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The Academic Programs Council (APC) is charged to serve as an advisor to the President, Provost, and the Faculty Senate on matters concerned with the instructional programs and curricula of the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus and Tulsa Campus. Its main responsibility is to evaluate new undergraduate courses, and existing or proposed undergraduate programs with regard to their educational value and to make recommendations to the Office of the Provost.

The Council is organized into two subcommittees—Courses and Programs. Guidelines for the subcommittees are listed below.

Course Subcommittee is charged to:
- Look for conformance to University standards and practice in form and procedure with all significant information provided on the form by the department submitting the request.
- Look for proper prerequisites and course numbers; match the level of instruction.
- Check the course description to make sure it is compact, clear, and indicates the level of instruction to ensure that it would make good sense to the general student.
- Look for duplication of courses in the same or other departments.
- Note the impact of the course on degree programs.

Programs Subcommittee is charged to:
1. Protect the rights of students in program deletions.
2. Review for duplication of programs.
3. Determine ‘Are there adequate resources for the program?’
4. Look for logical prerequisites.
5. Determine ‘Does the program make sense?’
6. Determine ‘Are University rules satisfied?’
7. Review checksheets for correctness and clarity.
8. Assess the impact on other programs, of program deletions, and course changes.
9. Determine ‘Are course changes coordinated with program changes?’
10. Determine ‘Does the program have faculty academic review?’

The APC reviews and makes recommendations regarding the undergraduate components of slash-listed undergraduate/graduate courses and of BS/MS accelerated degree programs, but otherwise, the review and approval of courses and programs offered for graduate credit resides with the Graduate Council. The APC also reviews and makes recommendations regarding Law School courses and programs because these do not fall under Graduate Council oversight.

The APC meets monthly during the academic year to review changes in programs and courses proposed by individual departments and make recommendations. Program changes include substantive changes—those that impact what a student must do to earn a degree—that must be approved by both the OU and State Regents, and nonsubstantive changes—those that do not impact what a student must do to earn a degree—
that are recommended to the Provost for final approval and reported to the State Regents.

All meetings in AY2020-21 were held via Zoom on the following dates, with Courses and Programs considered as tabulated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Courses Recommended for Provost Review</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Programs Recommended for Provost Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 4, 2020</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2020</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5, 2020</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 2020</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2021</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2021</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5, 2021</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2021</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above table, APC reviewed 232 programs and 270 course changes in 2020-21. Almost all of the recommendations to the Provost for review were resolved, or the course/program change requests were withdrawn by the department or tabled by the Provost Office pending Departmental response. One program issue has been held pending departmental resubmission.

The heaviest load was observed in December, and an unusual January meeting was held, due to the curricular changes necessitated by changing General Education Area V from a capstone course to UCOL 1523—Gateway to Understanding at OU. Due to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education’s (OSRHE) implementation of General Education requirements, the replacement of the Capstone course with the UCOL course as a GenEd V requirement meant that whatever course fulfilled the capstone role also automatically ceased to be a requirement for all undergraduate degree programs. It was therefore necessary for every department/school that wanted to retain the former capstone course as a degree requirement in the major to reinstate it formally (and add or accommodate the addition of a 3 credit UCOL course) into the degree. All such modifications were ‘substantive’ and required APC review.

In view of the speed with which the addition of UCOL 1523 needed to be added and changes to the capstone accommodated for AY2021-22, the Provost’s Office granted permission for departments/schools to add the 3-credit DEI course to their degrees and increase total credit hours by 3 hours if necessary, to keep their capstone as a major requirement. Nevertheless, APC continued its policy—adopted last year—to consider the total number of credit hours for programs, both new and existing, when reviewing program change requests looking for a cogent argument for exceeding 120 total credit hours. In some cases, APC suggested reductions to the number of electives where possible to offset any increase.

It is noted that the APC reviews all new course proposals and syllabi and that the UCOL 1523 course was not submitted to the APC in AY2020-21. The current membership of the APC is prepared to meet this summer to review the UCOL 1523 proposal when ready.
**An Important and Continuing Issue**

The Academic Programs Council has repeatedly encountered numerous violations of the published Prefinals and Finals Weeks policies with regard to final projects, final presentations, and final exams. There were not isolated occurrences. These violations were so numerous among January courses that

“[b]efore reviewing the course requests, Lupia wanted to discuss the official policies and due dates regarding final projects and exams, since a large number of course proposals have submitted syllabi with exams, papers, and/or projects due either during prefinals week or during finals week. Morvant agreed with the committee that the policies on this matter were not very clear in practice or writing and they should be reviewed and possibly updated. In the meantime, Morvant stated the Provost office would send out a reminder to all faculty about the current policies in place.” [APC Meeting minutes, Jan. 21, 2021]

The violations are in the majority related to Sections 4.10.1(A) & (B) in the OU Faculty Handbook:

4.10.1(A) Assignments or projects worth less than 10 percent combined total of a student’s grade may be assigned at any time prior to pre-finals week and may be due during pre-finals week. However, no assignments or projects may be due on the last two days of pre-finals week. Quizzes may be given during pre-finals week but cannot account for more than 3% combined total of the final grade. Exams may not be given during pre-finals week.

Tuesday/Thursday classes were frequently in violation because projects were allowed to be due on the Tuesday and Thursday of pre-finals week rather than the Thursday of the week prior and Tuesday of pre-finals week. Rarely a non-comprehensive ‘midterm’ exam was scheduled during this week.

4.10.1(B) Assignments, take-home examinations, in-class examinations, or projects worth more than 10 percent of a student's grade must be scheduled at least 30 days prior to the first day of finals and must be due or given prior to pre-finals week. Any assignment that is to take the entire semester to complete may be accepted or presented during the first three weekdays of pre-finals week provided the syllabus explicitly states that the assignment can be turned in prior to pre-finals week.

Tuesday/Thursday classes were again frequently in violation because term projects were allowed to be due on the Tuesday and Thursday of pre-finals week rather than the Thursday of the week prior and Tuesday of pre-finals week. And rarely if ever did a syllabus explicitly state that the assignment could be handed in prior to the prefinals week.

Additional issues also arose. In accord with Faculty Handbook Section 4.7, a final exam is given at the discretion of the instructor or department. However, in some courses wherein no final is given, and the projects are due before the end of the course (either before or during pre-finals week), a class meeting during finals week did not appear to be scheduled. According to Dr. Mark Morvant, Vice Provost for Instruction, the two hours of the final exam period is counted by the OSRHE towards the mandatory contact hours for the credit assigned. Therefore, if no final is given, but also no class is held, then this will violate OSRHE mandate for contact hours.

Ambiguities also arise in the text of the Faculty Handbook. For example, can a final project be due during finals
week and/or handed in during that exam period? Only a project due during pre-finals week is specifically excluded by the text of the current policy statement. For another example, in some courses, a final was not given, and a meeting was held during finals week, but that ‘finals week meeting’ was for the purpose of presenting the term project. It is likewise not clear whether this is permitted by the text of the Faculty Handbook. The APC discussed (without resolution or recommendation) whether this was appropriate for some courses, such as where presentations are discussed by students and its criticism is a constructive form of summative evaluation. In both cases, where a final project is to be handed in and/or a presentation given, there is the practical consideration of how this would be fairly handled if the course was concurrent with another final exam or if it were the third ‘final exam’ of the day for some but not all students in view of Section 4.8 of the Faculty Handbook.

4.10.1(C) Special cases deviating from the Final Exam Preparation Period policy must be clearly stated in the course syllabus and approved by the chair of the department through which the course is offered. If the professor is the chair of the department, the professor must have these special cases approved by the dean of the college in which said department resides. If the professor is the dean of the college in which the course is taught, the professor must have these special cases approved by the Senior Vice President and Provost.

Finally, in accord with Section 4.10.1(C), the current policy permits chairs to override these restrictions, but there is no mechanism by which 1) to record that a chair has approved deviations and 2) to attach a name and date to that deviation for current or future accountability and reference. When these issues arise, the APC points them out to departments who are given an opportunity to respond before APC meets and makes recommendations to the Provost’s Office. Usually, departments emend the syllabus changing the dates, but in one or two cases this semester, the departments responded by saying that chair approval was given, but without name or date.

THEREFORE, the APC recommends that the Faculty Senate work with the Provost’s Office to revise the Faculty Handbook and its prefinals and finals week policies in order to make the text explicit and clear to all faculty, and to record and track authority for any deviations. Although the Provost’s Office can—and should—actively remind faculty before the start of the semester as syllabi are prepared, it is incumbent on the Faculty Senate to actively uphold policies established in good faith with the University of Oklahoma student body. Thus, the APC further suggests that the Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office include the Student Government Association (SGA) in these deliberations.

And in business not directly related to prefinals-finals policies, the outgoing chair of the APC suggests that the Faculty Senate encourage both the President’s Office and the Student Government Association to fill their student appointee vacancies on the APC. Only one student served on the APC, for one year, during the last three years. Student members, as representatives of the larger population, would offer important perspectives on course and program offerings and through the APC have an immediately heard voice in raising concerns and/or recommendations for discussion by the Council. In the specific case of prefinals-finals week policies that arose this year, their experiences and input could have been informative and illustrative.
**Academic Programs Council (Norman) 2020-21**

**Ex-officio, nonvoting members**
- Jill Irvine
  - Interim Sr. VP and Provost
  - Grey Allman attends as designate.
- Mark Morvant
  - Vice Provost for Instruction
- Kellie Dyer
  - Registrar
- Lisa Cannon
  - Coordinator of Academic Publications and Curriculum, and Programs Moderator

**Administrative, nonvoting members**
- Jessica Burgett
  - Courses Moderator
- Alyssa Giles
  - Courses Moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Appointees</th>
<th>(6 faculty for 3-year terms – 1/3 to retire each year)</th>
<th>Subcommittee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lupia (Chair 20-21)</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>2018-21 Programs/Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassilios Sikavitsas</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2018-21 Courses Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Beliveau</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>2019-22 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Trytten</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2019-22 Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran Mullen</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2020-23 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Worley</td>
<td>Human Relations-Tulsa</td>
<td>2020-23 Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SGA Appointees</th>
<th>(2 students for 2-year terms – ½ to retire each year)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2019-21 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2020-22 TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Appointments</th>
<th>(3 faculty for 3-year terms – 1/3 to retire each year)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hayes-Thumann</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>2019-22 Programs Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenel Cavazos</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2018-21 Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Wickersham</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>2020-23 Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Appointments</th>
<th>(2 students for 2-year terms – ½ to retire each year)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2019-21 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2020-22 TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the May 3, 2021 meeting, the leadership of the APC for AY2021-22 was determined as:

- Karen Hayes-Thumann
  - Visual Arts
  - 2019-22 Chair-elect
- Deborah Trytten
  - Computer Science
  - 2019-22 Program Lead-elect
- Jane Wickersham
  - History
  - 2020-23 Courses Lead-elect
This Athletics Council met (via Zoom) four times in 2020-2021. Meeting Dates were September 16, 2020; November 10, 2020; February 10, 2021; and April 22, 2021. David McLeod was elected to assume the role of council chair for 2021-22. The Council completed all its required business, and this is the Chair’s annual report for those meetings.

2020-2021 Athletics Council membership:

- Faculty members: Daniel Larson (Chair), Aiyana Henry, David McLeod (Chair-elect), Emily Johnson, Lindsey Meeks, and Christopher Sadler
- Staff members: Erin Wolfe and Lindsey Mitchell
- Student members: Tyler Whitney
- Student-athletes: Sorre Bah and Megan Reilly
- Alumni: Greg Anderson and Andrew Hewlett
- Ex Officio: Joe Castiglione (Athletics Director), Gregg Garn (Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA), Brooklynn Nichols (Administrative Assistant to the Senior Associate Athletic Directors)

Athletics Department Attendees: Marcus Bowman (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Chief Financial Officer), Alex Hensley (Governance and Special Projects), Jason Leonard (Executive Director, Athletics Compliance), Mike Meade (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Academic Services), Larry Naifeh (Executive Associate Athletics Director), Lindy Roberts-Ivy (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Senior Women’s Administrator), and Brent Sumler (Director of Student-Athlete Experience & Well-being)

Summary: As the charge of this committee is to advise the University president and athletic director in athletics-related matters, the emphasis of the council meetings is on 1) open exchange and disclosure of information about athletic department activities, and 2) inquiry and feedback from council members who represent the University of Oklahoma community and a variety of areas of expertise. The overall council contains four subcommittees that work directly with athletic staff to report on activities more extensively in the areas of ‘Academic Integrity and Student Welfare’, ‘Equity and Sportsmanship’, ‘Fiscal Integrity and Personnel’, and ‘Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance’. The meetings were well supported by athletic department staff, including the regular attendance and direct engagement with the Athletic Director, Joe Castiglione. The Council members were actively involved in unfettered discussion and inquiry. The following material details the specific items discussed in each of the four Council sessions. The meeting minutes and subcommittee reports are also provided to the University president for review.
September 16, 2020 (via Zoom)

Governance and Expectations

Chair Larson spoke on how Intercollegiate Athletics started as student-run organizations and then moved to faculty/administrator oversight. The NCAA eventually was made in order to oversee and maintain control over each athletics institution. Modern Intercollegiate Athletics Governance and Athletics Council reporting now ultimately rests with the University Presidents’ offices (and the delegated authority of the AD). The Athletics Council was made to help bridge the athletics department and main campus. This council helps support both the main campus and the athletics department. The council structure originates from two primary sources. First, provisions within the NCAA constitution, and second, the subcommittee structures and expectations that are laid out by the Board of Regents policies for athletics (both provided to attendees).

