DASNR Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
February 15, 2016

Meeting called to order at 1:30 PM.

Roll call:
Dr. Tom Coon, Dean and Vice President, Division of Agricultural Science and Natural Resources  
Dr. Chris Richards, Animal Science (chair)  
Dr. Eric Rebek, Entomology and Plant Pathology (secretary)  
Dr. Mike Smith, Horticulture and Landscape Architecture  
Dr. Gina Peek, Design, Housing, and Merchandising  
Dr. Jon Ramsey, Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership  
Dr. Ajay Kumar, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering  
Dr. Junpeng Deng, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology  
Dr. Rodney Jones, Agricultural Economics  
Dr. Robert Matts, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology  
Dr. Tim Bowser, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering  
Dr. Tyson Ochsner, Plant and Soil Science  
Mr. Shane Robinson, Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence  
Ms. Deb Garrard Foster, Nutritional Sciences  
Dr. Ranjith Ramanathan, Animal Science  
Dr. Nathan Walker, Entomology and Plant Pathology (OSU Faculty Council rep)  
Dr. Gopal Kakani, Plant and Soil Science  
Dr. Craig Davis, Natural Resource Ecology and Management  
Dr. Sam Fuhlendorf, Natural Resource Ecology and Management

A. Questions for Dr. Coon, Dean, Vice President, and Director of DASNR (Dr. Coon’s responses are in italics below each question submitted by faculty and staff)

1. What can non-tenure track faculty do to get promoted? County staff have career ladders, but on-campus Extension faculty don’t. Since we don’t have a tenure process, the only way to move up is to move out and find another job. No amount of national awards or grants makes an iota of difference in non-tenure track faculty status. I hate to think I’m in a dead-end job, but that’s what it appears to be professionally.

_There are steps identified in the OSU Faculty Handbook for advancement of non-tenure track faculty positions, including adjunct faculty, clinical faculty, research faculty and temporary faculty but they do not address the positions with Extension titles. As I understand it, these are not addressed in the OSU Faculty Handbook because these are titles that are only used within the DASNR realm._

_I agree that this is a topic that needs attention, and will work with our HR office and the Provost’s office to determine whether this is fully within our authority in DASNR to address or if this needs to go through academic governance and academic human resource procedures to_
address it. I am open to developing a series of ranks that would provide opportunities for career development within the non-tenure stream Extension faculty positions.

2. What is the Dean’s position on counting 5000 level thesis hours or 6000 level dissertation research hours toward a faculty member’s teaching load? If the Dean’s position reflects supporting the use of those hours towards a faculty member’s teaching assignment, has he shared his position with the Associate Dean of Instruction? See the context for this question below:

According to our department head, the associate dean for academic program’s position is that neither 5000 level thesis research hours nor 6000 level dissertation research hours are considered teaching or advising – i.e., in terms of determining “workload” – for the respective faculty member with whom a given student is enrolled for those credit hours. My department head has said this on at least two occasions. How can this be? Isn’t that position antithetical to our mission? Some DASNR faculty members devote hundreds of hours to working – often before 8:00 a.m., after 5:00 p.m., and on weekend days and holidays – to assist graduate students with their research studies and the writing and preparation of thesis and dissertation documents. Does the dean support what has been described as the associate dean’s position on this issue of faculty workload? If not, what is his position? And, if it is different, will he discuss the issue with the associate dean of academic programs and clarify his position to her, the department heads, and the faculty members who advise graduate students enrolling for research hours under their guidance, direction, and instruction?

The process for assigning funding and responsibilities in accord with faculty workloads has gone through a significant change over the past three years and I am fully supportive of the changes that have been made. I think there is still room for making further improvements, but I appreciate the move away from semester-by-semester changes in faculty appointments in order to account for temporary changes in faculty responsibilities, for example with cancellation of a class or a significant increase in academic advisees.

At the core of this question is concern about whether advising of graduate students receives appropriate credit and appreciation with our current workload policy and position funding. I am convinced that DASNR administration values the role of graduate advising and appreciates the demands that it places on faculty time and attention. This is more a question of how best to account for this role within our division of responsibilities and accountability.

