

OSU-CHS FACULTY SENATE
2018-2019
February 15, 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. Curtis, Dr. Foster, Dr. Gignac, and Dr. Wagner

Members Absent: Dr. Chronister

Administrators Present: Dr. Stephens, and Dr. Stroup

Call to Order: Dr. Sanny welcomed everyone in attendance and called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes were subsequently approved by email.

The meeting proceeded as it appeared on the agenda.

Administrative Reports:

Dr. Sanny called for reports from the administration.

Dr. Stroup:

Dr. Stroup indicated he had three items to report:

- 1) As he mentioned at the Executive Committee meeting, he commented that the Continuing Quality Control Committee, which is currently included in the Faculty Senate Bylaws where the committees are listed as a part of the committee structure. However, he raised the question whether that committee should continue within the faculty purview, or whether it should be under the OSU Medicine umbrella from a quality standpoint. He asked the Senate to look at that. It was incorporated at a time when we did not have a structured practice, but now we have an umbrella of OSU Medicine, and we need to reevaluate whether it should more appropriately be located there. Under the current circumstances, the membership is appointed by the Faculty Affairs Committee, and is not very active.
- 2) Although the topic was removed from the Senate agenda, he wanted to mention that the Guns on Campus legislation that would be coming, and Dr. Stroup wanted to have the legal counsel look at the template document that had been distributed rather so a system-wide response could be developed rather than having individual location replies. He noted that following counsel's input, the Executive Committee may want to review and endorse it.

- 3) The third topic centers on the RPT process. He mentioned there are three topics involved with RPT; it includes, a) those who are due for cumulative review [which is not an optional process], b) Reappointment, for those who are in year three and are in the process of going for reappointment, and, c) those faculty who are going up for promotion and/or tenure. He remarked on the deadline date for submission of the required materials. He said the RPT Committee would review the documents the following Monday, so the Friday deadline was necessary.

Dr. Stroup asked if there were any questions. Dr. Sanny raised some inquiries regarding departmental guidelines for review. Dr. Stroup commented on the differences between them. An additional question was raised; it was regarding the post-tenure review. Dr. Sanny provided information on the timing for the post-tenure review process. There were comments regarding the variety of reviews that are conducted and the ending request asked whether the variety of reviews could be timed so they can be handled over the same timeframe. Sequential reviews, with a variety of time periods, require the repetitive investment of time. There was additional discussion regarding the time cycles involved. Dr. Stroup commented that when we moved to having a CHS based review, the prior timelines were no longer applicable. The difference between the timeline in the RPT document and the Post-tenure review process were noted. Following additional comments, it was decided the topic would be addressed external to the current meeting, and prior documents may be consulted for content. The reasons for the post-tenure review process were recalled. Dr. Sanny provided information regarding the departmental review and the thoroughness that is incorporated—at least in his department.

Dr. Beaman commented that after listening to the discussion, there seems to be a level of confusion or possible duplication of policy and documents, and the policies mentioned may need to be reviewed to see what has been superseded and therefor may be examined to determine whether it is duplicated effort, and therefore a process may not still be necessary.

In terms of the continuing review part of this, what is the reporting structure? Is there a departmental evaluation portion that later goes to the Provost? Dr. Stroup indicated it does go to the Provost. He said his plan was to read all of the documents and then provide feedback to the faculty member that would function as summary of the evaluations. These items could then be examined for changes/improvements during the next five-year review.

Dr. Beaman said the various documents could be gathered and reviewed. He noted the Provost is a central university position that has the 30K view of what is being done and by whom. The idea was raised to have an Ad Hoc Committee look at the issue. Dr. Stephens suggested we look at the CHS RPT Guidelines that were developed when CHS was separated from the Stillwater process. Available prior documents will be consulted. Dr. Stephens said the departmental processes may also be reviewed as an element, and to have the due dates be aligned if all of the processes will continue to be required.

Dr. Sanny indicated he would gather documents and timelines and would organize the information for ease in moving forward on the questions that have been raised. Dr. Beaman suggested that the individual department guidelines could also be gathered.

A new question was asked regarding the “Guns on Campus” issue. Dr. Stephens advised that the Bill had passed the House on Wednesday, and they have carve-outs for university campuses. Our intent is to remain as it has been, that there will not be open-carry on campus. We will follow the Higher Regents and the State Regents.