Subcommittee Overviews

Chair Larson relayed that each member serves on a minimum of one of the following subcommittees. At the request of Chair Larson, each of the subcommittees was described by the associated athletic department staff.

Equity and Sportsmanship

Lindy Roberts-Ivy is the athletics department lead for this subcommittee. This committee is responsible for making sure everything is equal for each team from their facilities, financial aid, staffing, and equipment for each team. This committee puts together a report each year to illustrate how we maintain our Title IX compliance. A third-party contractor, Janet Judge, has been regularly contracted to gives us direction on how the department is doing and what needs to be done better.

Academic Integrity and Student Welfare

Mike Meade, as the athletics staff member lead of this committee, shared this subcommittee is responsible for three essential charges. The annual report is the first of the three. This subcommittee will help review the annual report before it is presented to the full Athletics Council. The second will be to review if a student-athlete should be offered an NLI. Lastly, the subcommittee will help with the awards banquet which the council helps choose the recipients of the awards.

Fiscal Integrity

Marcus Bowman is the athletics department lead for this subcommittee. The committee reviews the Athletics department’s finances. This committee has three reports during the academic year and allows their committee members to give the reports during the council meetings. The reports cover the expenses from the previous year and then where we are at in the auditing process. There is also a report that gives a snapshot of where we ended up budget-wise and where we predict to be the next year.

Governance and Compliance

This committee develops one report a year. The committee works hand and hand with the athletics compliance office. The committee will have the opportunity to look over compliance legislation and share any new
legislation they would like to see. Compliance’s job is to help monitor our student-athletes, boosters, and staff to make sure they adhere to NCAA rules and regulations.

Athletics Director’s Report

Mr. Castiglione opened his report by welcoming everyone to the meeting and thanking them for committing to serve on the council. Joe mentioned that he could not possibly fit everything that has happened in the last six months in this report so he will stay brief and open it up to questions. He stated that we are in the middle of an unprecedented time in history. We are learning as we go with information that is constantly changing. One of the most challenging things was making the decisions on how to get our teams safely back into competition.

Mr. Castiglione stated that the whole time we have been working through COVID we have put the health, safety, and welfare of our student-athletes and staff as the main priority. It has been rugged and messy but very enlightening and refreshing to see people step up in ways that cannot be put into words. He shared that there were two victories last Saturday, simply having the game and then winning it. Mr. Castiglione was not shy about lifting up others and their hard work during this time and stating that teamwork and drive are what has gotten us here today.

Mr. Castiglione mentioned that we are still very much in the middle of this situation and have to take things week to week and he is aware there are still some hard decisions that will come. He also stated that our medical staff is some of the best in the nation and are truly the people that are keeping us going. In addition to our athletics department medical staff, he celebrated the staff at Goddard and how they have been instrumental to our successes during this time.

Next, Mr. Castiglione shared that there will be significant budgetary issues that lie ahead, and our main focus is to cut back in every way we can without impacting the student-athlete experience. Not only are we short in revenue with cutting the stadium capacity back 75% but we have new outbound line items that we did not have before. We have already spent over $440K on COVID testing and PPE and projected to go over $1M.

To wrap up the Athletics Director report, Mr. Castiglione closed by thanking his staff and everyone that has been involved with the successes we have had and opened for questions.

A council member stated that they saw the news that the OSU athletics department had to lay off and furlough many of their staff and asked Mr. Castiglione how he is feeling about what OU might have to do like this. Mr. Castiglione stated that on July 1 we released a 20% budget cut to all areas/sports and salary reductions. He mentioned that there will still be more to come but we did a great job at getting a head of these things before many other schools did. Many of our staff members are wondering the same thing and our team working with our financials is doing everything they can to find the best solution.

Chair Larson asked if there is tracking of health impacts or community spread as it relates to having athletics events or even a response that is being used to combat negative reactions. Joe stated that we gave our ticket holders the option to opt-in/out for the season, so a person’s attendance is completely voluntary. Larry Naifeh shared that there are currently conversations happening on how we can improve our safety guidelines for the next game, many in regard to the student section. Mr. Castiglione mentioned that we do have the ability to withdraw fans from the experience if people cannot abide by the safety measures that we have in place.
Faculty Athletics Representative Report and Council Orientation

Dr. Gregg Garn welcomed and thanked everyone for their time on the council this upcoming year. He mentioned some upcoming plans the athletics department has and big topics that are of constant discussion in the department. Some of these are the Sooners For Humanity diversity, equity, and inclusion plan the department has developed, COVID updates, and Name Image and Likeness discussions. Dr. Garn also mentioned the Alston case which is an instance where a group of student-athletes sued the Athletics department for the cost of attendance and the issues that are wrapped up in that. Dr. Garn then followed that all of these topics will be covered further in our next meetings.

Student-Athlete Innovative Leaders (SAIL)

Megan Reilly gave the SAIL report and mentioned that it is a little difficult being virtual right now, but they are currently reestablishing the mission and vision of SAIL. She did mention that the upcoming events are the Unity Week happening next week that will include a unity walk and unity games for football and volleyball.

Old Business

Mike Meade stated that typically the academic integrity subcommittee reports on missed class policy in the fall and since we did not have classes for much of the spring this does not apply.


November 10, 2020 (via Zoom)

Guest Speaker - Scott Anderson

Scott Anderson is the Head Athletic Trainer for OU Athletics. Scott shared the OU Athletics approach to the COVID pandemic. He expressed his thankfulness to the tremendous team that came up with the wonderful response that we have. He also shared that our coaches and student-athletes have been great at following our plan.

The plan started with bringing back student-athletes to a two-week quarantine and testing. We run all of our testing through Goddard on campus, which has been exceptional to work with. Scott shared that many of our peers are struggling with their COVID testing and Goddard has gone above and beyond for us making it as seamless as possible. Many of our peers opted to return in June when we opted to return in July because of student-athlete safety.

Scott also expressed that our student-athletes are the ones that really determine the outcome and success of our COVID response and is truly a team effort of all sports both athletes and staff. He also shared that the response team holds bi-weekly meetings to reevaluate our COVID response and update it as needed.
Dr. Garn asked the number of student-athletes that have opted out of competition this year. Scott said we have had a relatively small number of people opt-out. These athletes cannot participate in any team activities but will still have their scholarship and any academic/medical support they need. Dr. Garn then asked how travel to competitions has changed in response to COVID. Scott followed up by saying we continue to social distance during the travel period as much as possible and that masks are mandatory. Limited travel parties have been suggested (smaller staff numbers). Director Castiglione shared that there have been budgetary impacts because of the distancing measures we want to uphold (for example, if we typically traveled to the airport in 3 buses, we now use 8 to uphold the distancing measures). He also shared that team meals look different because all meals are now individually packaged and while on road games players take their meals back to their rooms to eat.

A council member asked Scott about the reports that shared there were high rates of heart complications in student-athletes that contracted COIVD and if this is something we have monitored. Scott said we do monitor this and have cardiac evaluations before return to play, but we have not been faced with any student-athlete facing any of these heart complications. Scott then reiterated that our procedures and protocols before return to play have continued to grow and evolve with new findings regarding COVID and student-athlete safety.

Scott shared that his team is currently working on compiling data on how our student-athletes are experiencing the COVID pandemic (symptomatic or not, etc.).

**Academic Integrity Subcommittee Report**

Mike Meade gave the Academic Integrity Subcommittee Report. He started by thanking his subcommittee and all of their hard work putting the annual report together. Mike shared a link to the digital report for all the council to see. Mike recognized that this report is a very lengthy document because it has a lot of data included and stated that he will highlight the high point of the report.

Mike started by sharing the 10-year admissions summary. He shared that the trend has continued that we are consistent with past years and with the non-student-athlete body. The next section that Mike covered was the graduation rates of our student-athletes. These numbers will not be posted until next week. We set a new record at 86% for our graduation success rate. The GSR is important because of the NCAA’s academic-based revenue model.

There are two different rates that are looked at and compared, the federal graduation rate and graduation success rate. The federal graduation rate excludes mid-year enrollees and transfers. In order to be considered in these numbers, a student must be enrolled during a fall semester of their first year. Since the federal graduation rate does not count these two groups of students, the Graduation Success Rate was created to encompass all student-athletes that we are giving scholarships to. The GSR also takes into account if a student-athlete left before graduation due to the chance to play professionally.

The next section in the annual report that Mike covered is the Academic Progress Rate (APR) which is a real-time measure of student-athletes’ academic progress and timely graduation within five years. This also is used to see how programs are doing on retaining student-athletes. Most of the time the reason we lose points against our APR is because of a student’s decision to leave. If a student-athlete is on any amount of scholarship, they are counted in this number. If a team has a perfect 1000, this means they have had no point loss in the last 5 years.
or they have been granted delayed graduation.

Mike also discussed the other opportunities we have for student-athletes who do leave school early, to come back and finish their schooling with the opportunity to receive funding through our academic endowments and The Varsity O Association. The post-eligibility scholarship program helps students who come back to school to finish the degree they began here.

Last semester was a very non-traditional year, and the pass/no pass grading scale was put into place to help with the transition due to the COVID pandemic. The new cumulative GPA for all student-athletes for last semester is 3.17. The all-sport overview highlights numbers over the past two years for each team. Mike pointed out that Women’s gymnastics had an outstanding spring 2020 semester. They had a 3.84 cumulative team GPA.

The next section covered was the class checking policy that Dr. Garn covered. He shared that there is a software that we are trying to gain access to called spotter. Historically we had graduate assistants and student workers go from class to class to check and make sure our student-athletes are there. The spotter would do all of the class checking for us based on technology that would be in the classroom and on the student athlete’s phone. Dr. Garn stated since there are far fewer in-person classes this year due to COVID this is something we are hoping to gain access to when class resumes to more normal times. He ended by saying this software is NOT a tracker and would only be used in the classroom.

Student-athletes are only allowed to miss 10 classes a semester as it relates to their sport. If there are unforeseen circumstances that cause them to miss more than the 10 there is a process to have it approved.

Mike also mentioned that we do monitor student-athlete class enrollment and majors. Our most popular degrees are communication and human relations. However, we do have a wide range of majors represented across all of our student-athletes and teams. He then went on to state that in the past years our involvement in the study abroad programs we provide has skyrocketed. This unfortunately has been hurt by the COVID pandemic, but we do have an amazing program to be involved in once we deem it safe again.

Lastly, Mike shared that our Faculty In Residence (FIR) develops a report each year that is included in the full Academic Annual Report. This section includes different engagement opportunities and happenings that happen in Headington Hall.

Emily Johnson asked if special admission academic success rates are tracked separately. Mike shared that we do track this, and we usually do this by sport and by coach and the success rate varies.

Athletics Director’s Report

Mr. Castiglione stated his report by recognizing the extraordinary efforts that many people in our athletic department have done since the COVID pandemic started. There have been so many moving parts when trying to keep our student-athletes safe and uphold our high standard for our student-athlete experience. From our medical staff to our academic and student-athlete development staffs - Joe shared he is truly so proud.

Joe shared in his report the Sooners for Humanity outline and our commitment to that. He shared that we have
no updated soonersports.com to reflect our constant commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

He continued by sharing our approach to the COVID pandemic and how constant pursuit to keep our student-athletes healthy and in competition. We have already pushed some start dates for sports schedules to after January 1, but we are scheduled to start both basketball seasons this month. Joe shared that we cannot forget about how difficult it is for some of these sports who have had their competitions come to a halt and canceled last year and are still experiencing changes.

Joe shared that we are expecting our revenues to be down about 33% for the year. We have already made budget cuts and are in the middle of another round of assessments for this. He also shared that we will probably know more after basketball. Joe stated that these budgetary issues will not only have impacts on us this year but will during FY22 as well. This will be due to some of the strategies that we put in place this year to help offset some of the financial hardships. An example of this was our strategy for season ticket holders who had already paid but did not receive tickets this year.

The next topic Joe covered was the transfer policy. He shared that the legislation should pass sometime early next year and that there is no telling how this will impact each sport. This essentially would give student-athletes to transfer any time they want, wherever they want.

Another significant budgetary impact and impact on our student-athletes is that all sports in all seasons have been granted another year of eligibility if they elect to do so. Name Image and Likeness is another big topic of discussion within the NCAA. We are currently putting together a program on how we can support our student-athletes during these changes.

Lastly, Joe shared that we have a monthly department newsletter in the format of a sway that includes highlights of our staff, important announcements, and the great and fun things that are happening within the department. We will begin to share this with the Athletics Council starting next month.

**Faculty Athletics Representative Report and Council Orientation**

Dr. Gregg Garn gave the FAR report and started by sharing how great of an addition Brent Sumler has been to the Athletics Department and the amazing work he has done. Part of his role has been to refigure SAIL and develop a strong group of student-athletes that are working to improve our student-athlete experience. This year, our student-athlete voter registration was over 80% and this Sunday they will have a discussion over the election results. This group is working hard to connect all of our student-athletes and teams, especially during this unique time.