Quite simply, the standard at OSU and at many universities is to consider graduate student advising as primarily a research activity. There certainly is an academic dimension to the instruction and mentoring that takes place in this process, but the ultimate measure of success is reflected in the ability of a graduate student to plan, execute, complete and report on a research project. All of the colleges at OSU treat graduate advising in this way, as a part of a faculty member’s research expectations and not a part of their academic teaching responsibilities. Teaching of graduate courses DOES remain in the academic teaching realm.
Dr. Clary has provided this summary of the changes that have taken place in handling faculty position appointments and funding and the philosophy underlying these changes:

“Faculty members have budgeted appointments and scholarship expectations in research, extension and/or teaching. Dissertation, thesis and creative component work support a faculty member’s scholarly activity and are recognized and valued as part of the A&D and P&T processes.

With research and extension appointments, budget dollars are not assigned to specific program activities. Instead, a faculty member’s expectations and performance are examined in a more holistic manner. Examples of these include annual program of work documents, Hatch projects and funded grant projects.

Historically, teaching appointments have not been viewed by CASNR administration holistically and instead we have attempted to assign a budget amount to each specific anticipated activity. In the past, the practice had been to adjust these teaching budget allocations throughout the fiscal year, in particular, to reflect cancelled courses. These practices resulted in salary budget shifts that affected the ability of the agencies and the college to accurately manage overall budgets. In 2013, the associate dean and directors agreed to work together to stabilize these budget adjustments so that a faculty member’s budgeted split and appointment split would align and be more consistent across fiscal years. As part of the 2013 analysis of teaching budget allocations, the associate dean contacted the other OSU associate deans and also her colleagues at other land-grant institutions. At that time, the standard practice was to evaluate thesis, dissertation and creative component as part of the faculty member’s research/scholarship activity and service contribution and not as part of the assigned teaching budget appointment. For example, a nine-month faculty member with a 25% teaching expectation would still teach 2, 3-credit courses each academic year.

Teaching budget allocation guidelines were also requested from each CASNR department head. Practices regarding dissertation/thesis/creative component budget allocations varied across departments. In some cases, the prior college guideline of allocating in the semester a student would graduate was not the practice, leading to an over-commitment of the teaching budget. The implications of this practice were clearly seen in the summer teaching budget as it had been regularly overspent each fiscal year.

This budget allocation issue was discussed with the other associates and the interim dean. The decision was to remove thesis/dissertation/creative component credit hours from the CASNR budget allocation process, recognizing that these efforts were part of the scholarly work activity in all areas of faculty appointments (research, teaching and Extension) and were recognized and rewarded through A&D and P&T reviews.
Faculty who are funded 100% through the teaching budget and who engage in research and other scholarly work generally have a portion of their budgeted appointment assigned to this activity.

The associate dean continues to work with the department heads, the agencies, the DASNR financial office and the Vice President/Dean to align and stabilize budgeted appointment splits and to support a holistic planning approach to all areas of a faculty member’s appointment.”

I consider this a significant improvement in how we manage faculty appointments and assignments and consider it a work in progress. As further evidence of that, Dr. Clary recently met with Academic Department Heads to review the current set of data on faculty assignments and funding splits. But for now, the recognition of graduate advising as a function of a faculty member’s research scholarly activity is consistent with the rest of OSU.

3. We have been told that student credit hours do not matter and small classes count the same as large classes toward teaching appointments. This provides a negative incentive to teach large classes. Why is it that teaching a class with 5 students gets the same credit as teaching a course with 100 students? What are the size limits for classes and shouldn’t teaching appointments be based on a blend of courses taught and student credit hours?

Academic Unit Administrators are given the flexibility needed to adjust teaching workloads based on the different kinds of activities that are involved (examples include: course instruction, undergraduate academic advising, unit committee participation, student organization advising). OSU sets the following standards for minimum class size (OSU University Academic Regulation 5.12):

5.12 Minimum Class Size. The minimum number of students required in order for a class to meet is as follows: 20 students for lower-division classes, 12 students for upper-division classes, and eight students for graduate-level classes.

There are instances where these standards may not be met (for example, the first time a course is offered), but in general, departments are expected to adhere to these minimum requirements. Deviations from these minimum class size requirements should be discussed with the associate dean. Departments are advised to examine course enrollment patterns to determine how low enrollment courses will be addressed and to determine the role of these courses in undergraduate and graduate degree programs. For example, a low enrollment course may be moved to an alternate year rotation or may be dropped from the curriculum.

