

**OSU-CHS FACULTY SENATE**  
2019-2020  
Joint November/December Meeting  
**November 15, 2019 Minutes**

**OSU-CHS Faculty Senate Members**

Jason Beaman, D.O., President  
Charles G. Sanny, Ph.D., Past-President  
Anne Weil, Ph.D., President-elect  
Kathleen Curtis, Ph.D., (21)  
Aric Warren, Ed.D, (21)  
Justin Chronister, D.O., (20)  
Amanda Foster, D.O., (20)  
Paul Gignac, Ph.D., (20)  
Sarah Hall, D.O., OSU-CHS Representative to OSU Faculty Council

*Recorder: Jean Keene*

**Members Present:** Dr. Beaman, Dr. Sanny, Dr. Weil, Dr. Curtis, Dr. Foster, Dr. Gignac, and Dr. Hall.

**Members Absent:** Dr. Chronister, Dr. Warren

**Administrators Present:** Dr. Stroup, Mr. Polak

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

**Action Items during this meeting:**

- Approval of Minutes of prior meeting  
**Action: Approved as corrected.**
  
- The DRAFT Agenda for the Fall 2019 General Faculty Meeting was reviewed and voted upon by the Senate.  
**Action: Approved; the agenda will be distributed to the faculty.**
  
- Formal Recommendation FS 19-20-004  
Revision-Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, Appendix D, Section 2.3, b.  
RPT Guidelines should be amended to state that accomplishments achieved after the candidate's application submission deadline can be applied to the following promotion review period.  
**Action: Motion approved.**

**Approval of the Minutes:**

Dr. Beaman called for a motion to approve the minutes of the prior meeting. A correction was offered: Dr. Sarah Hall is to be listed as the OSU-CHS Representative to the OSU Faculty Council. Approval of the minutes was Moved by Dr. Curtis; and seconded by Dr. Foster. The minutes were voted upon and approved as corrected.

**Administrative Report:**

Dr. Stroup and Mr. Polak were present to provide reports; Dr. Beaman invited Dr. Stroup to begin, followed by Mr. Polak.

Dr. Stroup advised:

- During that week, we hosted a company called LCS, which is a German company, whose background is drug delivery systems, e.g. films, biofilms, etc. The intent in bringing them to campus was to start up discussions. He noted that with the things that we gain from Purdue, if we get to the point where we have some drug discovery, partnering with some different institutions and private corporations could be beneficial in order to get those drugs to market. This is a new area for us and one where we have not had those kinds of discussions in the past. He said it was successful and it a beneficial trip to have them here, and they got to meet the governor in Oklahoma City.
- He advised that Dr. Shrum and Dr. Stephens were in Dallas meeting with some national foundations who are known for partner support for the National Center for Wellness and Recovery. There has been a focus on the settlement monies; a response is anticipated soon.
- Dr. Stroup distributed the most recent examination score reports, which included the breakout on specific areas of study; he briefly reviewed the content. He mentioned that one of the values of the breakout information is to look at the areas of study and evaluate by comparing the school mean to the national mean; the information can be taken to the Curriculum Oversight Committee and have them address the questions associated with curriculum content and whether adjustments are indicated to more closely align the content being taught to the areas covered in the exams. Dr. Stroup called attention to the school's pass rates compared to the national pass rates. He said we are doing well. [*See attachment A.*]
- Dr. Stroup advised that the holiday party is scheduled for noon in Tandy on December 17; this is the same day as the fall 2019 General Faculty Meeting.

Mr. Polak reported:

- We continue with the North Hall planning. We are sending out for bids for the demolition of Dunlap auditorium and the sky bridge and completely redoing the East parking lot. The current schedule has the bids to be opened on December 4. An award will be made and the demolition and construction will begin shortly thereafter. The contractors may wait until after Christmas to mobilize. The work will be done in phases; after Dunlap comes down, we will be building out the southeast part of the new parking lot first; parking will still be available in the northern part, then the process will be reversed for parking availability. It is anticipated that this work will be done by March, then activity will be seen with utility relocation in late April to mid-May, then work on building pad, and seeing dirt moving in June on North Hall. Of course, the schedule is weather dependent.
- The bids on the Legacy Plaza renovation are good; we were on the positive side of the bidding environment. Regarding a timeline on the phasing standpoint, the Psych area will be on Lower Level, moving upward to the Lobby and then progressing to T-3, 4, 5, and 6. Potentially, the CWR space will be completed in June; it is a priority since they are out of space. The Psych Clinic space will be next; each space will be about a month. We will be fully in Legacy at the end of 2020.
- The Board approved an architecture agreement for us to do an evaluation of the Barson building. Although the long-term master plan desire would be to tear down Barson, but with the associated expenses, that is not a reality in a 15-year horizon. Rather, we are looking at the post-move to North Hall programming, which includes what would need to be done to Barson to make it a usable building for the next 15 years. That would include replacing the elevators, redoing the electrical, and replacing the domestic water; we are good on core equipment—it has been exceptionally maintained plus some new installations. The façade will need to be redone. He said they are

looking at what would need to be done if the horizon were to be set at 30 years. That examination will occur after the holiday break.