Dr. Garn mentioned the Hugs From Home initiative that our student-athletes are doing to make sure every student-athlete feels loved and valued. Brent shared that his main goal is to create a more unified front for our student-athletes and gives all of the praise to our student-athletes. Brent mentioned that one thing that was brought up in the last SAIL meeting was that they are the first group of student-athletes that experience “athletic foreclosure” or having their athletic experience taken from them and then some of them having the opportunity to have it back but still had to have the feeling of not knowing. Brent stated that a lot of student-athletes shared that this made them realize they needed to take advantage of their time as a student-athlete.
and the opportunities they are given.

New Business

The Chair-elect process was initiated. We typically have our council members serve as the chair in their third year on the council, so they have assistance from the past chair during their time leading the council. Nominations were to be provided to Daniel Larson in the following weeks.

February 10, 2020 (via Zoom)

Approval of the Reports

A motion was made to approve the Academic Integrity Subcommittee report and seconded. The report was unanimously approved by the council.

Guest Speaker- Brent Sumler

Brent Sumler joined the council to share the Sooners for Humanity framework that addresses the issues that negate and suppress certain groups. Each year we will focus on different things, this year being Black Lives Matter. There are multiple pillars of this framework. The first pillar being Civic Responsibility. With this year being an election year, we focused on the election and created a mandatory day off for student-athletes on Election Day. The second pillar is Social Intelligence. Through this pillar, we sent several student-athletes to conferences and have matched them with mentors. The third pillar, education, strives to educate student-athletes and staff with education about all minority groups, focusing on Black Lives Matter this year. The fourth is accountability which is our commitment for our words to match our actions. The last pillar is Advocacy. Through this pillar, we are striving to promote Black Owned Businesses and will establish a scholarship for a black minority student-athlete.

Dr. Larson inquired about any possible compliance complications with pairing student-athletes with external mentors regarding the Social Intelligence pillar. Mr. Sumler clarified that the mentors are actually more often internal to the athletic department. Any such efforts outside of athletics would be in consultation with the compliance office.

Governance and Compliance Subcommittee Report

Lindsay Mitchell gave the Governance and Compliance Subcommittee report and stated how important this report and compliance office is and how big of a job making sure that our student-athletes and staff stay in compliance year-round. Lindsay shared that the report covers what the OU Athletic Department does as a whole and that there are currently 22 major violations active within the NCAA. At OU, there are currently 27 secondary violations which is very typical. She shared that while 27 sounds high it really means that we are doing our job as a compliance office in addition to many of these being self-reported and happened accidentally. Alex Hensley shared that 27 is actually very low for a typical year for us and this is due to COIVD and recruiting and action on campus being suspended for so long.
Jason Leonard then shared that he is thankful for the Governance and Compliance subcommittee and Lindsay’s leadership has the subcommittee chair.

Aiyana Henry asked if Jason could share about the training that is provided to the coaches on compliance education. Jason shared that this year has been difficult because, in a normal year, people often visit compliance in person and can pop in to ask questions. Due to COVID, this could not happen, so they started to offer more training online to help cover the gaps with not everyone being on campus full time.

Dr. Gregg Garn asked how the OU compliance office works with our student-athletes to educate them about gambling on sports. Jason shared that the NCAA rule is that our student-athletes and staff cannot gamble on any NCAA sport. The Big 12 actually partnered with a software platform called Game Plan to help provide our coaches and student-athletes with education about sports wagering with quizzes at the end before the education sessions are completed.

A council member stated that there is a perception that the compliance office at OU is fairly tight and asked if the office was aware of that and what they think of it. Jason stated that the office is aware of this and that they do not think it is a bad thing. Oftentimes, the compliance office is blamed for things they do not have any part in. However, he did mention that he is aware the OU compliance office is much more conservative and monitors more things than many other institutions.

**Fiscal Integrity Subcommittee Report**

Carrie Utley stated that this subcommittee focuses on the finances and budget of the athletic department. Andrew Hewlett is the subcommittee chair and gave the report. Andrew stated that they look at budgets and funding and have a unique role within the council. The subcommittee met with an accounting firm, Eide Bailley, in January and had a great discussion. The subcommittee and reviewer looked at a submitted NCAA report that has detailed information about OU’s revenue and budgets. This report also included data about financial aid and how student-athlete participation plays a role over all operations. Andrew then shared that they also talked with Eide Bailley, a CPA firm and that they looked over a number of things during the review of NCAA agreed-upon procedures. Eide Bailley reported that there were 0 exceptions on the report. Another major topic that was looked at and discussed was the impact of COVID-19 on both the athletics department and campus-wide. Andrew shared that the 2019 Football season helped offset the impact of COVID on the athletics department but there was still a major impact. He then stated that as we go into FY21 we might see a larger impact and what the projections look like for the end of FY21 and FY22 in full.

Marcus Bowman shared that he was very thankful for this subcommittee and appreciates all their hard work on the report. He also stated that the entire OU athletics department has been working hard to offset the financial impact COVID-19 had on our department. He said this was quite the year to start a CFO role but was very thankful to come to an institution that is historically very financially sound.

**Athletics Director’s Report**

Daniel Larson opened up this time for questions for senior administrators on the call as Joe Castiglione was not able to make it to the meeting. A Council member asked how moral was with our student-athletes through the
last year with all the changes. Larry Naifeh answered that we are very fortunate that under Joe’s direction a
number of years ago we developed a Psychological Resources unit that is there for our student-athletes with
anything they need, especially mental health. Larry shared that our student-athletes have been through a lot of
changes and back and forth and have been so great at rolling with all the changes. He also stated that the same
goes for our staff. Much of our staff has picked up extra job roles through all of this to ensure that we are able
to remain in competition safely and equip our student-athletes with all the necessary services regardless of the
impacts of COVID-19. Brent Sumler shared that it has been important to encourage our student-athletes,
coaches, and staff to lean on each other to get through this unique time as we are all experiencing this together.
Megan Reilly, a student-athlete, shared that some ways she and her teammates have rallied through all of this
were to stay in constant communication with each other. She also shared she was thankful for the student-
athlete development team and all their work trying to keep the athletes connected through COVID-19 with
things to take their minds off of what was going on.

Daniel Larson asked about the public COVID-19 reports that were periodically released online about the positive
tests between student-athletes and staff members and why this was stopped? Larry Naifeh answered that this
is still happening, and we continue to be transparent with the reporting numbers and the temporary absence
was due to the winter break.

Faculty Athletic Representative Report

Dr. Gregg Garn shared that the athletics department has what they call Sooner ShoutOUTs and began with
shouting out Carrie Utley and Marcus Bowman on their work with the athletics department budget and being
transparent about what we can and cannot do with what we have. He then went on to shoutout Mike Meade
and his work leading the academic unit of the athletics department. In fall 2020, 94 student-athletes had a 4.0
GPA.

Dr. Garn began to share that this spring we have more sports in competition than we ever had before due to
interruptions in seasons this past semester. There will be lots of activates going on. The last point Dr. Garn
shared is that the student-athlete development staff is continuing to work hard on providing support for the
student-athletes. Upcoming events are the international student-athletes orientation and career connections.
Brent Sumler shared that the international student-athletes orientation has always been needed but it was very
apparent after COVID-19 happened and the impact it had on our international student-athletes.

Student-Athlete Innovative Leaders (SAIL)

Megan Reilly shared that SAIL has been working a lot within their subcommittees. Community Relations is
working on food drives, Diversity and Inclusion is working on Black History Month, Communication is working on
how to consistently communicate to student-athletes and about COVID-19, and Legislation is working on the NIL
implications and voting education.

Aiyana Henry thanked Megan for her service on the council and asked what she hears from the student-athletes
about NIL. Megan shared that a lot of athletes are for it but also do not understand there is a lot to it and need
to be educated on the ins and outs of that legislation.
David McLeod asked about how we are capturing how the student-athletes are feeling and stated how it seems like they all have a lot of extra responsibilities piling on top of each other. Larry Naifeh answered that while that is a fair assessment and student-athletes do have a lot going on with many extra obstacles this year, many of the student-athletes are used to many of these things happening (outside of COVID-19 issues). He also stated that our staff continues to go above and beyond to support our student-athletes in every way possible and we will continue to do so. We have many great units within the athletics department that are dedicated directly to hands-on student-athlete support, but all of our staff members are there to serve and support student-athletes.

Alex Hensley asked Megan what are some concerns that are brought up by the student-athletes regarding NIL and she shared that it is mainly knowing what is permissible and what is not. The education side of NIL is what most student-athletes are worried about.

**New Business**

Typically, the chair-elect would be a Norman campus council member going into their third year on the council. This year, the two eligible nominees are unable to fulfill the chair role next year, so we moved on to the eligible members which are Norman campus council members going into their last year on the council. The chair-elect nomination for 2021-2022 is David McLeod. Additional nominations were solicited.

**April 22, 2021 (via Zoom)**

**Guest Speaker - Dr. Cody Commander**

Cody is the Director of PROs. Our PROs department is one of the largest in the nation. The services that are provided by this department are traditional counseling, mental health pathology, psychological testing (we are the only athletics department that does this in-house) which tests for learning disorders like ADHD. A few changes have come with COVID as there have been with many areas. The demand for PROs services has gone up. One thing that separates an athletics PROs office from other counseling services is that they are also trained in performance services. This helps because our student-athletes are under an incredible amount of pressure to perform. Each staff member has their own teams that they deal with mostly. They are tasked with building that relationship by going to practices and competitions to show support for the athletes and be a common face.

PROs have recently started an internship program for students who are in the last part of their doctorate degree. OU is the first and only athletics department that offers a full sports psychology program. Another thing that sets us apart from all other PROs offices in the nation.

Dr. Garn asked Cody to speak to the council about social media and the impact it has on our athletes. Many people lose focus that our student-athletes are human beings and tend to be pretty harsh on them. Cody stated that about 20% of student-athletes have learned to tune out the noise of social media and do not check their messages, especially from people they do not know in relation to their performance. However, there are a lot of student-athletes that cannot do this so PROs help work with them on how to make social media a healthy habit and how to process both the positive and negative following they have because of who they are. Compliance also has a yearly social media training for our student-athletes.
In addition to all the scheduled appointments that the PROs staff have they also have processing and open sessions that anyone is welcome to come to. They truly have an open-door policy.

Approval of the Reports

A motion was made to approve both the Fiscal Integrity Subcommittee Report and Governance and Compliance Subcommittee Report and was seconded. Both reports were unanimously approved.

Fiscal Integrity Report

Marcus Bowman gave the Fiscal Integrity Subcommittee Report. He shared that he would be going over the budget process. There were three phases of budget reductions/spending mitigations. Phase 1 was a 20% overall reduction in June, phase 2 was a 15% controllable expense reduction (nothing that directly impacted the student-athlete experience), phase 3 was fourth-quarter spending mitigations. The goal as we investigate FY22 is to develop a budget that aligns with our department’s core values and top priorities. We also want to develop a multi-year plan to build back up our cash reserves and recover from the negative financial impact of COVID-19. The three ways we intend to meet these goals are by maximizing revenue, judicious and strategic with expenses, and model several budget scenarios (best, middle, and worst case). Marcus shared the process in which we must follow to get to these goals. We must start with revenue budget projections and maximizing revenue opportunities. Then determine total fixed expenses, followed by developing the remaining operating budget with budget targets for every sport, in addition to, providing flexibility and trust that our coaches are spending the money the way that is needed to make the student-athlete experience the best it can be.

Marcus shared the timeline for these goals.

Athletic Director’s Report

Larry shared that the council is obviously aware of the new hires that have been made and that they are in the process of putting together their staffs. Joe joined in by sharing that as everyone knows we had two coaches who had been with us for a long time announce their retirements within about a week of each other. He then went on to share more about these new hires, Coach Porter and Coach Baranczyk. Joe shared that these searches were made a little more difficult because we have a rule that we do not talk to coaches while they are still coaching their team, so we had to wait to begin searches until all our potential candidates were no longer playing. He also stated that during these searches we worked hard to maintain an extreme amount of confidentiality. Joe also shared that a unique thing to navigate during these coaching searches was that not only do the head coaches have agents but so do all the assistants. One unique obstacle during these specific coaching hires was that both coaches that we hired were both in their hometowns or very close, surrounded by their families, and had been at those schools for a while. This meant that Oklahoma had to be a perfect fit for them to pick up their lives and leave. Joe shared that both coaches have been hard at work hiring their staff and that they are both an amazing fit for Oklahoma.

Next, Joe shared about the transfer portal and how big of a deal it is. We are continuing to learn how to navigate these changes and the changes keep coming. One of the most recent and big changes is that student-athletes can now transfer within the conference without penalty. Joe shared that he has made it known that he is not a big fan of the portal and the new rules. He, nor any of our coaches, would ever do anything to hinder a
student-athletes ability to transfer but they will make their stance on the portal known. He stated that he knows that the portal and the rules will not go back to what it was, so it is something we are going to have to continue to learn how to navigate. Daniel Larson asked Joe how this portal was affecting the coaches and their decisions. Joe shared that not only has the portal changed roster numbers for each sport but so has the ruling to let spring sports have an extra year of eligibility if they choose due to COVID. This has made it extremely hard on coaches to maintain and know what their roster is going to look like for the next year. Joe shared that these next couple of years are going to be very interesting because of the impact of the portal and COVID.