Maximum course enrollments vary across departments according to factors such as course level, course type, accreditation guidelines, classroom availability and GTA support. In addition, the definition of a “large class” also varies. Department heads are expected to work with their faculty to determine equitable teaching assignments that match the department’s teaching resources with the prioritized needs of the department and the college.
I have asked for input from DASNR Faculty Council and from DASNR Unit Administrators on the faculty workload guidelines for DASNR, and I think that resolving differences between perspectives in the workload guidelines document will help us to ensure fair and equitable management of course assignments and recognition of effort as we implement these guidelines.

4. As faculty and staff, we hear of constant threats of cuts and are asked to do more with less. It is our impression that the administration has grown over the past decade while faculty numbers have declined. What is the organizational structure of the administration and what are the roles of each of the levels of organization?

The number of Tenure System and Non Tenure System faculty in DASNR reached a high point in fiscal year 2010 (measured in January, 2010). There were 237 faculty (including department heads) at that time and 21 individuals in DASNR administrative positions. As of January, 2016, we have 214 faculty and 16 individuals in DASNR administrative positions. The declines have been in direct response to the decreases in state funding DASNR has experienced since 2010 (14.8% as of February 23, 2016). Faculty numbers have declined 9.7% and administrative positions have declined 23.8%.

The Dean’s Office serves as an administrative unit that supports the breadth of work in DASNR. It includes the lead administrative faculty positions (Dean, Associate Dean, Assoc. VP for OAES, Associate Director for OCES, Assistant Dean, Assistant Director of OAES, Assistant Director of OCES) as well as the support staff associated with the central offices of the two state agencies (OAES and OCES) and the College. The number of Administrative FTEs in the Dean’s Office was 17 in 2009 and has been reduced to 14 at this time with all positions filled. We have combined some positions and redefined others. We have added one non-tenure system faculty position which reports in the Dean’s Office (Rodeo Program Coordinator) and have added a reporting line for a tenured faculty position as Director of MIAP, both with some funding support from central administration. The remaining changes in personnel assigned to the Dean’s Office are administrative support and professional support positions, which serve the entire Division and College, including DASNR Finance, Human Resources, Sponsored Programs and Student Success Center. The table given here shows the change in FTE assigned to the Dean’s Office in FY2010 and FY2016. Over that time, the total investment of FTE has decreased by nearly 3 FTE or 4%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE in FY2010</th>
<th>FTE in FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The organization structure of DASNR is available on our web site: http://www.dasnr.okstate.edu/division-administration/DASNROrganizationChartFebruary2016.pdf
5. What is the purpose of the research reports to the experiment station and why are they under increased scrutiny at a time when we are forced to find even more external funding?

The annual research reports are required for our federal formula funding. This funding is supporting faculty salaries so we need to be timely and complete in the reporting. Most of the reports that are under increased scrutiny are very brief and do not report annual progress, and in some cases are word-for-word identical from one year to the next. The reports are entered into a national database that is publicly available and used by federal legislative staff, other universities, corporations, and the media. For instance, if a legislator is interested in research on fire ants then a search of the database would yield all projects in the US researching any aspect of fire ants. A report that is too brief or repetitive does not portray OSU, OAES, or the faculty member in a favorable way.

6. How safe is Ag Hall in the event of a major earthquake? If unknown, when will an assessment be conducted?

The structural code that Ag Hall was built under has been in place for 80+ years. I’m told this code ensures building design would withstand earthquakes of magnitude 5-6 with minimal damage. All buildings on the Stillwater campus are built to this code and should be able to withstand earthquakes of similar magnitude with Ag Hall being among the strongest given it’s age and methods of construction at the time. No assessment is scheduled.

Dean Paul Tikalsky, College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology, indicates that based on his experience inspecting structures after intense earthquakes in Northridge, California associated with the San Andreas fault, the greatest vulnerability is in buildings that are between 10 and 15 stories tall. Buildings shorter than these, such as Agricultural Hall, are able to withstand earthquakes in the range we’ve been experiencing in Stillwater (2.0 – 5.3).