Dr. Stephens:

Dr. Stephens reported he had been at the Capital a lot—a *lot!* It is a better year. In talking with the House Representatives, they said the reduction in the deficit is most welcomed. The proposed budget will likely be

certified Monday, February 25. The Governor uses the first Board of Equalization numbers to develop his budget for the State of the State address. The final numbers that the legislature will use will come from 2-25-19; it is more of a real number. Although the surplus has been spoken of in the media as being around six hundred million, since the energy element has not been as fruitful as hoped, the real number will likely be between three and four hundred million dollars.

Looking at the governor's executive budget, we can see that the medical examiner has \$12.8 million in it; we are working to have that figure reflect what is needed, but we are not there yet.

We have asked for the restoration to what the appropriations should have been for a long time. Dr. Stephens heard President Hargis say the Higher Education allocation looked better. There has been more talk about higher education on the House side. Dr. Stephens said he does think there will be more for higher education. A question was asked regarding faculty salary increases. Dr. Stephens said we need to look at it for faculty and staff increases.

Dr. Stephens mentioned projects we are working on for the Cherokee campus. We will have a new four-story building rather than remodeling two floors of an existing structure. The new plan is for an 84,000 square foot building modeled after the Tandy building. It will be phenomenal. We will not be limited to classroom sizes of 50 students; it will have a target of 90 students. He noted the timing to completion may be altered a little, noting that the first 1.5 floor will be done--which is what will be needed for the first year of students. The timeline may actually be improved over what would have been the case with the previous renovation plan.

Dr. Stephens said there are faculty positions posted now, and we are moving forward with the interviewing/hiring process. He said we will be applying for a grant to help with the costs. We will have a classroom so we can practice with the zoom technology, and we are on time overall. These are exciting times! There is also excitement at the Cherokee campus, and that spreads.

Dr. Sanny thanked the administrators for their thorough reports.

Faculty Senate President:

Dr. Sanny advised he had no items to report.

Voting Items:

There were no items for voting

Committee Reports:

Dr. Sanny called attention to the Written Committee Reports document included in the Agenda packet. He said the Academic Success Committee had provided a document titled, "Student Academic Probation Protocol OMSI/OMSII". The Senators commented that they were in agreement with the committee's notable efforts to be of assistance in the process of our students becoming successful professionals. Dr. Sanny will share the Senate's appreciation for their considerable efforts.

Old Business:

There was no old business to address.

New Business:

There was no new business to address.

Dr. Wagner asked to readdress the topic of the CQI Committee which had been raised earlier in the meeting. He commented that Dr. Stroup had provided the view that the CQI be removed from being a COM committee; he said it has a clinic function, and he mentioned some of the aspects they review, noting that it really belongs with the clinics. Therefore, it would need to be removed from the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Dr. Wagner said he wanted to make that recommendation, and to send it forward to the

Faculty Affairs Committee for them to prepare as needed for a vote. In reply to a request, Dr. Wagner read the charge to the committee from the current Bylaws. Dr. Wagner commented that since Dr. Stroup is on the COCA board, if CQI were needed as an element of the Bylaws, he would not be asking the Senate to review its continuing in the Senate Bylaws. Rather, it is being proposed that it be moved to the appropriate location for meaningful oversight, reporting, and effectiveness since it has a fully clinic-related function.

There was additional discussion, with input from a clinical Senate member who endorsed that a benefit would be achieved with the proposed change. Dr. Wagner said it's not urgent to vote to do it right now, but we can ask if it needed to remain in the Bylaws for COCA requirements. Once that information is obtained, action on the step could occur on the next Senate meeting agenda.

Dr. Sanny said he would prefer having a formal recommendation about removing this, including a rationale for doing it. Dr. Sanny said it could come from the CQI committee to us. Following further discussion, it was decided that any questions we have can be raised to Dr. Stroup. Dr. Sanny said if something written is sent to us, we can move forward from there.

Dr. Wagner said he would forward Dr. Stroup's email to the Faculty Senate so they can see the content. Then we can move forward with the appropriate process from that point.

Dr. Sanny summarized that he would like it to come to the Senate as a recommendation, not that the Senate should prepare it.

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