Mike Meade began to share the obstacles that the Academics staff had to face during COVID to continue to make sure our student-athletes were successful upon being sent home. He shared that often we do not know what kind of home our student-athletes are going home to. We also do not know if they have functioning internet or the capability to get their work done. On the other side, he also addressed what the incoming students might look like this upcoming year because of the impact COVID had on high school students learning environment. While forecasting what this might look like, Mike shared that they opted to replace a vacant position with another learning specialist due to the high demand they think they might have this next year. Mike also shared in relation to the transfer portal that student-athletes must be in good academic standing with us in order to complete the transfer and have it as an option.

Faculty Athletics Representative Report

Dr. Garn started his report by giving Aiyana Henry for nominating one of our Rowing student-athletes for an award that she ended up receiving a stipend to help offset her expenses of student teaching.

Dr. Garn then went on to discuss the changes in the transfer portal rules. The new rules are that student-athletes now have a one-time transfer with no penalty. This gives the student-athletes more control over where they want to go but also creates challenges for roster management. On April 28th, the NCAA will vote to ratify this constitution.

Next, Dr. Garn shared his appreciation for the PROs staff and how this time of the year is an especially stressful time for student-athletes as many are in competition in addition to being in the middle of wrapping up their classes for the semester.

Lastly, recruiting rules and regulations have changed recently. During COVID these rules and regulations changed for obvious reasons. Coaches have not been able to travel to recruit in over a year and this is finally starting to open back up a little. Not only will this be a change that is coming up but will also be another budgetary item the athletics department will have to look at.

Student-Athlete Innovative Leaders (SAIL)

Megan Reilly gave the SAIL report by starting off by listing some of the initiatives that they are currently working on. Some of these are LGBTQ rights and equality, how to keep connected over the summer, volunteering with kids around the community, interacting with conversations led by PROs. She also shared that the SAIL application will come open in the next few weeks. Megan also discussed the transfer portal and how this will be a topic of their SAIL meeting this upcoming week.
New Business

Our new chair will be David McLeod for the 2021-2022 year.

Daniel Larson asked about the new Senior Athletics Director of DE&I and what that position will be responsible for. Brent Sumler shared that they will be responsible for creating programming for both the staff and student-athlete but also making sure we have a diverse staff and hiring practices. The most important thing is to make sure we are meeting the needs of our student-athletes.
Executive Summary

The Norman Campus Budget Council plays an integral role in the University’s progress toward achieving the five pillars of the 2020 Lead On Strategic Plan by making recommendations to “the President and other appropriate administrators on matters concerning fiscal policies and resources of the University.” In accordance with this charge, the Norman Campus Budget Council identified and studied several budget-related priorities during AY20-21 and accordingly offers the following recommendations. Background information and additional details are included in the attached Memo and Appendices.

A) Enhancing budget literacy and transparency. Limited budget transparency and the lack of budget literacy, common in academia, create significant inefficiencies, increase enterprise-wide risks, lead to wasted resources, decrease responsiveness and productivity, and hinder the ability of the Budget Council to provide timely input. As such, the Budget Council recommends: (1) engaging stakeholders (faculty, staff, and students) in financial literacy training, (2) establishing budget dashboards, and (3) mandating budgetary reporting within units. (Study included in Appendix A)

B) Ensuring competitiveness of faculty and staff benefits. Retaining qualified and experienced faculty and staff is vital to the continued implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan. Competitive and equitable salaries and benefits result in more operational efficiencies, greater productivity, and improve educational outcomes.

a) Data on the new structure of health insurance tiers were analyzed by the Budget Council, revealing inequitable impact in carrying the burden of increased health insurance cost. The council recommends changing OU’s contribution structure between tiers 1 and 3 and increasing the upper salary limit for tier 2. (Study included in Appendix B)

b) Concerns were expressed by faculty and staff regarding performance- and position-based pay equity and the rising cost of living. The Budget Council recommends compensation data reports be studied on an annual basis for inflation, equity, compression, and inversion, and detailed data be made available to shared-governance bodies. Several detailed recommendations regarding compensation are included in the attached Memo.

C) Gathering information to analyze the continued benefits of OU Online’s existing cost structure and effectiveness. OU Online can potentially create a significant positive impact on the University’s budget. However, to measure the impact and ensure it remains positive, collecting and analyzing data is necessary. Additionally, it is crucial to understand how the growth of online education impacts existing programs and departments. The Budget Council recommends the University adopt policies, guidelines, and other assessment criteria to analyze existing and future structures to ensure OU Online’s impact remains positive and minimize adverse effects.

D) Other recommendations are detailed in the Memo regarding OU’s long-term financial health, the need to quantify the true cost of research, and the concerns regarding the RCM budget models which do not align with the strategic focus on trans-disciplinary collaborations.
The Budget Council believes the University can implement many of these recommendations – particularly those relating to communication, transparency, policies, and training – with minimal budgetary impact. Thank you for considering these recommendations. If you would like to meet with the Council to discuss them further, please let us know.
The Budget Council acknowledges the time and effort that the Associate Vice President for Budget & Finance, Stewart Berkinshaw, dedicated to educating and assisting the Budget Council. Without his transparent and timely contributions, this work would not have been possible.

A. On budget literacy, transparency, and communication

Employee knowledge of certain budgetary information serves several purposes including synergy, efficiency, and supporting equity. The current lack of such knowledge, including the basic dimensions of revenue streams and costs, hinders the work of the Budget Council and impacts its ability to deliver properly-researched and timely recommendations. Appendix A includes a review of the literature and an outline of recommendations in this regard. The Budget Council recommends establishing a culture and practice of budget transparency at all levels, including the University, colleges, as well as academic and non-academic units. This is achieved by:

1. Establishing training courses on budget-related content focused on reading budgets and understanding university cash-flow systems and processes. The Faculty Welfare Committee worked on a proposal with the Center for Faculty Excellence to start establishing a level of budget literacy through a Finance and Budget Curriculum. We highly support and endorse this effort and encourage getting this established during AY22.

2. Establishing budget dashboards. The timeline, content, and levels of access are to be determined by discussion between the Budget Council and the Office of Budget and Financial Planning.

3. Mandating budgetary reporting from all chairs/directors/deans whereby an annual report of the unit budget is shared with unit employees. The content of such reports is to be determined by discussion between the Budget Council and the Office of Budget and Financial Planning.

B. On compensation and benefits

The Budget Council worked with the Faculty Compensations and Benefits Committee, the Faculty Senate, Human Resources, Institutional Research & Reporting (IRR), and the Provost’s Office to discuss issues of equity in salaries and the changes to the health insurance structure.

On health insurance; Appendix B is a report analyzing the structures of contributions to the health insurance premium for CY20 and CY21. The analysis acknowledges the 13% increase in the cost of insurance premiums between CY20 and CY21, however, it highlights the inequitable distribution of this increase (ranging from an 86% increase to an 8% decrease). The employees that are most disadvantaged by this new structure are employees earning in the proximity of $30K a year or less, and employees earning between $65K and $85K. The following recommendations are included in Appendix B:

1. Restructuring OU’s contributions between tier-1 and tier-3 employees

2. Modifying the upper salary limit for tier-2

3. Hedging against a move to a 1-tier structure, which removes any ability to limit the amount some employees pay towards insurance premiums, which can exceed 20% of their gross income.

4. The health insurance costs were analyzed by tier but have not been analyzed with an equity lens to assess gender and racial disparity. We recommend that HR work with the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to conduct such assessments at each decision-making point.
The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee raised several concerns with retiree benefits, including the need for timely communication between HR and relevant groups and providing all relevant data (for both current employees and retirees). The Budget Council supports these recommendations.

**On compensation:** Multiple offices and constituents expressed concerns that pay structures do not appropriately reflect faculty and employee performance and roles. Like other recommendations, the Budget Council recommends that shared-governance representative groups be given more access to annual reports and other compensation data. Templates of such data reports on de-identified faculty salaries by the academic unit have been shared with IRR and the Provost’s Office; however, the Budget Council did not yet receive the data and was unable to review it before the end of the academic year. The Budget Council will await this report and continue conversations to establish an annual data reporting policy. The Budget Council recommends:

1. Establishing an annual process and reporting structure in order to consistently study and address inflation raises (cost-of-living adjustment), equity raises, and compression and inversion assessments and adjustments. This needs to be established as an annual process that is tasked to a particular office in consultation with the relevant faculty and staff governance bodies.

2. Pausing merit-raises, which are important and critical, until merit evaluation criteria and systems are modified to be equitable across gender and racial lines and aligned with all aspects of the strategic plan to value all dimensions, efforts, and impacts of faculty and staff work. This includes the need to value and reward teaching and service in faculty performance.

**C. On OU Online**

There seems to be a good vision for OU Online that is well researched. The projections show modest amounts of profit that are not going to save the University but are also not a trivial amount of money flowing to the central budget. There is currently insufficient information to appropriately analyze the added value of the Elsmere contract’s cost structure. Quantifying this added value by collecting good quality data is critical for the proper assessment of this structure. Two sources of data are the ongoing marketing study and the collection of good data about the financial status of PACS for proper comparison (for example, one of the concerns seems to be the possible channeling of students recruited through other marketing strategies through the OU website to become Elsmere students). Under this topic, our recommendations are:

1. Including the Budget Council when assessing the OU Online data.

2. In consultation with academic units and the Faculty Senate, implementing policies and structures to clearly communicate guidelines to academic units. Such must account for the needs of the impacted department, seek to mitigate negative effects, and support equity across units.

3. Evaluating and addressing the needs of support offices and units for the added drain on their resources (such as University Libraries and other University resources).

4. Updating the marketing strategy to clearly communicate which online programs are accredited. Currently, some unaccredited programs are advertised alongside accredited programs, which could give the illusion of accreditation when combining the marketing of such programs.
D. On OU’s long-term financial health

OU’s financial health as measured by the Composite Financial Index is not good. We are in the range that requires completely reengineering and restructuring the system to improve the financial health and be comfortably able to invest in strategic change. Under this topic, our recommendations are:

1. Assessing the financial cost to OU’s current low credit rating status and the benefits of improving the CFI.
2. Establishing a process through which all major financial decisions are clearly and transparently assessed for their long-term financial impacts.
3. Although the CFI is not a comparable measure, we recommend studying how other comparable institutions maintain better CFIs (amount of debt vs. budget). We are concerned about the level of debt at this institution and weary about taking on more debt.
4. Considering the negative long-term impact of variable interest rates in the current market of low interest rates. It is important that these decisions are made with long-term finances in mind.
5. When there are needs for budget cuts, establishing a process by which such decisions are made in accordance with changes in growth and needs of various programs, rather than going for across-the-board cuts.

E. On budget alignment with the strategic plan

The following recommendations relate to the scope and context of the OU Lead On Strategic Plan:

1. The University rewards research, and the renewed focus on research in the Strategic Plan is good. However, it is critically important to communicate that it is the students who keep the University afloat. Accordingly, assessing the true cost of research and quantifying the University’s overall financial investment in it is of utmost importance. The Budget Council highly recommends conducting and communicating a detailed quantitative study on this topic in addition to communicating the value and impact of research. The Budget Council did not have the bandwidth and relevant data to conduct this study in 2020/2021.
2. The RCM budget model that is referenced in the strategic plan is more suitable for corporate rather than academic institutions. Implementing such a model could encourage competition rather than collaboration between various colleges and academic units, which does not serve well our new trans-disciplinary strategic initiatives.

Members of the 2020/2021 OU Budget Council

Mashhad Fahes, Chair, Faculty, Mewbourne School of Petroleum and Geological Engineering
Paul Spicer, Chair-Elect, Faculty, Department of Anthropology
Rodney Bates, Staff, Director of Graduate Student and Postdoc Retention and Support, Graduate College
Jill Edy, Faculty, Department of Communication
Lauren Lee Lewis, Staff, College of International Studies
Lubomir Litov, Faculty, Division of Finance
Caleb Muckala, Staff, Legal Counsel
Lauren Patton, Student, SGA Ways and Means Chair in the Undergraduate Student Congress
Laurie Scrivener, Faculty, University Libraries
Maria Shpeer, Student, GSS Ways and Means Committee Chair
Beth Stetson, Faculty, Steed School of Accounting
Appendix A - Budget Communication and Transparency Working Group Report

Charge: Research best-practices in budget transparency and analyze the pros and cons from the administrative and employee/student perspectives.

Members: Rodney (lead), Lauren, Laurie, Maria

Background and Rational

Budget literacy and transparency are critical in enabling the Budget Council to perform its functions because staff and faculty who serve on it will already be educated on budget issues. Budget transparency supports OU’s Strategic Plan, specifically, Pillar 3, Make OU’s Excellence Affordable and Attainable, strategy 4, Transparently focus resources on the Strategic Plan. Such transparency helps build trust between faculty and staff with their unit administrators and with the OU administration as a whole on where and how resources are allocated and supports equity and belonging so that everyone has access to all the information that impacts their decisions to negotiate salary and access to resources.