If you believe earthquake damage has occurred, please notify your unit administrator and complete a work request at fm.okstate.edu or contact the Action Desk at Facilities Management.

7. When will Banner be completely integrated into the OSU system? We keep hearing from administrators that we need to be patient, but it has now been 8 months since faculty have received accurate ledger sheets for their grants. This makes it very difficult and frustrating to run research programs.

Students will enroll for fall 2016 in Banner and that process will begin very soon. Summer enrollment will be through SIS.

Human Resources/Payroll will go-live on July 1. This will complete the Banner Finance module. Training has been on-going with departmental financial personnel from our DASNR Fiscal Affairs and Sponsored Programs offices, which has included many one-on-one sessions. We have a unique and complex system in DASNR with multiple revenue sources from
Federal, State, University and local funding to CASNR, OAES and OCES including our funding splits for faculty and staff. Reports and account reconciliations are being produced now with more confidence in the financial information being presented. And staff are better able to process project completion invoices for grants and contracts than we experienced in the first four months of Banner implementation. If faculty or staff have specific concerns, they may take these up with their unit administrator, Bob Klein or Dean Coon (thomas.coon@okstate.edu).

8. The college recently had a consulting firm conduct an assessment of the condition of all the college’s buildings and facilities. Now, Dr. Owens is requesting a further assessment of buildings and facilities. Is there a reason that we are duplicating this work? Additionally, what will be the result of these assessments? In the past, we have had space audits of the college that have went nowhere so it would be good if we actually had results from this current assessment.

These are two different projects, one of which addresses short term needs and the other addresses long term needs. For the long term needs, the Ag Lands Master Plan required an assessment of the structural integrity of all of the buildings on the Ag Lands west of campus and our on-campus facilities. This plan that is scheduled to be completed in the next few weeks will contain information that will assist us in determining the overall worthiness of making continued investments in some of our older buildings. A number of these older buildings have deteriorated to the point that additional funds should not be spent on them but investments made in new structures. That assessment was on a building-level scale. We expanded this to include on-campus facilities assigned to DASNR as well. This planning effort will form the basis for a long-range master plan to serve DASNR facility needs over the next 10 – 20 years.

For the short term needs, Dr. Owens requested a laboratory-level assessment of conditions so plans can be made for renovating individual labs based on their condition for current uses. This is for needs that must be addressed in the next 5 years. A small committee has filed a preliminary report and we are expecting the final report shortly.

Dr. Owens, Dr. Raper and I will consider both reports prior to any renovations. And we will share the results of both reports with unit administrators and faculty for their review and comment. The recent budget reductions and predictions for next fiscal year are obviously going to limit the time scale and scope of laboratory improvements, and fund-raising efforts will determine the timeline for long-range facility improvements. But the first step is to get a realistic estimate of needs, conditions and costs.

Special action item: DASNR Workload Guidelines; Dr. Coon presented a draft document outlining procedures to govern workload assignments of DASNR faculty members. He is seeking comments and input as the draft evolves, and DASNR faculty council representatives raised some concerns with the document, including the following:

- Teaching workload has detailed, measurable benchmarks whereas Extension and Research do not.
• 100% Teaching appointments incur a heavy workload, which will likely lead to burnout and resignations at current salary structure.
• Assigning specific metrics for Research is problematic because of the varied roles and responsibilities of faculty researchers across disciplines. This variability translates to differences in productivity (e.g., bench science vs. field science often results in a higher rate of publications for the former). Thus, specific benchmarks (i.e., expectations) cannot be fairly assigned across research disciplines and subdisciplines.
• Productivity and workload should be distinguished, and the guidelines in this document should only address workload. This developed into a broader discussion of distinguishing between position appointments and assignments, and guidelines for both should be clearly delineated but allow for some flexibility depending on the type of appointment or assignment.
• Faculty who fill gaps in Teaching as retirements or resignations are tendered aren’t recognized as overload.

Dr. Coon will take these concerns into consideration and provide an updated version for further input from DASNR faculty. He would like to have a finalized version ready to submit to the Provost’s office by early May 2016.

