search. Hopefully, you had a chance to go to their forums and listen. We've received a lot of positive feedback already and we anticipate making an offer within the next couple of weeks, and that person will be joining us as soon as possible. Most likely July. I’m happy to answer any other questions.

Hoff stated that Jim correctly referred to OSU and OU as our state's flagship institutions. I wanted to bring the focus to why we are the flagship institutions. I think that has everything to do with our research and our academic excellence. I hear from colleagues that they feel under pressure from multiple directions. One is, if you look at our website, it is now very focused on attracting undergraduate students with research is now 20 clicks away. I feel uncomfortable with this. I feel we are a flagship because of that research and academic excellence. In my college, there are some financial fluctuations, and we're cutting TAs that directly eats away from the research mission. I feel that there are very good pressures on upping our educational efforts that eats away time that would otherwise be spent on research. I want to bring back enough faculty bandwidth and support for research. I don't think I have a question, more relaying concerns that I hear from my colleagues. Mendez stated I hear it. We've got Kyle Wray and Megan Horton here that are hearing your comments on the website. In terms of faculty bandwidth that is something we're talking about with the Deans and the associate Deans. Almost all of us are governed by our percent workload, and we certainly discuss that often with the Deans. We do not want to overemphasize one or the other. The great point about being a comprehensive Land Grant R1 Institution is that we are here serving all three of those parts of the mission in the triangle that we are here to serve, to provide research and to teach. Horton asked to make one clarification, research is on the top navigation of the OSU homepage. That's a global across all of our websites. So, it is at the very top. Hoff stated that he hears from colleagues who want to know when the next seminar in physics or biochemistry is. Good luck! They cannot find it. Mendez stated Horton would love it if we all collectively were adding to the campus calendar. We've talked about that a lot. We beg our colleges and departments to add those and feed them into the campus calendar. Horton requested faculty go to calander.okstate.edu to add to the campus calendar. Anyone with an Okey account can contribute, and when you add it, our team monitors that weekly and will select items to put on the homepage. Hoff stated maybe part of the issue is insufficient information. Send out a reminder to do go to the site and add your events.

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

None

**Faculty Council Chair’s Report:**

Slevitch stated her update is really, really quick. It's more of a reminder that the next election cycle is approaching. We have a full slate for Vice Chair, for the College of Arts and Sciences. We are good at Education and Human Sciences. We do need one nominee for CEAT and FCA. And we do need two nominees for Spears as well as a nominee from OSU-OKC. For the sake of time, I'd like to move to the reports of the liaison representatives who we have today.

**Report of Liaison Representatives:**

* 1. Emeriti – Tom Royer

Carolyn Gang opened the January Evening dinner, which had over one hundred members attended. Carolyne Gang. Justin Moss and Matt Beartrack shared their overview of the OSU Student FARM. Future dinners will allow us to host Chancellor Sean Burrage, President Emeritus Burns Hargis, Professor Kevin Wagner, and Senior Vice Provost Chris Francisco. We had ten “golden achievement members (members 90 or older) and welcomed Myr Lou Rollins Wade as our newest member. We also welcomed 4 new members to our group. Our upcoming 2005 Emeriti Association Directory will be coming out soon. Clem and Mimi Ward recently received the Outstanding Community Service Award from the Cimarron Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Past President Mike Woods submitted the 2024 President’s Report

We recognized obituaries for Jodelle Stout, Frank Steindl, and Gayle Ward.

Royer added he appreciates Jim Hess attending their last meeting to talk to the group about what’s going on. It was interesting and forthright and they appreciate knowing what going on.

* 1. Staff Advisory Council – Aaron Lively – No Report
  2. Graduate Council – Veronique Lacombe

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

*• New Programs:*

*•* Innovation and Change, Doctor of Professional Practice

*• Program modifications, through an* APC Expedited Review*:*

* Plant Biology, PhD - addition of "research proposal defense" to degree requirements, updating to reflect current practice
* Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, MS - remove GRE requirement
* Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Unmanned Aerial Systems, MS - remove GRE requirement, change Program code
* Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, PhD - remove GRE requirement
* Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Unmanned Aerial Systems, PhD - remove GRE requirement, change Program code

*Proposed Military Leave –* Registrar Rita Peaster presented the proposed military leave (see summary below). Proposed changes were approved following a motion and discussion.

This document outlines proposed revisions to the *Leave of Absence for Active Military Duty* policy ([Registrar](http://catalog.okstate.edu/about/registrar/) section of the University Catalog), *Graduate College Policy 7.1 Leave of Absence*, *University Academic Regulation (UAR) 6.2 Grade Interpretation*, *OSU Policy 2-0206 Adding and Dropping Courses and Withdrawing from the University*, and *OSU Policy 2-0217 Attendance Policy for Students* to ensure compliance with [Public Law 117-328. Section 3691A](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title38-section3691A&num=0&edition=prelim#:~:text=§3691A.,of absence from covered education.).