Two recent Chronicle of Higher Education articles, “What if Everyone on Campus Understood the Money?” (September 2020) and “Higher Ed is Not a Zero-Sum Game,” (June 2020) underscore the importance of institutions of higher education making their budgets understandable and transparent. Additionally, a 2015 SUNY Voices Conference paper reports that “public budgeting scholars and practitioners have long recognized that budgetary review and decision-making processes that are open to public scrutiny and debate are valuable tools in effective and accountable democratic government” (p. 6). The paper goes on to say that although public universities are not governments, their budget practices should be transparent for two reasons:

1. State universities are supported by tax revenues and tuition paid by state residents, thus there is an obligation to report how they use those resources, and
2. Budgetary transparency can help universities garner support for their activities and allow the public to evaluate for themselves the university’s programs and services, making institutions more accountable (p. 7).

The Working Group considered negatives to making the University of Oklahoma budget more transparent, such as the potential for added work for financial administrators as university stakeholders ask more questions about expenditures and the potential invasion of privacy with the publication of information such as employee salaries. Despite some misgivings, the Group agreed that because the University is a public institution, the rights of students, faculty, staff, and the public to understand how their money is being spent outweighed any negatives.

Summary of Recommendations

The Budget Council recommends establishing a culture and practice of budget transparency at all levels, including the University, colleges, as well as academic and non-academic units. This is achieved by:

1. Establishing training courses on budget-related content focused on reading budgets and understanding university cash-flow systems and processes. The Faculty Welfare Committee worked on a proposal with the Center for Faculty Excellence to start establishing a level of budget literacy through a Finance and
Budget Curriculum. We highly support and endorse this effort and encourage getting this established during AY22.

2. Establishing budget dashboards. The timeline, content, and levels of access are to be determined by discussion between sub-groups of the Budget Council and the Office of Budget and Financial Planning.

3. Mandating budgetary reporting to employees from all chairs/directors/deans whereby an annual report of the unit budget is shared with unit employees. The content of such reports would be the subject of conversations between sub-groups of the Budget Council and the Office of Budget and Financial Planning.

Examples of Budget Information Sharing

The Group proposes that the University’s Office of Budget and Financial Planning host a page on its website for budget transparency. On this page, there should be a glossary, a literature review, a flow chart detailing revenue sources and expenditures, and a dashboard with current and historic financial information. Explanations of each of these follow.

Glossary: For stakeholders who have not been trained in accounting or finance, a basic glossary of terminology and common acronyms used at the University should be included. Some examples of terminology to include:

- **Academic Support, Expense Coded As** - “Expenditures primarily to provide support services for the institution’s primary missions—instruction, research, and public service. It includes: (1) the retention, preservation, and display of educational materials—for example, libraries, museums, and galleries; (2) the provision of services that directly assist the academic functions of the institution, such as demonstration schools associated with a department, school, or college of education; (3) media such as audiovisual services and technology such as computing support; (4) academic administration (including academic deans but not department chairpersons) and personnel development providing administrative support and management direction to the three primary missions; and (5) separately budgeted support for course and curriculum development. For institutions that currently charge certain of the expenditures—for example, computing support—directly to the various operating units of the institution, this function does not reflect such expenditures. Include expenditures for formally organized and/or separately budgeted academic support informational technology.”

- **EDGEN** - Education and General Funds. These are funds in the budget allocated to OU from the State of Oklahoma legislature. EDGEN funds are commonly referred to as “hard money” funds - meaning that they are fixed amounts for the fiscal year.

- **Faculty** - (Whatever the university’s definition is.)

- **Staff** - (Whatever the university’s definition is. This is important because graphics from the Office of Budget and Financial Planning seem to depict a disproportionate amount of money going to staff, while most staff actually make less than faculty).
Literature Review: A literature review helps explain the need for budget transparency and communication (Links included where available; if accessing from off-campus do not use VPN).


Vaillancourt, Allison M. “What If Everyone on Campus Understood the Money?” Chronicle of Higher Education (Online), September 11, 2020. (link)

Warner, John. “Budgets Are a Reflection of Values.” Inside Higher Ed (Online), December 1, 2019. (link; may require registration)

Flow Chart of Revenue: An explanation of where the university’s money originates and how it can or cannot be spent, with the most recent percentages of each. This would not just include the pie charts on revenues and expenses, but actual charts on how money flows, or what is the protocol for money coming in, and money going out. It should be stated that just because money comes in, does not mean it can be spent randomly due to rules and regulations. Examples include auxiliary funds, state-issued funds, tuition money per student and per class, grants, and so forth.
**Dashboard:** Dashboards are in common use today to explain situations such as the COVID crisis and at other universities for budget transparency. (See [California State University, San Bernardino](https://www.csusb.edu) and [California State University](https://www.csu.fullerton.edu).) The dashboard should be launched at the beginning of FY23 (July 1, 2022), if possible.

Software options for the dashboard: PowerBI in Office 365, which all OU personnel should have access to. (Small monthly fee and Pro license required.) Other software that the OU budget office deems necessary could also be used.

While waiting on the construction of the dashboard, post the PDF of the “budget book” to the budget office’s website.
Appendix B - Health Insurance Premiums; Analysis and Recommendations

This report has been prepared by the 2020/2021 chair of the Budget Council based on data provided by HR on insurance coverage costs for the CY20 (6-tier system) and CY21 (3-tier system).

Change in cost in health insurance

The cost of health insurance increased by an average of 13.6% between CY20 (annual average cost of $9,504.27 per employee; 4942 employees) and CY21 (annual average cost of $10,793.37 per employee, 4864 employees).

- PPO plans’ premiums increased between 11.7% and 13.6%, while HDHP plans’ premiums increased between 8.3% and 10.0%
- Combined employees’ contributions increased from 22.63% to 23.34%, while combined OU contributions decreased from 77.37% to 76.66%
- The total OU contribution to health insurance premiums was $36.34M in CY20, which increased to $40.25M in CY21. A $3.9M increase on OU contributions. This is a 10.8% increase corresponding to a 1.6% decrease in the number of employees covered.

Tier system assessment

89% of employees choose the PPO plan (87% of tier 3 employees, 89% of tier 2, and 91% of tier 1). The following table shares the percent of employee salary paid towards health insurance premiums in the case of PPO plans. It can be seen that the employees with a $30K income paid more than 16% of their income towards the premium in CY21. Highlighted in red are those cases in CY20 with more than 10.5% of employee salary going towards insurance premium, and those cases in CY21 where the percent paid is either over 10.5% or significantly higher than the average for that type of coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>CY20 tier</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>+Children</th>
<th>+Spouse</th>
<th>+Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$41,999.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$59,999.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$64,999.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$184,999.99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below includes the % change in employee PPO contributions from CY20 to CY21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier change</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>+Children</th>
<th>+Spouse</th>
<th>+Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 2</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 2</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 3</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 3</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 3</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that while the cost of health insurance increased an average of 13.6% per employee as indicated earlier, the change in employee contributions ranged from an 86.2% increase to an 8.5% reduction.

**Recommendations**

The employees that are most disadvantaged by this new structure are: CY21 Tier 1 employees earning in the proximity of $30K a year and CY21 Tier 3 employees earning between $65K and $85K. Staying within a 3-tier system, three major recommendations are evident from this data:

- **#1:** increasing the OU contribution to tier-1 employees to limit the cost of those earning around $30K that support children/spouse/family to be under 5.1-10.5% of their salary. This could require increasing OU’s contribution from the current level of 80 -77% to around 89-85%. In order to offset the cost to OU, a reduction in the OU contribution to tier-3 will be needed. One example could be to decrease it from the current level of 75-62% to 74-60%. The net effect on the OU contributions is less than a 0.3% increase. High income Tier-3 employees with families would still experience a 3.6% reduction in contributions compared to FY20, which achieves one of the goals of maintaining a lower cost for family coverage to be able to attract faculty in that salary range.

- **#2:** change the upper salary limit for tier-2 from $64,999.99 to possibly $84,999.99. Employees in this salary range experienced a significant jump in their contributions for moving from tier-4/6 to tier-3/3. We do not have access to the data that would allow us to calculate the impact of this change on the OU budget. However, a significant portion of this added cost can be offset by reducing the OU contribution to tier-3 employees. This can also be offset through changes to the HDHP contribution structure.

- **#3:** The health insurance costs have not been analyzed with an equity lens to assess gender and racial disparity. We recommend HR work with the Office of DE&I to assess equity before making decisions.

**Comparison to Market and the 1-tier option**

The table below compares OU’s current 3-tier system with a 1-tier and a 10-tier system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>OU 3-tier</th>
<th>WV 10-tier</th>
<th>OSU 1-tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,400.00</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$67,900.00</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,400.00</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the move to a 1-tier system is guaranteed to increase the cost of premiums for the lowest-paid employees to be close to 20% of their income before tax. While a 6-Tier system would have been better to resolve the impact on the mid-tier employees, the 3-tier system can still be salvaged to make corrections for CY22. Those corrections would need to be comprehensively integrated, and we do not have access to all the data needed to provide you with such a comprehensive proposal while keeping in check the impact on the OU budget. However, the guidelines are simple:

- A move to a 1-tier system would remove all possible opportunities to manage the percent of employee salary paid towards health insurance premiums unless OU contributions remain tiered.
As a new system is structured, one of the checks should be the percent of employee salary paid towards the premium for those in the lower and those in the higher end of their tier. This amount should not vary greatly in each coverage option. At the moment it varies between 16.1% and 3.6% for employee+family and between 9.2% and 1.8% for employee+children. This can easily be revised to range between 10.5% and 3.8% for employee+family and between 5.1% and 1.9% for employee+children without significantly impacting the total OU contribution.

Addition to Appendix B; Budget Council Report 2020/2021

The following information could impact the scope of recommendations regarding medical insurance costs:

- The numbers included in Appendix B are based on the analysis of CY2021 insurance premiums. CY2022 premiums will not be available before Sep 2021. The analysis needs to be repeated once these numbers are available to update the numbers in the recommendations accordingly.
- The number of employees included in the assessment is those working on the Norman campus. OU policies impact all three OU campuses and accordingly, the assessments need to be reviewed for the other two campuses in terms of their impact on the OU Budget.
- We did not have access to the number of employees in CY2021 earning between $65K and $85K and accordingly we could not assess the feasibility of the second recommendation in terms of its impact on the budget.
- The Affordable Care Act provides a maximum threshold (varies every year) that applies to employee-only coverage, and that threshold is based on the lowest employee salary. In 2021, all employee-only coverages cannot be changed more than 9.78% of the lowest-paid employee.

Additional Numbers:

The second table provided in Appendix B provided percentages regarding the change in the employees’ costs towards medical insurance premiums. The table below provides the dollar amounts of these changes from 2020 to 2021. Positive numbers are an increase and negative numbers are a decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier change</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>+Children</th>
<th>+Spouse</th>
<th>+Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1</td>
<td>$263.00</td>
<td>$529.87</td>
<td>$399.62</td>
<td>$471.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>$68.36</td>
<td>$295.63</td>
<td>$(192.46)</td>
<td>$(256.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 2</td>
<td>$308.40</td>
<td>$260.92</td>
<td>$486.02</td>
<td>$391.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 2</td>
<td>$113.76</td>
<td>$143.80</td>
<td>$42.02</td>
<td>$(336.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 3</td>
<td>$839.04</td>
<td>$695.04</td>
<td>$1,434.47</td>
<td>$715.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 3</td>
<td>$514.56</td>
<td>$577.92</td>
<td>$546.71</td>
<td>$(193.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 3</td>
<td>$125.04</td>
<td>$343.68</td>
<td>$(341.05)</td>
<td>$(739.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overarching Recommendations:

For CY2022 medical insurance costs and distribution of the OU contributions, we recommend the following process:

- Before the distribution of contributions is finalized, the following entities are to be provided with an assessment of the proposed distribution and its impacts (detailed below). They should be provided two
weeks to analyze the data and provide feedback, and then a meeting is to be scheduled to discuss the feedback and make changes as needed before Sept. 21st.

- Faculty and Staff Senate Chairs
- Employee Benefits Committee Chair
- Budget Council Chair
- Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee

- HR will have the premium numbers for CY2022 in early September. The following numbers would be provided to the entities highlighted above by Sep 7th:
  - The cost of the insurance premium for the various categories of coverage (Employee, with children, with a spouse, and with family), the proposed tier structure by employee salary, and the associated % of OU contribution to the premium for each type of coverage in each tier.
  - The total projected employee contributions and total projected OU contributions in dollar value (presenting 2020 and 2021 numbers as well for comparison)
  - A table showing the percent of employee salary paid annually towards the insurance premium, based on the proposed CY2022 structure, for the 4 categories of coverage under the two plan options. This would be for salaries starting with the minimum employee salary and calculated every $5K (ex: rows would be for salaries of $25K, $30K, $35K...). The same table, for comparison purposes, is to be provided for CY2021 data and CY2020 data.
  - A table of the number of employees in each salary bracket ($5K intervals) for each of the three OU campuses.
  - The dollar amount of change in employee contribution for each salary bracket ($5K intervals) from 2020 to 2022 and from 2021 to 2022.