- Many faculty members have participated in the conversations regarding the use of the 5<sup>th</sup> floor. Identifying a funding plan to make that usage a reality will be continued to be worked upon.
- A final item is that faculty and staff salaries have been discussed; we are moving forward with that and are working with department heads to identify pools of funds. Regarding the budget, we are tracking right-on, so we are moving forward.
- Questions were offered, which included:
  - In response to a question regarding any impact or interrelationship with the *Improve Our Tulsa*, Mr. Polak reported that much of the *Improve Our Tulsa* project is improving street infrastructure, which has a different set of contractors. We do not anticipate any impact there. However, one aspect involves the VA Hospital and the Mental Health Hospital expansion of the OSU Medical Center is to add the parking garage on that site. That garage was in the *Improve Our Tulsa* planning. Mr. Polak commented that we are very happy that *Improve Our Tulsa* passed.
  - A question regarding increases was offered. Mr. Polak said the process includes looking at re-setting the compensation for the lower- compensated groups of employees and are working toward market adjustments. For example, this would include looking at clinic front desk staff, nursing staff, and security groups. This would not only help the persons involved, but it would also help with recruiting.
  - A question was raised inquiring about the process for recommendations for increases, and who would participate in determining the recommendations that would go forward. It was noted that all of the information going forward are recommendations, which ultimately go up to the senior leadership. Department Chairpersons are able to participate as recommendations are being developed to go forward.

Dr. Beaman thanked the administrators for their informative reports.

**Faculty Senate President's Report:**

Dr. Beaman advised he had no items to report.

**Discussion items:**

Dr. Beaman said there were discussion points to address, and he invited Dr. Stroup to stay if the Senators would believe that would be beneficial. Dr. Stroup agreed to stay in the meeting.

Items for discussion:

At the prior meeting, it was mentioned that there may be possible discriminatory language in documents relating to the RPT process; work had taken place over the prior month, and it was determined that it was a moot point. There will be continued vigilance on this topic in the future to assure it does not become an active issue.

**Items to be presented for voting:**

A. Approval of the Agenda for the Fall 2019 General Faculty meeting. The DRAFT agenda was reviewed by Senators, approval was moved by Dr. Hall and seconded by Dr. Gignac, voted upon and approved.

B. Dr. Vivian Stevens, Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, submitted formal recommendation FS 19-20-004. The motion for revision to **RPT Guidelines, Appendix D, Section 2.3, b.** reads:

The RPT guidelines should be amended to state that accomplishments achieved after the

candidate's application submission deadline can be applied to the following promotion review period.

The recommendation was discussed, questions were answered, and a vote followed; the motion was approved. [See Attachment B.]

**Committee Reports:**

Dr. Beaman indicated the various Committee Chair's Reports for the November Senate meeting were included in the agenda packet; they had also been distributed by email just prior to the meeting. It was noted that the late submission of a key report prevented an earlier distribution. Senators agreed that additional time to preview the committee reports prior to the meeting would be appreciated.

Dr. Hall noted that she was able to provide a more thorough report on the activities of the OSU Faculty Council meeting in Stillwater, particularly on items that would be of interest to CHS faculty and was pleased to be able to submit it in advanced of the report's deadline. The Senators expressed their appreciation and commented it was a most welcomed report that provided valuable information.

A question was raised regarding the report provided from the Faculty Council activities relating to the P&T process. Dr. Stroup clarified that the CHS P&T process is no longer under Stillwater and the elements under consideration there do not apply to our CHS faculty.

Concerning the committee report from the Students with Disabilities committee, a question was raised asking whether this information applies to the graduate students. Dr. Stroup advised those students fall under the Graduate School. He said there is a process in the Graduate School on this aspect, but it is not known whether there is a report issued regarding graduate students. COCA requires that the information be gathered and that a process exists for the COM students. It was suggested that the information for the graduate students could be requested from the Graduate School, and if desired, this information could be included in the BSGC report to the Senate. At this time, the Student Disability Accommodations Committee is working with the COM students.

It was suggested that an inquiry be made to Dr. Benjamin to ask that it be defined whether the Graduate School has a need for an accommodation process. That could be a starting point.

Regarding the testing accommodations provided in the library, it was noted that service has been a great success. Dr. Stroup explained that the determination whether a student would be included in the COM process or in a process developed in the Graduate School depends upon the course in which the student is enrolled: if a COM course, it would be through the Student Disability Accommodations Committee, if enrolled in the Biomedical Ph.D. program, it would be through the Graduate School.