B. Old Business

1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes (Eric Rebek)

Meeting minutes from November 11, 2015 were not made available as hard copies for this meeting, thus the minutes were not approved. In addition to posting all meeting minutes on the DASNR Faculty Council website, Eric Rebek will provide hard copies for DASNR faculty approval at future meetings.

2. DASNR Planning Process Update (Jon Ramsey)

The facilities planning process is moving forward. The initial report provided by Studio Architecture (Oklahoma City, OK) categorized buildings into four categories, ranging from excellent to unusable. The current state of many DASNR buildings is that they are in need of major repairs or full replacement. Input is now being gathered across DASNR by unit representatives with respect to their perspectives on use and current condition of Teaching, Research, and Extension facilities on campus.

There is some concern about moving “centralized”, accessible facilities (e.g., Machine Shop) and services further off campus as a result of the planning process. Previously, there has been equal concern raised with respect to moving classroom and laboratory space further away from the campus core, which make it difficult for students to make classes on time.
3. DASNR RPT Committee Update (David Lalman via Chris Richards)

The DASNR RPT committee has reviewed faculty materials and are in the process of sharing the reviews with the Deans office. As this process is midstream, a follow-up to this year’s process will be given at the next meeting.

4. Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee Update (Astri Wayadande via Eric Rebek)

Eric Rebek read a detailed report prepared by Astri Wayadande regarding issues surrounding non-tenure track faculty in DASNR (see Addendum 1).

5. OSU Faculty Council Update (Nathan Walker)

Nathan Walker mentioned that the OSU tuition waiver for all dependents of faculty and staff has yet to move forward. This delay is likely the result of the state budget crisis. Faculty Council is seeking two nominees to replace Dr. Walker as the DASNR representative to Faculty Council. Eric Rebek (EPP) and Justin Moss (HLA) are the two nominees.

6. CASNR Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (Mike Smith)

Mike Smith provided a list of new course actions and title changes (see Addendum 2).

7. DASNR Supplemental Pay Committee (Ranjith Ramanathan and Sam Fuhlendorf)

This is a new committee spearheaded by Dr. Coon to clarify DASNR policy on supplemental (overload) pay. The committee met for the first time in early February. The committee includes Drs. Ramanathan and Fuhlendorf from DASNR Faculty Council. All questions and concerns about supplemental pay can be sent to Drs. Ramanathan and Fuhlendorf, or Dr. Jeff Edwards (PaSS), the committee chair.

Some concern was raised regarding the fact that there are more administrators than faculty on the committee. Thus, it is perceived that this is an administrative effort that could benefit administration more than faculty. But it was also mentioned that at least administration is now addressing the confusion surrounding supplemental pay within DASNR and at OSU, in general.

The question was raised whether or not administrators could receive supplemental pay, particularly at the unit administrator level. For example, can department heads get supplemental pay garnered from IDC’s allocated to departments? These issues will become clearer as the committee proceeds.
C. New Business

1. A chair is still needed for the Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee.

   DASNR Faculty Council needs a chair to lead this committee. Current members include Chris Richards and Jon Ramsey. Because Astri Wayadande did a great job chairing this committee in the past, the motion passed to ask Astri to return to this role once she is no longer Interim Director of NIMFFAB. Although she rotates off of DASNR Faculty Council at the end of this semester, she could still chair the NTT Faculty Committee as an at-large member similar to our at-large members who represent other governing and administrative bodies.

2. Other new business

   Chris Richards inquired about the need for a new committee to address teaching and advising workload, as it has been the focus of regular questions submitted by faculty and also part of the proposed workload guidelines. The motion was approved and Ranjith Ramanathan and Sam Fuhlendorf agreed to serve on this committee if another council member serves as chair. Rodney Jones agreed to chair the committee, and he suggested asking either Jon Ramsey or Shane Robertson to serve and represent Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership.

3. Next AFC meeting

   The next AFC meeting will be scheduled based on Dean Coon’s availability. Faculty will then be polled for their availability within those constraints.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Meeting minutes prepared and submitted by Eric Rebek, Secretary, on behalf of DASNR Faculty Council.
Addendum 1. Non-tenure Track DASNR Faculty at OSU (Astri Wayadande)

Summary: Non-tenure track faculty comprise approximately 16% (34 of 214) of regular faculty (including department heads) within DASNR. Proportion of NTT to TT Faculty ranges from a low of 6% to a high of 27%. This may have implications for overall departmental performance if NTT faculty are included in Faculty numbers (or not). There are at least eight position titles of DASNR NTT Faculty, most are Assistant Extension Specialists. Many NTT Faculty have been at OSU in NTT positions for 5 years or less, but some have stayed in NTT positions for 15 or more years. Some NTT Faculty are eventually hired into the TT ranks, but this is the exception at OSU.