- In the future, we highly recommend including representation from the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and conducting the assessments by gender and race/ethnicity.
CONTINUING EDUCATION COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Hamilton</td>
<td>Provost (designee)</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
<td>OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education,</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Outreach Staff provides support for the CEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Associate VP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Diaz de la Rubia</td>
<td>VPRP Office</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Hewes</td>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Dulin</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew Stock</td>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Miller</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2020-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Pitblado</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Irungu</td>
<td>SW Center - Outreach</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Anderson</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>2020-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Deberry, Chair</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kimmel</td>
<td>Center for Early Childhood Professional Development - Outreach</td>
<td>2020-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Meredith Raymond</td>
<td>IL AC</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathrine Gutierrez</td>
<td>Educational Leadership and Policy Studies</td>
<td>2020-23</td>
<td>No longer with the university per Paula Hansen – will be replaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Barbee</td>
<td>Outreach/Director of Continuing Education</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CEC Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of the Continuing Education Council

The Continuing Education Council (CEC) works with and supports the Vice President for University Outreach and reports to the Faculty Senate on matters concerning non-credit, non-degree continuing education. The Council provides a forum for faculty and administrators to discuss lifelong learning as it impacts the University of Oklahoma. It also serves an advocacy role in raising the level of campus discussion on such issues as:

- Cross-disciplinary interaction
- The role of the University in non-credit, non-degree workplace education, and community/public service
- Certification and non-credit, non-degree programming
- Non-credit, non-degree interdisciplinary continuing education
- Non-credit, non-degree distance education
The CEC serves a proactive role in providing information about outreach and lifelong learning to the Faculty Senate, the Provost’s Office, and the President’s Office and informing campus dialogue regarding these issues. In addition, the CEC provides substantive input and acts as a constructive sounding board for the Vice President and CCE staff regarding outreach and non-credit, non-degree distance education, and lifelong learning. Finally, the CEC serves as a liaison between the President’s office, the College of Continuing Education, and the faculty and staff, providing effective communication between these and other campus groups.

Administrative Liaison:

1. The Provost of the Norman campus or a designated representative will be an ex-officio member of the Council without a vote.

2. The Vice President for Outreach will be an ex-officio member of the Council without a vote and will provide staff support for the Council.

Annual Report (2020-2021)

The Continuing Education Council (CEC) received the list of new members appointed by the Faculty Senate in the fall of 2020. Due to the outbreak of COVID in the spring of 2020, university work – including that of committees – focused on responding to the pandemic in effective ways. COVID guidelines were adopted across the university campus while staff, faculty, students, and administrators transitioned to remote learning and working environments. Since the CEC is representative of staff, faculty, and administrators, we decided to have fewer meetings in 2020 to accommodate better committee member’s needs during COVID. Regular CEC meetings were held on January 29, 2020, and February 19, 2020. Then, the COVID pandemic hit in March of 2020. The March meeting was canceled, and the committee worked to adapt accordingly. A virtual meeting was held on November 20, 2020. This information was submitted by CEC Chair, Dr. Harold Mortimer, in the 2020 Annual Report last year.

The CEC Chair, Dr. Harold Mortimer’s three-year term expired, and unfortunately, he had to step down from his important role after assuming another faculty responsibility that did not allow him to continue on the CEC. He remains part of the OU faculty. CEC Members were quick to extend great appreciation to Dr. Mortimer for his excellent service and tremendous work. His enthusiasm was contagious. He consistently had ideas for innovative connections and programs to build through collaborations with OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education and OU departments across the campus.

CEC Meetings in 2021:

The CEC Committee held meetings this year on February 9 and April 13. The February meeting would be the first meeting with new replacement members (see Roster above) sent to us from the Provost’s Office.

February 9, 2021

Dr. Belinda Biscoe convened this meeting virtually due to COVID restrictions on face-to-face gatherings, etc. per university policies. Since this initial meeting would have new members, the main goal was to welcome and introduce committee members to each other. This gave established members and new members opportunities
to share information about themselves and their departments. As an orientation for new members Dr. Biscoe shared a documentary film, that she and staff produced several years ago “Mirrors from the Past: Reflections and Directions for the Future” about OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education and the Division of Public and Community Services. The documentary provides a historical perspective about the evolution of the college and its important role in connecting the university faculty and staff over many decades to transformational work in the State of Oklahoma, nation, and the world, including providing programs and services for the adult and life-long learner. As the outreach arm of the university, we continue to connect “town and gown” in ways that improve the quality of life for individuals and communities.

The film showed a long and impactful history highlighting the many collaborations established and programs developed by Outreach/CCE and the Division of Public and Community Services spanning decades. The film showed that since its inception Outreach/CCE is almost 100% self-supporting. That is a little-known fact in many circles. The film focused on the mission and core values. Interestingly, committee members were excited to learn about the many collaborations Outreach/CCE has developed and maintained, i.e., joint programming with academic colleges, noncredit programming partners, and service/work stemming from federal, state, local, and regional funding sources, including foundations.

The documentary film was extremely well-received and offered an opportunity for group sharing and many thoughtful questions from members. Several ideas were proposed, and the members suggested continuing the discussion for innovative and collaborative programming across campus for all future meetings. Feedback from members indicated an interest to explore the Outreach/CCE website to learn more.

April 13, 2021

As concerns for the COVID pandemic continued into 2021, the April meeting was also held virtually. Dr. Biscoe checked in with all the CEC members for updates on how everyone was doing. After sharing among committee members, Dr. Biscoe welcomed everyone. Dr. Nina Barbee opened the meeting with an overview of the Agenda. Dr. Biscoe provided context for the meeting. The Minutes were approved, and each Agenda item was addressed by Dr. Biscoe and various CEC members. The discussion focused on the need to nominate a replacement Chair for Dr. Harold Mortimer. Nominations are submitted to Dr. Nina Barbee, CEC coordinator, and then selections are voted on by individual members. For this term, Mr. Vince Deberry is serving as CEC Chair. The vote was approved by acclamation with no dissents. The CEC unanimously welcomed Mr. Deberry. He has vast experience as the Director of the Center for Public Management, OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education and his skills and talents are an excellent fit for this important role as CEC Chair.

Other agenda items included identifying trends in continuing higher education, expanding on the discussion about the role of OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education’s mission, programming, funding, and events, etc. Additionally, for the next meeting, the committee will propose ideas for useful subcommittees, formulate new goals, and outcomes (short- and long-term) for the CEC as a way to collaborate with academic units, especially in the areas of competitive grant writing and program development.
COUNCIL ON FACULTY AWARDS AND HONORS
2020-21 ANNUAL REPORT
SUBMITTED BY MARISSA MANGRUM, CHAIR

The University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors (UCFAH) fulfilled its charge of reviewing nominations and making recommendations to the Provosts (OU Norman and HSC). This was the second cycle of reviews following new procedures and updated criteria recommended by a separate Faculty Awards Advisory Committee (FAAC) in 2019 and approved by the Regents.

The committee had one zoom orientation session on November 2, 2021. The Provosts' staff, namely Grey Allman and Megan Lottie (OU Norman), and Claire Young (HSC) attended the meetings. The committee chair and the staff briefed the members on the process of reviewing and scoring the dossiers; prior to the meetings, each member was required to view Dr. Irvin’s training video on Implicit Bias.

Nomination packages were made accessible to the UCFAH members on December 15, 2020. All the files were maintained online through a secure website. The UCFAH met on Wednesday, January 20, 2021, to consider nominees and recommend recipients of awards. The following are the UCFAH members, and all participated in the reviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marissa Mangrum (Chair)</th>
<th>Medical Imaging &amp; Radiation Sciences</th>
<th>College of Allied Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rozmeri Basic</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioana Cionea</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Davis</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Moreau</td>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Neeson</td>
<td>Geography and Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>College of Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Nelson</td>
<td>Surgery, Tulsa</td>
<td>College of Medicine - Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Peters</td>
<td>Nursing Academic Programs</td>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei Yue</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following member was absent:

| Raymond Orr            | Native American Studies             | College of Arts and Sciences |
An outstanding group of 56 highly qualified nominees was evaluated by the Council and awardees were selected. The members of the Council are to be commended for the difficult challenge of selecting from such a distinguished group of nominees. The award categories were:

- David L. Boren Professorship (2 nominations received)
- Davis Ross Boyd Professorship (7 nominations received)
- Regent’s Professorship (8 nominations received)
- Regents’ Award for Superior Professional and University Service and Public Outreach (11 nominations received)
- Regents’ Award for Superior Research and Creative Activity (9 nominations received)
- Regents’ Award for Superior Teaching (9 nominations received)
- General Education Teaching Award (1 nomination received)
- University Distinguished Teaching Award (9 nominations received)

We paid primary attention to the criteria for each award as instructed. As mentioned above, all committee members paid attention to Implicit Bias prior to and during the meeting. The final gender distribution for both the nominations received and the recipients is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Norman</td>
<td>20 (53%)</td>
<td>18 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUHSC</td>
<td>10 (56%)</td>
<td>8 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 (54%)</td>
<td>26 (46%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All recommendations and deliberations of the Council were communicated with the Provost.

2021-2022 Committee: The Council elected Jennifer Davis, Department of History, College of Arts and Sciences, Norman Campus as Chair of the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors for the 2021-2022 term. As you may recall, the Chair position alternates annually between the Norman and HSC campuses.
Key issues that the Information Technology Council (ITC) worked on during the 2020-2021 AY:

- **Standardized Computing Requirements.**
  - Coming into this year, IT required us to purchase computing systems (laptops and desktops) from a small, standard menu. In addition, individuals had been limited to having one device.
  - An exception request process was in place, but it required additional documentation and waiting. There was a lot of confusion about who managed the exception process; we seemed to have individuals not responsible for the exception process rejecting requests and not forwarding them on.
  - We were seeing a dramatic slow-down in the purchasing process, which required much more faculty time to resolve.
  - Provost Irvine formed a committee to look at our concerns with this approach. The conclusions, which have recently gone into effect:
    - Externally funded exceptions are automatically granted (though we still need to go through the exception process).
    - One-device-per-person limitation does not apply to machines that are purchased with external funds.
    - Start-up packages are internal funds, but purchase requests with these funds will not be held up.

- **Other Computing Purchase Issues**
  - We also have a lot more clarity on the “lifecycle” issue. Computers may continue to be used after retirement from their primary role (to labs or to students).
  - The federal government has put in place restrictions on some of the types of computing hardware infrastructure that we can purchase (“section 889” requirements). Purchasing will flag requests that violate this requirement.

- **Computing Policies/Standards in General**
  - IT now has a standard process for new & modifications to existing policies and standards.
  - Publicly post proposals; available for comment by the OU community.
  - Also, discuss these in ITC on a regular basis.

- **Research Computing Survey**
  - IT launched a research computing survey in the middle of April. Faculty should take time to respond.
• **New Supercomputer and Related Services**
  o Components for the supercomputer are coming online starting this summer, with “friendly user” access this Fall.
  o Computing with sensitive data: working to bring up supercomputing/storage services that properly handle HIPAA and other sensitive data types. Expect systems to be available end of 2021/beginning of 2022.
  o **OUrDisk/OUrStore:**
    ▪ Disk and tape storage are purchasable for use with the supercomputer and other systems (~$100/TB and $6/TB, respectively). Hardware has a defined lifetime, depending on what is purchased.
    ▪ OU IT will cover maintenance, power, cooling.
    ▪ Can mirror disks between Norman and HSC for better data stability.
    ▪ In some cases, resources are sharable outside of OU.

• **Password Management**
  o Lastpass (a password management system) rolled out during the Spring Semester. We encourage everyone to move over to using it or another password manager.

• **Accessibility Technology**
  o ADRC (Chellé Lodge Guttery) is available to help faculty and departments develop a more generally accessible online presence.
  o They are looking at services that will automatically check Canvas and websites for accessibility challenges.

• **Authentication**
  o The legacy authentication mechanisms for POP/IMAP access to the OU mail system have been deactivated. This is part of the planned Microsoft phase-out of these interfaces. Faculty having trouble with accessing OU mail should work with IT to move to modern authentication tools.
  o Single Sign On: moving to using email address as the standard username (and away from 4x4). But, both work right now in some systems.

• **Faculty with Concerns/Problems/Challenges with IT**
  o Feel free to bring to the ITC.
  o We need specific details about the issue and who is involved.

• **Phishing**
  o IT at HSC and Tulsa have been sending fake phishing email messages to faculty and staff (one per ~1-2 months). This process will expand to Norman soon.
  o If someone responds to a phishing message by clicking on a link, they will be registered for anti-phishing training and be tested later at a higher frequency.
  o ITC has discussed the process and agrees that this is a reasonable approach, especially in light of the data that were collected at HSC and Tulsa.
• Online Teaching
  o From the student’s perspective: online procedures vary greatly across classes. This is a big source of confusion and stress for the students.

Open issues that we are working on for the 2021-2022 AY:

• Policies, Standards, etc.
  o In addition to the legal documents that are being put in place, we need human-readable documents. What must be done? Who are the responsible parties? How do we make processes feasible given that faculty and staff are already over-committed?