It was noted that Dr. Hall's report for the OSU Faculty Council was robust and the focus on items of potential CHS interest. Appreciation was expressed for her valuable report.

There was a related question regarding whether CHS has a Threat Assessment Committee, and if there is an Active Shooter protocol and training, including how that information would be conveyed. Details regarding the app mentioned in the Faculty Council's report were raised, and it was noted that app information was specifically designed to address the Stillwater campus, including being able to identify specific Stillwater campus locations. It was noted that the three-point guideline of "Run-Hide-Fight" applies regardless of which of the campus locations is involved.

**Old Business:** There was no Old Business to address.

**New Business:** There was no New Business to address.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:59 p.m.

**OSU-CHS Faculty Senate  
Formal Recommendation  
2019-2020**

Faculty Senate Recommendation Number: FS 19-20-004

*To be presented: November 15, 2019*

Moved by: Promotion and Tenure Committee

Seconded by: Second not required if moved by committee

Senate Action taken: Approved

Date: November 15, 2019

Recommendation Title: RPT Late submission accomplishments-applied to next review

**Motion:** The RPT guidelines should be amended to state that accomplishments achieved after the candidate's application submission deadline can be applied to the following promotion review period. *(See attached page.)*

*Rationale:*

*It is believed that items such as publications, major grants, etc. that could affect a candidate's consideration for promotion or tenure acquired during the time period after application submission and the time at which the decision is made for approval of the submitted application may not be credited towards the candidate's next cycle of review based on the definition of being "at rank." Depending on reviewer interpretation of "at rank," an applicant's accomplishments during the previously denoted time may have been included in the previous cycle and not be considered for the next cycle, which could adversely affect their outcome for promotion or tenure.*

Senate Formal Recommendation: FS 19-20-004

Action: Approved

Recommendation forwarded to: Date: 11-19-19

Dr. Stroup

Vice President for Strategy/Interim Provost/Interim Senior Dean Operations

Dr. O'Brien

Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

Recommendation Process:

**Considerations leading to this Formal Recommendation are listed below.**

Committee(s) involved:      Promotion and Tenure Committee  
   Faculty Senate

Proposed Faculty Senate Bylaw change presented as FS 19-20-004

Voting by:                      Promotion and Tenure Committee  
   Date Approved: 11/6/19

Faculty Senate action: Approved      Date: 11-15-19

If approved, will this recommended action need to be approved by General Faculty?

Yes              By digital voting

No

**Excerpt from RPT Guidelines, Appendix D, Section 2.3, b.**

b. Appraisal and development materials covering the period of time from the last appraisal and development document through the most recent fall semester shall be added to the RPT documentation file as soon as finalized. These documents shall be considered by the unit personnel committee and unit administrator prior to making their recommendations. It is expected that this most recent material may have to be added to the file *after* the RPT documentation file is otherwise complete, and *after* the faculty member has signified in writing that the file is otherwise complete; however, unit administrators should make strenuous efforts to complete the latest A&D review for each candidate by January 15. No new documentation regarding faculty performance or accomplishments occurring after the end of the immediately preceding calendar year may be added to the file. **Accomplishments achieved after the candidate's application submission deadline, on or around January 15<sup>th</sup>, can be applied to the following promotion review period.**

c. After the Statement of Recommendation is formulated by the unit personnel committee and recorded, the only documentation that may be added, except as noted in 4 and 5, to a candidate's RPT packet are the Statements of Recommendation from the unit personnel committee, the unit administrator, the OSU-CHS RPT Committee, and the SADAA.

d. The candidate will be provided one opportunity to respond to a negative Statement of Recommendation and to have that response added to his/her RPT packet. The candidate will have three working days following receipt of the *first* Statement noting denial of the proposed action to formulate a response no longer than 1,000 words. The candidate will submit his/her response to the next higher review level, i.e., if the Statement noting denial is received from the department head, the response will be submitted to the SADAA's office within five working days.

At each review level, all reasonable efforts will be made to notify the faculty member, in a confidential manner, of the Statement of Recommendation. However, if the faculty member is not readily available due to current assignment or is unwilling to accept sensitive documents sent via U.S. mail, the opportunity to respond to a negative Statement of Recommendation is lost. The faculty member should bear the responsibility of keeping his/her department head informed of his/her whereabouts during this critical review process.

e. If during the review process the reviewer(s) determines that supplemental written materials are to be added to the file, all documentation, including the new materials, should be sent back to the unit administrator, who will contact the faculty member and the unit personnel committee, and restart the review process. This is to ensure that all reviewers have an opportunity to deliberate on the additional materials in the event they have a bearing on the outcome of the reviewer's recommendation.