Some issues that are of concern to NTT faculty:

1. NTT faculty have been told that their position is not promotable. This is incorrect, but is often conveyed to NTT faculty. (I myself was told for 17 years that I could not be promoted to Associate Researcher and on).
2. NTT faculty are not guided by departmental RPT committees (actually this is variable from department to department). This should change as departments are developing guidelines for NTT faculty assessment and promotion (e.g. Entomology and Plant Pathology has one).
3. NTT salaries are a fraction of TT salaries. This is to be expected, however, some NTT faculty essentially do the same work as TT faculty (teach, do research, publish, write grants, supervise graduate students, sit on committees (except RPT), perform extension programming, etc.
4. NTT faculty are not represented by faculty council or staff council (at least this was true when I was a NTT faculty member).
5. NTT faculty are not recognized for their time and contributions to DASNR. DASNR triangle pins are presented to TTF and staff, but not to NTT faculty. I got my first pin (20 years) three years after my appointment to a TT position, so they must have been keeping track!

Some concerns of TT faculty:

1. If NTT faculty are counted in overall faculty performance, this could dilute per capita contributions. For example, many NTT faculty do not publish or write / receive grants. When divided by the entire faculty number of the department, mean performance goes down.
2. Decisions for hiring NTT faculty often do not involve regular faculty (no interview, no evaluation) and are sometimes at the discretion of the department head.
NTT Faculty numbers by department. All data were obtained from departmental websites, so this may not be completely accurate, depending upon how current departmental websites are.

34 / 214 Faculty in DASNR are NTT (16%)

Position titles:

Assistant Researcher
Assistant/Associate Research Professor
Assistant / Associate Research Professional
Assistant Extension Specialist
Specialist
Assistant / Associate Research Scientist
Instructor
Teaching Associate

Terminal Degrees of NTT Faculty:

16 Ph.D.
10 M.S.
3 B.S.
5 unknown

Agricultural Communications 2/16
Lupita Veregas adjunct fac, Ph.D  ? teaches
Avery Culbertson, adjunct fac, Ph.D  teaches
  I’m not sure if these two adjuncts are considered NTT Faculty
(employed by the university)

Agricultural Economics 3/30
Fred Eilrich,  ? Asst. Extension Specialist
Roger Sahs,  MS  Asst. Extension Specialist
C. Hobbs, ??  Ag Econ Specialist

Agricultural Engineering 4/26
J.D. Carlson, Ph.D  Associate Researcher
Randy Bean, B.S.  Teaching Associate
Al Sutherland, M.S, Asst. Extension Specialist
Randy Taylor, PhD. Asst  Extension Specialist ??

Animal Science  2/31
Ali Beker?  Sr. Res. Specialist- Poultry
Craig Clifford?
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 4/17
Steve Hartsen, Ph.D Associate Res. Scientist (> 15 years)
Peter Hoyt, Ph.D Res. Associate Professor (10 years)
Estela Arrese, Assoc. Res. Faculty, Ph.D (17 years)
Judy Hall, MS, Instructor

Entomology and Plant Pathology 7/26
Rick Grantham, Ph.D Asst. Res. Professional (15 years)
Trenna Blagden, Ph.D. Asst. Res. Professional
Ali Zarrabi, Ph.D, Asst. Res. Professional (1 year, but at OSU > 25 years)
Jen Olsen, MS. Asst. Ext. Specialist (2 years)
Kelly Seuhs, B.S. Asst. Ext. Specialist (1 year)
Edmond Bonjour, MS, Extension Entomologist (7 years, at OSU > 25 years)
Andrine Shufran, Ph.D , Assoc. Ext. Specialist (6 years)

Natural Resources Ecology and Management 4/23
Ron Weir, MS., Res. Associate
Raymond Moranz, Ph.D, Visiting Assistant Professor
Mark Gregory, MS, Asst. Researcher
Marley Beem, Ph.D Asst. Ext. Specialist