*Pete’s Pantry* – Dean Morgan reported that 42% of OSU students were food insecure in 2018 and 2020. OSU was 12% higher than the national average in 2021. About 70% of the pantry usage is from graduate students.

*The Spring 2025 General Graduate Faculty Meeting* will be held Thursday, March 13 at 1:30 PM vis Zoom.

*3 Minute Teach* competition*:* This is an opportunity for GTAs to share their teaching philosophy and give an example of how they practice it in the classroom. The preliminary round will be by video submission with a due date of March 14, 2025. The Finals will be held in-person at the Student Union Theater on Tuesday, April 15 at 3:30 PM.

*Upcoming deadlines*

* Last day to submit a Graduation Clearance From and a revised Plan of Study (if needed) to the Graduate College Friday, March 14
* Last day to file a Graduation Application with the Office of the Registrar Tuesday, April 1
* Last day for online submission of electronic thesis or dissertation, and submission of Signature Approval Page to Graduate College Friday, April 18
  1. Student Government Association – Sam Hiltz

Hiltz stated not much has been happening in Student Government this past month due to the inclement weather. We do have an update on the body President and Vice-Presidential elections. We started out with 3 candidacy pairs, but they require 500 signatures to be put on the ballot. We only had one candidate reach that amount. We had an open forum with them last week on March 5th about their campaign, and what they want to do in the future. Today and tomorrow, we are having the Presidential and Vice- Presidential election as well as elections for the living group Senators.

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

**GPSGA Phoenix Awards**

* Applications open **October 28, 2024 – March 10, 2025** (**No late submissions accepted**).
* Apply via [**GPSGA Community on Canvas**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/assignments/2213852)via[**Microsoft Forms**](https://forms.office.com/r/uVkiQmgTuq).
* Faculty and graduate student recommenders will receive the recommendation form directly from GPSGA.
* Applications are **only considered complete after all recommendation forms are submitted**.

**GPSGA Assistance & Funding**

* **Spring 2025 Travel Assistance Application is open**.
* Apply via **GPSGA Canvas** after reviewing the [**GPSGA Travel Assistance Information Page**](https://canvas.okstate.edu/courses/84470/pages/gpsga-travel-assistance-information).
* **Deadline:** **Monday, March 31** (for travel from **January 1 – June 30, 2025**).
* The **Finance Committee** will review applications at the semester’s end.
* Approval notifications will be sent via email after evaluations are completed.

**GPSGA Membership Application – Spring 2025**

* **New representatives and liaisons** must complete the **Spring 2025 Membership Application** (available on **Canvas**, submission via **Microsoft Forms**).
* **Returning representatives do not need to reapply**.
* Ensure submission for accurate attendance records.
* For questions, contact **gpsga@okstate.edu**.

**GPSGA’s Participation in University Committees**

* **Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) Search**
  + Access **CVs, bios, and input portal** on the **information site.**
  + Sign up for the **Graduate Student Leaders Dinner** with VPSA candidates and attend the forums.
* **Student Activity Fees Allocation (Group I & II)**
  + **Total Estimated Budget: $1.1 million (2025–2026)**
  + **Group I: 26% allocation** | **Group II: 74% allocation**
  + **Group I Allocation Meetings**: **Late March/Early April**
  + GPSGA will coordinate with **SGA AFAP Chair** on **student organization funding** (April).
* **Group II Allocation (Feb–April 2025) – In Progress**
  + **Departments Involved**: Arts, Athletics, Campus Life, Dining, Hargis Leadership Institute, Housing & Residential Life, Music, Theater, Wellness.
  + **Six total meetings** with final allocations **determined by April 2025**.

**OSU Undergraduate Research Symposium – Call for Graduate Student Feedback Providers**

* **Date:** Tuesday, April 22, 2025
* **Location:** ConocoPhillips Alumni Center
* **Register:** [tinyurl.com/feedbacker24](https://tinyurl.com/feedbacker24) (*Please share with interested graduate students!*)
* Graduate students are invited to **mentor and provide feedback** for undergraduate research presentations.
* **Feedback Provider Training Session:**
  + **Date:** April 16, 2025
  + **Time:** 3:30 – 4:00 PM
  + **Location:** General Academic Building B-09 (Basement)
  + **Incentive:** Earn **Level 2 Credit for Research Activities** in the **360° Critical Skills for Career Success program**.

**GPSGA Information Session - March**

* **Drop-in session** for students interested in learning about GPSGA roles and leadership opportunities.
* Encouraging participation in **Executive Board elections**.

**GPSGA General Assembly Meeting – March 26**

* **Date & Time:** Wednesday, March 26, 2025, at 5:30 PM
* **Location:** SSH 035 (In-person) | **Online option available** for Tulsa & OKC representatives

**Guest Speaker Selection – Next General Assembly**

* **Survey results on preferred topics:**
  + **Career Services & Development** (*Selected for next meeting*)
  + Research & Academic Success
  + Wellness, Mindfulness, and Resilience
  + Intercultural Competency & Academic Challenges
  + Community Engagement & Impact
* The **next GPSGA General Assembly** will feature a **Career Services & Development speaker**, based on member interest.

**REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:**

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

As I reported last month, we've been looking at course objectives and making those bound with the course in the same way that descriptions are. We've identified several challenges with that. We are in the process of forming a task group to identify those challenges so that we can bring forward a recommendation to this body.

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

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

This year our work has been centered around investigating mental health resource availability for faculty on campus. We’ve shared with this group in previous reports the list of resources available on campus. We are now to the point of identifying some of our committee objectives. Number 1: the faculty awareness of these available resources on campus. Number 2: are our faculty’s mental health needs being met on campus. Do they feel that there's a current level of support to meet their needs. And number 3: do faculty feel prepared to be able to recognize mental health challenges in their students? Are they comfortable in referring them for help. Do they know where to refer students to help for how to get help? We're in the process of investing in this. We have identified a Healthy Mind Survey. This is a survey that's been utilized on campuses that we feel captures our objectives to identify and learn more about faculty needs for resources. The big part of this is about their comfort level in recognizing mental health concerns with students. We will be sharing more information and a lot of statistics based on the Department of Wellness incidents of Mental health crises in both students and faculty mental health challenges. We will be sharing some of this information with the Faculty Council in April. Our survey will be next fall, but we are planting the seed now. We really want and really encourage members of Faculty Council to go back to your respective colleges, schools, and departments and start sharing this information. We really need to get more conversations going on campus about this. For one, we really want to get a good turnout from faculty. The key thing here is we want to find out what are some ways that we can do better to serve our students regarding mental health needs. That we might have

better ways to serve our faculty with some of their similar concerns. But also, how can we better educate faculty and staff to be able to recognize these needs amongst our peers and amongst students in our classrooms. So that's our work. We're continuing to move forward with that, and we'll get more information to you at the April meeting.

**d. Budget: Brad Lawson – No Report**

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

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

The Career Track committee continues to meet every month, and we continue to work on supporting the Faculty committee and looking at policies to further integrate career track faculty in terms of reappointment and promotion. Specifically, one of the things we're looking at now is getting a consistent university-wide policy looking at reappointment times, frequency and span on those. Glenn wanted to thank Vice Provost Francisco for meeting with the committee. We have a lot of ideas and are looking at how we can be value added and can really make the most impact. What's most important to our constituents. We have over 800 career track faculty. We're making lots of progress. We have a great committee, and we really appreciate the support we get from the Provost's office.

**g. Faculty: James Knapp – Update**

Knapp stated the Faculty Committee is looking to push the finish line policy revisions on the policy statement and the RPT document at the university level. We're hoping to get those across the finish line in time for the end of the semester. We're scheduled to meet with President Hess the Monday after spring break. We're looking forward to that. The committee has identified some additional concerns that have come up through the faculty to bring to the table at that time.

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

Perkins gave the update for Boileau who is teaching today.

The Long-Range Planning and Information Technology committee has been working methodically on creating a survey which we would like to distribute campus wide in regard to AI and AI detection. Our first step is going to come after spring break. We would like to provide the Faculty Council with an iteration of the survey, and have faculty council, answer it, and then give us your comments on how it could be improved or refined. We do intend, before the semester ends, to send that survey out to the entire faculty. Obviously not all faculty have the same concerns with AI, but we've got faculty who are in writing intensive courses who have Gen. Ed requirements, and there are faculty who would like to see through this survey whether we do need AI detection. If nothing else, is it a deterrent to help students focus on writing and not look for shortcuts when writing papers. McCaughan asked if you have noticed if the AI detection software has improved any. The last time she was exploring AI detective software, it was notoriously terrible at detecting AI. Perkins stated it depends on what AI detection you use. But we have not done so on campus. Slevitch stated that's the reason why we don't have it, because it was so bad. Perkins stated there could be a protocol associated with AI detection, that if the faculty member is going to use it, we have a policy in terms of how you communicate with the student after some detection is made to engage in dialogue, so that we're not engaging in punishment, but engaging in education. Francisco stated we may want to pay special attention to neurodivergent students because the evidence suggests that they're more likely to get flagged than other students. So just having that as a consideration.

**i. Research: Wouter Hoff – No Report**

**j. Retirement & Fringe Benefits: Mark Weiser – No Report**

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

**l. Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Heather Yates – No Report**

**Unfinished Business** – None

**New Business** –

Jim Hess stated that we have a new Chief Financial Officer (CFO) as of this afternoon is Chris Kuwitzky. Hess stated that he is an outstanding chief financial officer. He worked at another university, and then most recently worked at Langston. We're lucky to have him. He brings a wealth of experience to the CFO job.You'll be very pleased working with him.He’s articulate, understanding and approachable. Slevitch thanked Hess for the update and stated we look forward to having him attend a Faculty Council meeting.

Slevitch asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is Tuesday, April 8, 2025 in room **126 ITLE**.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Crick, Secretary