

OSU-CHS FACULTY SENATE

2018-2019

January 18, 2019 Minutes

OSU-CHS Faculty Senate Members

Charles G. Sanny, Ph.D., President

Jason Beaman, D.O., President-elect

Jarrad Wagner, Ph.D., Past-President

Franklin Champlin, Ph.D., (19) OSU-CHS Representative to OSU Faculty Council

Kathleen Curtis, Ph.D., (19)

Aric Warren, Ed.D, (19)

Justin Chronister, D.O., (20)

Amanda Foster, D.O., (20)

Paul Gignac, Ph.D., (20)

Recorder: Jean Keene

Members Present: Dr. Sanny, Dr. Beaman, Dr. Champlin, Dr. Chronister, Dr. Gignac, Dr. Wagner, and Dr. Warren

Members Absent: Dr. Curtis, and Dr. Foster

Guests:

Administrators Present: Dr. Stroup, Pharm.D, Mr. Polak

Call to Order: Dr. Sanny welcomed everyone in attendance and called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:

Dr. Sanny called for any changes to the minutes of the previous meeting; hearing none, he declared them approved as distributed.

The meeting proceeded as it appeared on the agenda.

Administrative Reports:

Dr. Sanny called upon Dr. Stroup and Mr. Polak to provide reports from the administration.

Dr. Stroup:

He advised there is a vacancy on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and he noted that the Senate has already undertaken the process to identify/elect the faculty member to fill that position, and he appreciates the fast action.

Dr. Stroup also advised that he had met with the Executive Committee the prior week, and the Bylaws do not speak specifically regarding an urgent request that had come from the Veterans Administration. He said he appreciated the rapid action that facilitated the needed approval by the general faculty.

He raised a related question inquiring whether the Faculty Senate's vote of approval on smaller or routine issues could be considered as being approved and in effect without waiting for a General Faculty vote or meeting. He said the Bylaws already in place indicate that the Senate represents the faculty. Further, he said he did not see those occurrences being very frequent. He said the governance documents do already state that the Faculty Senate represents the faculty when the general faculty is not in session, he invited the Senate to discuss the issue. This process would provide for moving forward and maintaining momentum without needing to wait a potentially long time until the next general faculty meeting in order

to have progress on an item. It was noted that in the event the general faculty did not agree, there could be a call for a vote by the full faculty, and the mechanism for an overturn of the Senate's vote could be enacted. He invited the Senate to discuss the topic.

Dr. Stroup commented that the new Governor had been sworn in during the week. He has five pillars upon which he plans to focus: 1) Government efficiency, 2) Education system, 3) Prosperity, 4) Infrastructure and 5) Health Care. Dr. Stroup said we have been working on the Health Care side with the governor's transition team. His state of the State address will be on February 5; that will be the first date of the legislature. Dr. Stroup said there was information included in the agenda packet regarding the 2019 Legislative Agenda, and information is included regarding the FY 2020 Budget needs. One change that is being anticipated is that agency requests will need to include justification which is to include what reforms will be made. The overview is that the governor wants to have greater control over agencies, including personnel hiring/departure decisions for the agency leadership positions.

Dr. Stroup said the government shut-down has had an effect on us, the associated amount falls at approximately \$600K per month. We can cover that for a period of time, but becomes problematic for us over time, particularly regarding clinics, and scholarships. Another aspect involves the Department of Education since our Post Bac program, which has been approved, has not had Dept. of Education approval yet due to that department being shut down. Although unknown things could occur, it was noted that the debt ceiling vote could extend until March. One aspect is that the debt ceiling is in part determined by the tax collections, and the IRS is shut down. It is all inter-related and complicated. The sides are entrenched in their viewpoints. The comment was made that the shut-down actually affects four agencies: Homeland Security, Department of Education, Interior (which includes IHS), and Treasury.

Related to the shut-down, Mr. Polak commented that that the money is there for the medical things for which we are due payment; however, due to the shut-down, there is no one there to process the payments.

A question was raised asking regarding the state, since any agencies that need/want new monies have to justify it, will that requirement impact us in any direct way? Dr. Stroup advised that one of the challenges is that we really fall under education. Under the Health and Human Services, under each of the cabinets there is an agency with a director or CEO, but each has an independent board that does the hiring/firing. The governor wants to be able to control the spending of some of the agencies, so there may be an effort to redesign the structure to make the governor's control stronger. The legislature's view on this will need to be observed.

Regarding statutory authority, the legislature does not have constitutional authority over higher education. The governor has authority for appointments to the State Regents, and those are nine year appointments. The State Regents for Higher Education is the constitutional entity, so the only legal role the legislature has in higher education is funding the state regents and opening and closing campuses. They do not have authority over the *operations* of higher education campuses; that is constitutionally vested with the State Regents for Higher Education.

The Health Care Authority Board has basically three appointees from the governor, two from the speaker, and two from the Pro-tem; no one has a majority of the appointees. It was designed that way intentionally to provide an independent focus on running the Medicaid agency. Succinctly, we are buffered in higher education.

Dr. Stroup referred back to Mr. Polak's report in a prior meeting advising that our enrollment growth over ten years compared to OU's: they have a little less than 3,400 students and their appropriation is \$70 million/year. Our report shows us at 1,034 students and we receive less than \$11 million/year. They have had an enrollment decrease in ten years, whereas our enrollment has grown by 146% during the same time frame. In addition, we are receiving less appropriations than we did in 1999. We have been

engaging with the chairman of the state regents regarding an adjustment to our base funding to recognize our enrollment growth.