Horticulture and Landscape Architecture 4/20
Shelley Mitchell, Ph.D Asst. Extension Specialist (7 years)
Kemin Su, Ph.D Res. Asst. Professor
Casey Hentges, MS. Asst Extension Specialist (1 year)
David Hillock, MS, Asst Extension Specialist (19 years)

Plant and Soil Sciences 4/23
Josh Bushong – Extension, unk
Shane Osborne, MS Extension Specialist,Altus
Randy Boman, PhD, Extension Director, Altus
Roger Osburn, B.S.
The following CASNR course actions have been approved by Academic Affairs following recommendations from the CASNR Curriculum Committee.

New Courses:

AG 2890 (1-3), Special topics in Ag. & Nat’l Sci., Individual or small group study.

AG 4890 (1-3), Special topics in Ag. & Nat’l Sci., Individual or small group study.

HORT 5973, Sustainable Landscape Mgmt., Ecological principles and resources for decision making.

SOIL 5131, Professional Development In Plant & Soil, Prepare grad students for careers.

AG 3011, Seminar for Transfer Students, Transfer student orientation.

AGCM 3503, Issues Mgmt & Crisis Comm in Ag, Theoretical & practical applications of principles & skills.

AGED 4203, Professional Development in AG ED, Prep for ag ed careers.

AGEC 2990 (1-6), Problems in Ag Econ and AG Bus, Directed topics.

AGEC 4613, Adv Ag Finance, Time value of money and financial concepts.

ANSI 2233, Meat We Eat, Overview of animal protein sources for human consumption.

FDSC 2233, Meat We Eat, Cross listed with ANSI 2233.

FDSC 3133, Plant Sanitation for Food Processing Operations, Government regs, voluntary and mandantory guidelines.

HORT 5543, Sustainable Nursery Production, Sustainable production of woody ornamentals.

HORT 5953, Plant Growth & Development, Embryogenesis & organogenesis of plants influenced by certain abiotic conditions.

PLNT 4933, Plant Biotechnology & Transgenic Plants, Principles & techniques for producing transgenic plants, with public concerns and controversies discussed.

BIOC 5112, Articulation of Research Logic, Scientific reasoning, logic and critical thinking with emphasis on public presentation.

Changed:

AGED 4103 → 4103, Methods & Skills of teaching, slight description change.

AGED 4200 (1-9) → 4200, Student Teaching, added certain prerequisites.
AGEC 5311 → 5311, Ag Mktg Concepts, added certain prerequisites.
AGEC 5603 → 5603, Adv Ag Fin, Modified description.
ANSI 1223 → 3420 (1-4), Undergrad Research,
BAE 4012 → 4012, SR Design Project I, Prerequisites added.
BAE 4023 → 4023 SR Design Project II, Prerequisites added.
BIOC 1990 → 1990 (1), Freshman Research
BIOC 2200 (1-3) → 2202, Medicine & Molecules, Fixed course hours.
BIOC 2344 → 2344, Chem & Applications of Biomolecules, Expanded prerequisites.
BIOC 3713 → 3713, Biochem I, Prerequisite added.
BIOC 3723 → 3723, Biochem & Molecular Biol, Prerequisites added.
BIOC 4224 → 3224, Physical Chem for Biologists, # and prerequisites changed.
BIOC 4990 → 4990, Undergrad Research, Title change
BIOC 5002 → 5002, Research Compliance and Biochem Grad Colloquium, Title change
LA 2223 → 2223, Visual Comm II, prerequisite change
AGCM 2113 → 2113, Intro Ag Comm, Title change and prerequisites
AG 1011 → 1011, CASNR 1st Year Seminar, Title and description change
AG 3733 → 3733, Food and Culture, Course description
LA 2323 → 2323, Computer-Aided Design, Description & prerequisites
LA 3315 → 3315, Studio I: Principles & Theory of Design, prerequisites
LA 3673 → 3673, History & Theory of LA, description

MANY OTHER COURSES TWEAKED REGARDING TITLE, DESCRIPTION, PREREQUISITES, ETC.
Dropped:
NREM 3513, Principles of Conservation Biology