• End-point user device policy.
  o Trying to address security concerns from state and federal agencies, as well as insurance providers.
  o Originally: all on-network devices must allow admin-level access by IT.
  o Current discussion: only OU-owned devices must have monitoring software installed.
    ▪ Scanning for malicious code; logging of activity on the machine.
    ▪ Still in question as to what information is being logged. Recent email (unclear as to whether it was official) suggested that even browser URLs would be logged (through the CrowdStrike service).
    ▪ We are currently discussing with IT the privacy and performance issues. It is not yet clear where they will come down on this. They state that they are committed to being transparent about the solutions that are chosen.

• Sharing of Data with Other Institutions. We need secure ways of sharing data with our research collaborators, including HIPAA-protected data. OU does not have these latter capabilities in-house, and so far, there is a lot of friction to signing up for 3rd party services that provide these protections (One individual recently secured access to Databrary, but this is an exception, not a generally available solution).

• Gradescope
  o The license has been renewed through August 2022

• Membership
  o Need to make sure that we have a full five faculty appointed.
  o Currently do not have a representative from the President’s office or the Vice President for Student Affair’s office.
  o Only one student member has been appointed to the ITC for the last two years. This perspective is greatly appreciated, and we need more input.
  o Tend not to have a lot of diversity on the committee (we have done better this year).
  o The ITC term for the current chair expires at the end of the year.

Chair Election: The ITC Chair for the 2021-22-20 academic year will be Andy Fagg (Computer Science).
History and Membership

The Research Council was approved as a council by the President of the university upon recommendation of the Faculty Senate and The University of Oklahoma Student Association in December 1972 and revised May 10, 1974, June 28, 1978, and July 2, 1982. The Council was restructured in Spring 1991 and consists of fifteen members; five are appointed by the Office of the President and ten by the Faculty Senate.

In 2013, the Faculty Senate approved a plan to balance the Research Council membership to reflect the disciplines represented by recent patterns among submitted proposals. The new structure for the Research Council began in 2014-2015, and is as follows at the end of 2020-21:

- Engineering, Energy, Mathematical and Physical Sciences (3 members)
- Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 members)
- Life Sciences (2 members)
- Humanities (3 members)
- Education/Professional/Other (2 members)
- Fine Arts (2 members)

The faculty members of the 2020-21 Research Council, their departments, and terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xun Ge</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ping Zhu</td>
<td>Modern Lang., Lit. &amp; Ling.</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Krumholz</td>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Plant Biology</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Vishanoff</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ashby</td>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Plant Biology</td>
<td>2020-22</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deven Carlson</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alissa Mortimer</td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Haag</td>
<td>Modern Lang., Lit., &amp; Ling.</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Rogers</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Avery</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2020-23</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Robbins</td>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>2020-23</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Jones</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>2020-23</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2021-2022 Chair of the Research Council will be Dr. Cynthia Rogers from the Department of Economics. The Research Council is administered through the Office of the VPRP; Secretary to the Research Council is Dianna Crissman.
Budget

A total of $400,000 was split between the Faculty Investment Program ($250,000) and Junior Faculty Fellowships ($150,000). This amount is unchanged from FY 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FIP Budget Allocation</th>
<th>JFF Budget Allocation</th>
<th>Total VPRP Budget Allocation</th>
<th>FIP Funding Awarded</th>
<th>JFF Funding Awarded</th>
<th>Total VPRP Funding Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$301,738</td>
<td>$151,188</td>
<td>$452,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$278,107</td>
<td>$149,276</td>
<td>$427,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$257,377</td>
<td>$173,382</td>
<td>$430,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$291,535</td>
<td>$133,014</td>
<td>$424,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$289,690</td>
<td>$145,980</td>
<td>$435,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$314,698</td>
<td>$142,633</td>
<td>$457,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$286,454</td>
<td>$116,406</td>
<td>$402,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$265,294</td>
<td>$127,946</td>
<td>$393,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$260,408</td>
<td>$159,453</td>
<td>$419,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities (2020-2021)

The primary activity of the Research Council during the 2020-2021 academic year was to advise and make recommendations to the Vice President for Research (VPRP) pertaining to awards and honors under his administration, namely

- Faculty Investment Program (Up to $15,000)
- Junior Faculty Fellowships ($7,000 + Fringe)
- George Lynn Cross Research Professorship (recommendation to President)
- Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Educational Research

Faculty Investment Program (FIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2020-2021 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$129,430</td>
<td>$14,381</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>4 Female 10 Male</td>
<td>29% Female 71% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,253</td>
<td>$1,253</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1 Female 0 Male</td>
<td>100% Female 0% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,801</td>
<td>$7,801</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0 Female 2 Male</td>
<td>0% Female 100% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1 Female 1 Male</td>
<td>50% Female 50% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$28,487</td>
<td>$14,243</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1 Female 2 Male</td>
<td>33% Female 67% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$63,438</td>
<td>$12,688</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7 Female 2 Male</td>
<td>58% Female 17% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$260,408</td>
<td>$13,020</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14 Female 17 Male</td>
<td>41% Female 50% Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Investment Program proposal and award breakdown by discipline and gender, FY 2021.
FY – 21 saw 34 submissions for the Faculty Investment Program, of which 20 were funded (59%). This compares with FY – 20, which saw 39 submissions, of which 17 were funded (43%), and FY – 19, which saw 52 submissions, of which 21 were funded (40%).

This year, the number of applicants decreased, and with similar numbers of funded applications, so the percent funded increased. We anticipate that post COVID, these numbers will return to the 40-45% funded range. Applications from Engineering and Physical Sciences remain disproportionately large compared to other disciplines. Although we are now seeing a good number of applications from scholars in Education and professional programs, remaining disciplines are underrepresented in application numbers.

### Junior Faculty Fellowship (JFF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2020-2021 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposal s Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Fundi ng Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditurs</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$18,802</td>
<td>$9,401</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$74,436</td>
<td>$9,305</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,452</td>
<td>$8,484</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$23,401</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$17,361</td>
<td>$8,681</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Ot her</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$159,453</td>
<td>$8,858</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[figure 3] Junior Faculty Fellowship proposal and award breakdown by discipline and gender, FY 2021.

Junior Faculty Fellowship (JFF) Submissions were lower in FY– 21 (19) than in FY–20 (26), which in turn was appreciably lower than prior years; (FY-19 had 35 and FY–18 and FY–17 each had 54 submissions). This trend, if it continues may be concerning.

In FY–21, there were 19 submissions of which 18 were funded (95%). This compares with:
FY–20 in which there were 26 submissions of which 15 were funded (58%).
FY–19 in which there were 35 submissions of which 14 were funded (40%)
FY–18 in which there were 54 submissions of which 17 were funded (31%)
FY–17 in which there were 54 submissions of which 17 were funded (31%)
FY–16 in which there were 69 submissions of which 16 were funded (23%)

This year we note that the number of proposals is down, likely due to COVID. The proposal quality was generally high, and since adequate funding was available, the council was happy to be able to fund most of the applications.
George Lynn Cross Professorship and Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award

Awards for the George Lynn Cross Research Professorship (recommendation to President): The council nominated Dr. Rong Gan (School of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering (AME). For the Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Educational Research, the council nominated Deven Carlson (Political Science).

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion:

In 2020, the Research Council has mandated a more extensive Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion training as a part of the preparation for new council members in collaboration with the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. This focuses on helping members recognize their own implicit biases in the context of peer review and the evaluation of research proposals. This has been continued this year.

a) Award by gender: While this year’s figures seem to suggest significant gender disparities in application and award in some disciplines, it is not clear that this is representative of historical trends. (See appendix 1 for historical data for context).

b) Award by race and ethnicity: The Research Council has not, to date, been able to collect or track either submission or award numbers by race or ethnicity. We were told by legal counsel that we could not request the data on the applications, so we have requested the data from HR, but it has not been provided. Going forwards council will try to collect this information, and we will make efforts to retrospectively compile this data across the last three years to the extent that this is possible.

Concluding remarks:

The number of applications this past year for both the FIP and the JFF was down significantly from previous years. This is most likely because of issues related to COVID including difficulty in traveling and a closed research lab early in the year. It is likely that the popularity of the FIP will return to previous levels.

The JFF has been thought of as a very good investment for the Research Office and awards are more equitably distributed among engineering, sciences, humanities, social sciences, and fine arts. There has been a downward trend in applications for the JFF and it may be worth considering an increase in the maximum funding level for this award to encourage the applications.

Regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion, the Research Council has included DEI training as a part of each year's Research Council training the past two years. Council also hopes to track both applications and awards by race and ethnicity in addition to gender and discipline. We hope also to be able to retrospectively track this information going back three years.

The Research Council will continue to evaluate and revise (as necessary) both the rubrics provided to applicants on the Research Council website and those used by the Research Council during the evaluation process in light of our meeting with the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to further limit the impact of implicit biases on the review process.
Appendix 1: Historical data on FIP and JFF submission and award:

### Faculty Investment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2019-2020 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$139,932</td>
<td>$14,996</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4 Male</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3 Female</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$42,478</td>
<td>$13,825</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5 Male</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3 Female</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1 Female</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,540</td>
<td>$13,540</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2 Male</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$51,320</td>
<td>$12,820</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3 Male</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2 Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>$260,294</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,133</strong></td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Junior Faculty Fellowship Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2019-2020 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$36,032</td>
<td>$9,138</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2 Male</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2 Female</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$49,342</td>
<td>$8,224</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8 Male</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4 Female</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$14,224</td>
<td>$6,142</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$23,648</td>
<td>$6,498</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>$177,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY – 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2018-2019 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$204,856</td>
<td>$14,579</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7 Male</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5 Female</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$42,841</td>
<td>$14,280</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7 Male</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3 Female</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$60,821</td>
<td>$13,064</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5 Male</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4 Female</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$35,227</td>
<td>$11,776</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5 Male</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2 Female</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$18,609</td>
<td>$7,363</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0 Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2 Female</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35,600</td>
<td>$8,030</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4 Male</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>$286,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,641</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2018-2019 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$44,363</td>
<td>$8,838</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3 Male</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3 Female</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$59,835</td>
<td>$8,062</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7 Male</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1 Female</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2 Male</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,920</td>
<td>$7,068</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2 Male</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1 Female</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,458</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,313</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## FY – 2018

### Faculty Investment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2017-2018 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$93,210</td>
<td>$13,321</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Female 30% Male 70%</td>
<td>Female 41% Male 59%</td>
<td>Female 43% Male 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$39,781</td>
<td>$15,634</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Female 30% Male 70%</td>
<td>Female 36% Male 64%</td>
<td>Female 54% Male 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$72,291</td>
<td>$11,696</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Female 67% Male 33%</td>
<td>Female 65% Male 35%</td>
<td>Female 69% Male 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$31,871</td>
<td>$11,696</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Female 71% Male 29%</td>
<td>Female 67% Male 33%</td>
<td>Female 75% Male 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23,257</td>
<td>$11,779</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Female 22% Male 78%</td>
<td>Female 23% Male 77%</td>
<td>Female 22% Male 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$314,688</td>
<td>$13,883</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Female 93% Male 7%</td>
<td>Female 99% Male 1%</td>
<td>Female 98% Male 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Junior Faculty Fellowship Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2017-2018 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$55,200</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Female 41% Male 59%</td>
<td>Female 29% Male 71%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$31,952</td>
<td>$6,779</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Female 46% Male 54%</td>
<td>Female 11% Male 89%</td>
<td>Female 50% Male 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,025</td>
<td>$6,025</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Female 35% Male 65%</td>
<td>Female 99% Male 1%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$141,698</td>
<td>$8,393</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Female 26% Male 74%</td>
<td>Female 99% Male 1%</td>
<td>Female 98% Male 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FY – 2017