Mr. Polak:

Mr. Polak reported regarding facility related items:

- The Bookstore and Marketplace Hub
It is scheduled to open the upcoming Monday; some moving will likely begin later in the afternoon. The Marketplace area will be open even after the bookstore and bursar are closed.
- The Bursar's office will have a representative here.
- The mailroom, shipping and receiving, and the copy services will be in the left section. It will be another month before this section is fully moved/functioning from that location. The vacated space from the mailroom and copy services will be used to build out the fitness center.

Regarding Security department activities, Mr. Polak cautioned the Senate that they are being very careful regarding excessive speeds in the parking structure. Reminders will be made to drivers to keep their speed below the posted speed. It was noted that it is not only the students who are driving faster than appropriate. In response to a question, Mr. Polak advised that the students are regularly being reminded about safe practices, and that they are advised that radar speed equipment is being used, and license numbers may also be taken.

Mention was also made about the faculty and student use of the guest parking lot. Tracking may be incorporated.

A suggestion was made to have the floor number painted clearly and in large size to identify each floor in the structure.

Dr. Sanny thanked the administrators for their thorough reports.

Faculty Senate President:

Dr. Sanny advised that he has not had a report from Dr. Matt O'Brien regarding the election of a new member for service on the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Dr. Sanny said he will report it when he receives that information.

Dr. Davis is now the Interim Dean of the Biomedical Sciences and therefore is not eligible to serve on the P&T Committee

Dr. Sanny advised that Dr. Amlaner is interested in reporting at the Faculty Senate regarding the research that is going, and he said he would like to provide the same presentation he gave in Stillwater to the Senators. Dr. Sanny proposed he be invited to the February meeting. Dr. Wagner commented that he would be interested in learning about the new members of that department and the work that is being undertaken. Dr. Sanny will extend an invitation to Dr. Amlaner.

Voting Items:

There were no items for voting, therefore no discussion.

Committee Reports:

Dr. Sanny called attention to the Written Committee Reports document included in the Agenda packet. Dr. Champlin added that he had one item he wished to mention. Every year the Faculty Council seeks nominations for awards that they give. He said we do not make any nominations, but he would encourage the Senators to consider providing appropriate nominations through the

Women's Faculty Council. Nominations will be taken throughout February, and the awards are made in March.

Old Business:

There was no old business to address.

New Business:

There was no new business to address.

Dr. Wagner said he would like to return attention to the topic raised by Dr. Stroup. He reviewed elements of the information offered earlier by Dr. Stroup relating to the idea that Faculty Senate approval voting be treated as representing the general faculty, and as being effect at that time rather than needing to wait until a general faculty vote occurs in order to be considered in effect. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Sanny provided an historical background regarding voting. Specifically, he recalled changes for Academic Standards Handbook revisions. The changes were voted upon by both the Faculty Senate and the General Faculty. A comment was made that the ASH applies to the COM. In addition, it is generally unclear which faculty each Senator represents. A variety of viewpoints were offered; both pro and con views were expressed. One View offered that it is good practice to have the general faculty vote on issues, and that the Senate serves a gatekeeper function since a Senate is needed before progressing to a general faculty vote. It was commented that there is an existing method to have issues proposed for a vote by the general faculty. It was mentioned that faculty can submit items through the Senate for consideration on the General Faculty Meeting Agenda

There was recognition of the importance of having issues go through the established protocol and practice of discussion/approval by committees, the Senate, and the general faculty. It was mentioned that it was easier when it was just COM. The expansion to being CHS has complicated the process.

Dr. Wagner indicated that he did not wish to waste time, but process can make a difference in the amount of time it takes for things to become effective. He reviewed the concept of shared governance.

The view was expressed that the discussion and voting by both the Senate and the general faculty was not just a "rubber-stamping" procedure; the vigorous discussion of issues was viewed as valuable. In response to a question asking whether there is a problem with having a general faculty vote, it was commented that it is better now that we have electronic voting.

It was suggested that the process should be more clearly defined in the bylaws as to which categories, documents, and handbooks require a general faculty vote. It was mentioned that there has been an unevenness in the past expressed by clinical faculty when they could not attend the General Faculty Meeting to vote. Dr. Wagner suggested that the issues to be voted upon by the general faculty could be distributed 30 or 60 days in advance of the vote.

A member commented that if the Senate is to provide/continue in a gatekeeping role, then the Senate needs to provide their vote, not just abdicate their voting process to the general faculty. If we are going to maintain being gatekeepers, the Senate vote must continue.

Dr. Sanny reminded Senators that what the Senate is doing in voting is making a recommendation; the next level of approval is to be by the general faculty.

Continued discussion did not produce agreement.

Dr. Sanny summarized a variety of comments by saying the Senate works for the general faculty. The concept in his view is not a position of power, but rather one of influence and service to the general faculty. He reiterated what had been mentioned earlier, that the Senate serves as a “think-tank” for the general faculty.

Following extended discussion, a request was made to develop a list of handbooks that currently exist; it was requested that the committees listed in the Bylaws be polled to determine whether they had a handbook. The request could be to supply whatever handbook, guidelines, or policies and/or procedures the committee has or uses beyond what is included in the Faculty Senate Bylaws as the charge to each committee. The information gathered could be reviewed and an informed recommendation regarding committees could be made accordingly.

Dr. Beaman stated that the Academic Standards Handbook should be protected and be one that requires a general faculty vote.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12: 58 p.m.