### Faculty Investment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2016-2017 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$46,680</td>
<td>$11,670</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,900</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Female 56% Male 44%</td>
<td>Female 44% Male 56%</td>
<td>Female 44% Male 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$89,250</td>
<td>$14,875</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Female 44% Male 56%</td>
<td>Female 67% Male 33%</td>
<td>Female 65% Male 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$46,907</td>
<td>$9,818</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Female 44% Male 56%</td>
<td>Female 44% Male 56%</td>
<td>Female 44% Male 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$33,257</td>
<td>$8,314</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$54,690</td>
<td>$13,674</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Female 50% Male 50%</td>
<td>Female 50% Male 50%</td>
<td>Female 50% Male 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$289,698</td>
<td>$13,308</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Female 21% Male 79%</td>
<td>Female 18% Male 82%</td>
<td>Female 18% Male 82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Junior Faculty Fellowship Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2016-2017 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$43,480</td>
<td>$14,468</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Female 80% Male 20%</td>
<td>Female 20% Male 80%</td>
<td>Female 20% Male 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$33,320</td>
<td>$8,462</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Female 42% Male 58%</td>
<td>Female 35% Male 65%</td>
<td>Female 25% Male 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$34,728</td>
<td>$8,462</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Female 33% Male 67%</td>
<td>Female 33% Male 67%</td>
<td>Female 33% Male 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$28,947</td>
<td>$8,629</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Female 38% Male 62%</td>
<td>Female 38% Male 62%</td>
<td>Female 38% Male 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,317</td>
<td>$9,317</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
<td>Female 100% Male 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,217</td>
<td>$9,217</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0% Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$245,360</td>
<td>$8,587</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Female 30% Male 70%</td>
<td>Female 24% Male 76%</td>
<td>Female 24% Male 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year 2015-2016 Discipline</td>
<td>Number of Proposals Submitted</td>
<td>Number of Awards</td>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>Average Award</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</td>
<td>Gender of Submitted Proposals</td>
<td>Gender of Successful Proposals</td>
<td>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: Male</td>
<td>Female: Male</td>
<td>Female: Male</td>
<td>Female: Male</td>
<td>Female: Male</td>
<td>Female: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY – 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Investment Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$125,151</td>
<td>$24,383</td>
<td>39%: 44%</td>
<td>38%: 38%</td>
<td>6: 17</td>
<td>26%: 14%</td>
<td>2 : 1</td>
<td>22%: 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$46,423</td>
<td>$11,013</td>
<td>37%: 16%</td>
<td>17%: 3%</td>
<td>4: 3</td>
<td>23%: 43%</td>
<td>2: 2</td>
<td>50%: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$29,170</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
<td>29%: 10%</td>
<td>8%: 3%</td>
<td>2: 3</td>
<td>29%: 71%</td>
<td>1: 1</td>
<td>50%: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$10,157</td>
<td>$2,528</td>
<td>80%: 14%</td>
<td>17%: 9%</td>
<td>3: 2</td>
<td>60%: 40%</td>
<td>2: 2</td>
<td>50%: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$29,905</td>
<td>$9,668</td>
<td>50%: 10%</td>
<td>12%: 4%</td>
<td>2: 4</td>
<td>33%: 67%</td>
<td>1: 1</td>
<td>50%: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,129</td>
<td>$7,099</td>
<td>40%: 5%</td>
<td>8%: 3%</td>
<td>2: 3</td>
<td>20%: 80%</td>
<td>1: 1</td>
<td>50%: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$291,531</td>
<td>$22,147</td>
<td>43%: 100%</td>
<td>100%: 100%</td>
<td>23: 32</td>
<td>38%: 62%</td>
<td>9: 13</td>
<td>57.1%: 42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Faculty Fellowship Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year 2015-2016 Discipline</td>
<td>Number of Proposals Submitted</td>
<td>Number of Awards</td>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>Average Award</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</td>
<td>Gender of Submitted Proposals</td>
<td>Gender of Successful Proposals</td>
<td>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,151</td>
<td>$5,045</td>
<td>10%: 29%</td>
<td>13%: 1%</td>
<td>1: 2</td>
<td>10%: 90%</td>
<td>2: 1</td>
<td>33%: 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,418</td>
<td>$8,403</td>
<td>24%: 12%</td>
<td>33%: 9%</td>
<td>0: 1</td>
<td>20%: 80%</td>
<td>0: 0</td>
<td>0%: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5%: 9%</td>
<td>0%: 0%</td>
<td>0: 0</td>
<td>0%: 100%</td>
<td>0: 0</td>
<td>0%: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$2,818</td>
<td>10%: 26%</td>
<td>38%: 13%</td>
<td>0: 1</td>
<td>24%: 76%</td>
<td>4: 2</td>
<td>63%: 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>50%: 50%</td>
<td>0%: 0%</td>
<td>0: 0</td>
<td>0%: 100%</td>
<td>0: 1</td>
<td>0%: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>10%: 7%</td>
<td>0%: 0%</td>
<td>0: 0</td>
<td>20%: 80%</td>
<td>0: 1</td>
<td>0%: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$133,014</td>
<td>$8,319</td>
<td>23%: 100%</td>
<td>100%: 100%</td>
<td>13: 24</td>
<td>10%: 90%</td>
<td>8: 8</td>
<td>50%: 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Faculty Senate’s Committee on Faculty Compensation and Benefits (FCBC) is charged with reviewing and recommending policy on questions related to the economic welfare of the faculty, including fringe benefits. The purpose of the FCBC is to monitor salary increases requested by the University administration, gather information on salaries and fringe benefits from within and without the University, and suggest appropriate proposals for advancing the economic position and needs of the faculty.

Membership

The members of the 2020-2021 Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee with academic units and terms:

Anthony Natale (Social Work) (2018-2021), Chair, anatale@ou.edu
Tassie Hirschfeld (Anthropology) (2018-2021)
David Horton (Music) (2019-2022)
Honoreé Jeffers (English) (2020-23)
Gregory Burge (Economics) (2019 – 12/2020)
Rebecca Lorramm (Geography and Environmental Sustainability) (1/2021-2022) – replaced Prof. Burge

Meetings

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee met monthly for 90 minutes. Four meetings occurred during the Fall semester, and four meetings occurred during the Spring semester.

Issues

1. **Tuition Benefits for Dependents.** The committee examines all schools in the Big 12 to determine tuition benefits for dependents at each institution. The committee discovered that OU’s benefit is comparable to or more comprehensive to other Big 12 institutions. The exceptions were Baylor and TCU, both private, who allow dependents to take their tuition benefits to other private institutions within a national consortium.

   ⇒ **Outcome:** Upon conclusion of the review, the committee decided that no further action steps are needed at this time.

2. **Expansion of Compensation and Benefits Committee.** The committee recently expanded in scope to consider benefits. At the same time, the administration has channeled several compensation and benefits initiatives through the committee for consideration. As a result, the committee’s workload is more significant than ever.

   ⇒ **Outcome:** The committee drafted a proposal to expand the committee from 5 to 7 members and passed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate.
3. **COVID-19 Related Health costs and Disability.** The Faculty Senate is requesting that the University create a special fund for faculty and staff who may need assistance with out-of-pocket health costs (including co-pays and deductibles) in the 2020-2021 academic year due to COVID 19 infection. While several federal policy initiatives (such as the CARES Act) have sought to limit out-of-pocket costs for patients during the COVID pandemic, this benefit is likely to expire before the beginning of the fall semester.

⇒ **Outcome:** A detailed proposal was drafted and passed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. (See passed proposals on the Faculty Senate website for full details).

4. **COVID-19 Disrupted Sabbaticals.** Faculty on sabbatical that extended through spring of 2020 experienced several unique disruptions that could not have been foreseen when they completed their application. These disruptions involved data collection with community research partners such as schools; differential accessibility to state and federal funding agencies experiencing mandatory shutdowns; access to research laboratory facilities and supports; and unexpected increases in caretaking (child, partner, elder). As a result, faculty on a sabbatical that extended through Spring 2020 have been unable to realize the benefits of uninterrupted time and focus on furthering their scholarship.

⇒ **Outcome:** A detailed proposal was drafted and passed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. (See passed proposals on the Faculty Senate website for full details).

5. **Retiree Benefits.** The committee engaged in a series of conversations with the Faculty Senate, OU HR representatives, OU retirees, and the President. Explored challenges from the most recent rollout of OU changes to Medicare retiree plans.

⇒ **Outcome:** Cataloged the issues and established a formal relationship between retirees and OU HR to impact retiree benefits decisions.

6. **Compensation and Benefits Equity Review.** The committee has been working on gaining access to salary and benefits data to examine the most compressed and inverted and make that consideration in light of benefits. In addition, the committee has begun a list of recommended best practices for compensation adjustments at the unit, college, and administrative unit to not exacerbate existing equity issues.

⇒ **Outcome:** The conversations continue relative to data needs and will resume in Fall 2021.

**Chair Election**

Anthony Natale was reappointed to the committee for a second three-year term and was unanimously supported for the Chair position for the 2021-2022 academic year.
Membership

The members of the 2020-21 Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC):

- Boyko Dossev
- Phil Gibson
- Keri Kornelson
- Wayne Riggs
- Sarah Robbins (Chair)

Tasks continued from 2019-20

1. Teaching Evaluation Working Group (TEWG). The Faculty Senate’s Faculty Welfare Committee and the Office of the Provost charge the Working Group on Teaching Evaluation with evaluating and improving course evaluations with respect to reducing biases and improving actionability, with the goal of improving teaching, learning, and equity. During 2020-21, the working group piloted a student experience survey over the summer and made revisions for a more robust pilot during the Spring 2021 semester. The group also worked on their web presence to communicate with the OU community on the work underway. The site also outlines the timeline for their work. The working group will continue to meet over the summer and into the new year.

2. Update to the Faculty Handbook. Monitoring and suggesting revisions to the Faculty Handbook continued through 2020-21. The committee is working with the Provost’s office to remove non-policy items from the handbook. It is also monitoring the creation of a policy office on campus and the impact that may have on the handbook moving forward.

New Tasks

1. 9-month Faculty & Summer Work Expectations: The committee discussed issues related to service commitments that continue during the summer when faculty are not on contract. The expectations seem to vary by department. There was no consensus about what should be done, so we decided to table the issue.

2. Building Understanding of University Finances Curriculum: Met with Stewart Berkinshaw, the chair of the Budget Council, and representatives from the Center for Faculty Excellence about creating training for faculty to build their understanding of finances in higher education. Drafted a curriculum outline and shared it with the Center for Faculty Excellence for implementation.

3. Non-Regular Faculty Representation in Shared Governance: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee asked the committee to investigate how non-regular faculty should be included in shared governance.
After reviewing peer institutions and related literature and discussing as a committee, we proposed the creation of an ad hoc committee composed of non-regular faculty to explore the issue in-depth and make recommendations for future involvement in shared governance. The committee has been formed, and Phil Gibson will serve as the Faculty Welfare Committee liaison to the group. This work will continue into 2021-22.

4. **Guidelines for Remote Instruction:** The committee discussed university procedures and policies for canceling classes versus moving to remote instruction during inclement weather. As the conversation evolved, the committee discussed the need for policies on when instructors could move classes online at their discretion versus canceling class or finding a substitute. After reviewing the faculty handbook, it was determined that sufficient guidance is already in place and no further action was needed at this time.

5. **Proposal Regarding University Service:** Drafted a proposal regarding the need to better recognize service contributions on the OU-Norman campus. Presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate in May 2021. Will need the Faculty Senate to vote on the resolution at the first meeting during the fall 2021 semester.

**Possible Tasks for 2021-22**

- Continue to monitor progress with the Teaching Evaluation Working Group and the Ad Hoc Non-Regular Faculty Committee.
- Continue to work with the Provost’s Office and future Policy Office on revisions to the Faculty Handbook.
- Consider developing committees to work on research and service evaluations that parallels work being done on teaching evaluations.
- Centralized University system for communicating student grief, illnesses, etc.
- Propose a process for how changes to the general education curriculum should occur.

**Chair Election**

Prof. Sarah Robbins from the University Libraries was re-elected to serve as FWC Chair for the 2021-2022 academic year.
The Faculty Senate’s Faculty Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (FDEIC) was constituted by the Faculty Senate in the fall of 2017 and given the following charge:

1. Investigate, discover, and promote best practices for faculty recruiting and retention.
2. Gather and review information on the allocation of university resources (awards research grants, prizes, etc.) and advancement (tenure, promotion, named professorships, etc.) relative to metrics of diversity, equity, and inclusion.
3. Suggest to the Senate appropriate proposals, strategies, and forums for advancing the goals of the committee.
4. Work with the Office of University Community to set priorities, advance policy, and follow up on the progress of proposed initiatives.
5. Report at least yearly to the Senate and, upon approval, the President and the Provost.

The membership for 2020-21 was:

Heather Shotton (Educational Leadership & Policy Studies) (2020-23), Chair
Tamera McCuen (Construction Science) (2018-21)
Lori Franklin (Social Work) (2019-22)
Shawn Churchman (Musical Theatre) (2019-22)
Paul Ketchum (Criminal Justice) (2020-23)
Jacquelyn Slater Reese (University Libraries) (2020-23)

The FDEIC met monthly virtually during the academic year 2020-21 to discuss issues and foster conversations on diversity, equity, and inclusion matters. The FDEIC developed and put forth a resolution on an official Faculty Senate land acknowledgment statement at the May 2020 meeting. The resolution passed unanimously, and the Faculty Senate land acknowledgment statement was officially adopted. Following incidents of faculty use of racist language in the classroom and the subsequent student protest calling for action to be taken to address racism on campus, the FDEIC put forth a resolution on anti-racism to the full Faculty Senate in March 2020. The resolution called for 1) plans to recruit and retain more diverse faculty, 2) review the impact of existing policies and procedures on diversity, equity, and inclusion goals, 3) provide faculty with tools and support to be anti-racist, and 4) develop action plans to facilitating learning, dialogue, and healing processes following racist events. Feedback was garnered from faculty during the introduction of the resolution and the committee discussed potential amended language to address concerns regarding tenure language in the resolution. The resolution was tabled in spring 2020 and brought back to the FDEIC for discussion and potential amended language in 2020-21. Throughout 20-21, the committee discussed issues of faculty diversity, recruitment, and retention of diverse faculty, and reviewed previous Faculty Senate recommendations and resolutions related to diversity. The FDEIC committee chair met with Lori Snyder to discuss retention data and pay equity for faculty of
Color to inform committee discussions. This work will continue in 2021-22 and the FDEIC will develop recommendations to present to the Faculty Senate.

Chair Election
Prof. Heather Shotton from Educational Leadership & Policy Studies was reappointed to the committee for 2020-23 and reelected to serve as FDEIC Chair for the 2021-22 academic year.