

OSU-CHS FACULTY SENATE
2019-2020
September 13, 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)
Anne Weil, Ph.D., OSU-CHS Representative to OSU Faculty Council

Recorder: Jean Keene

Members Present: Dr. Beaman, Dr. Sanny, Dr. Weil, Dr. Chronister, Dr. Curtis, Dr. Foster, Dr. Gignac, and Dr. Warren.

Members Absent: None

Administrators Present: Dr. Stroup

Call to Order: Dr. Beaman welcomed everyone in attendance and called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Action Items during this meeting:

- Approval of Minutes of prior meeting
Action: Approved with 3 abstentions by Senators not attending that meeting.
- Senate Reaffirmation of the Mission and Vision Goals for the COM as previously approved; there is no change in the wording from prior approval. *For tracking purposes, #FS 19-20-003 assigned.*
Action: Approved and Reaffirmed on behalf of the faculty.
- Formal Recommendation FS 19-20-001
Revision-Charter Article VI, Section 3, Quorum (Attendance by electronic means approved)
Revision-Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Article II, Elected Officers of the Faculty Senate, Section C. Article IV. Meetings, Section A.
Action: Motion Approved as modified.
- Formal Recommendation FS 19-20-002
Revision-Bylaws of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate, Article III, Section 2.
Voting Rights (Full-time faculty and part-time faculty with at least 0.75 FTE will have voting rights).
Action: Motion tabled; Dr. Beaman to request additional information prior to removal from table for consideration by Senate-potentially at October 2019 meeting.
- Dr. Beaman will contact Dr. Amlaner regarding the recent communication to faculty from the Office of Research, and he will report back to the Senate.
Action: Dr. Beaman will communicate with Dr. Amlaner and report to Senate.
- Dr. Beaman proposed that the Senate agree to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meet only when there are specific topics the administration wanted to provide to the EC prior to the Senate meeting.
Action: EC members will be notified monthly whether an EC meeting will be held.

Administrative Report:

Dr. Beaman invited Dr. Stroup to provide an administrative report.

Dr. Stroup provided a report regarding space usage. Regarding CWR and the Legacy Towers that will off-load some space pressure. In addition, he noted that some space is being rented at OSU-Tulsa to house some of our faculty and staff there since we are cramped for space on this campus. Our next step is the North Hall, which will house the Medical Examiner, the Anatomy Lab, and several offices that will be housed there and that will free up space in this building. We will then do a redesign assessment to determine what would be the best use. From the lab standpoint, we need to move labs and get them into a better location, but then the vacated space could potentially be used for offices. The challenge is to determine what would be the best and most productive use of our space.

Dr. Stroup provided some background on the program mission of the COM. Just to give some background, in May of 2018, the General Faculty voted on the Mission and Vision Goals for the COM and it was approved. As we are going to our COCA documents and the new accreditation standards, a statement was included stating that “The COM must consider the input of its faculty, staff, and students when reviewing and revising its mission.”

Dr. Stroup explained that at the time of the prior general faculty approval, faculty input/approval was provided. However, staff and student approval were not a part of the process at that time. Therefore, for thoroughness, the exact same wording of the Mission and Vision Goals statement previously approved by faculty has now been presented to both staff and students for their approval so complete approval is included in the same document and approval process. The staff and the students have now reviewed and approved the Mission and Vision Goals statement previously approved by faculty, and in the spirit of completeness, this same exact statement is now being presented for reaffirmation by the Senate on behalf of the faculty.

Dr. Beaman opened the topic for discussion, following which, a motion was offered.

MOTION: Dr. Beaman moved that the Faculty Senate **approve and reaffirm** the Mission and Vision Goals Statement for the COM which were previously approved by the Senate and the General Faculty. Motion seconded by Dr. Gignac.

For thoroughness, the Mission Statement was read:

“Oklahoma State University College of Osteopathic Medicine educates osteopathic primary care physicians with an emphasis on serving rural and underserved Oklahoma.”

Rationale: Since the Mission and Vision Goals statement is exactly the same as previously approved, on behalf of the faculty, the Senate Reaffirms approval of the statement.

ACTION: **Approved and Reaffirmed**

Approval of the Minutes:

Dr. Beaman called for a motion to approve the minutes of the prior meeting. Moved by Dr. Sanny; seconded by Dr. Foster, voted upon and approved with three abstentions from Senators not attending the previous meeting.

Consideration of formal recommendation FS 19-20-001

Dr. Beaman advised regarding the background of this recommendation noting that this will allow the opportunity for faculty who are not on the CHS main campus to attend/participate. He emphasized that it is important for faculty who attend from a distance via electronic methods be counted as attending; he said a record of attendance will be kept. During discussion, a change to the motion was made, seconded, and agreed upon that it be modified to read:

A quorum shall consist of a majority of faculty who have voting rights **who are attending either in person or from a distance using video conferencing or other electronic methods. A record of attendance shall be kept.** [New wording = red text]

ACTION: **Approved**

Dr. Beaman explained that the platform has a “chat” feature which would allow faculty to enter their name, which could then be downloaded and preserved for attendance records.

Consideration of formal recommendation FS 19-20-002

Dr. Beaman advised that the motion would change the full-time and part-time faculty with at least 0.75 FTE will have voting rights. He provided additional information gleaned from a meeting that included Ms. Heidi Holmes and Ms. Tina Tappana who examined and reported on faculty FTE information on file. Detailed discussion ensued which included questions and concerns raised by Senators. One concern was to identify categories of faculty who are designated as 0.50 FTE, how many faculty are at 0.50 FTE, and whether they may be disenfranchised if this motion were to be approved, or conversely, whether including voting rights for 0.50 FTE faculty would enfranchise those whose first level dedication was other than CHS. It was recognized that additional information would be helpful to Senators regarding this recommendation. The distinction between percentages of work-effort, and the basis of the MOU when hired. Dr. Beaman said he would gather more information, specifically from the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding the voting history of 0.50 faculty voting. Based on the discussion content, it was moved and unanimously agreed that the topic be tabled, likely to the October 2019 Senate meeting when it is anticipated more information will be available.

Committee Reports:

Dr. Beaman indicated the various Committee Chair’s Reports were distributed in the agenda packet, and they had also been distributed by email prior to the meeting for the Senator’s convenience in reading them in advance. He invited the Senators to review them if they had not already done so; he said there were no associated action items.

Old Business:

There were no Old Business items to discuss.

New Business:

Dr. Beaman said there was new business to discuss. Dr. Gignac raised the topic of an email from the Office of the Vice President of Research that had been distributed to a number of research faculty the prior day concerning pulling their start-up research funds that had not been used in a certain period of time. Details on the motivation or the methods of how it was planned to be achieved were not clear.

Other Senators had also expressed concerns, and some had received the email mentioned. Dr. Beaman provided some information regarding elements of the MOU when the faculty were hired, and there was no expiration date on that start-up funding. A variety of comments were offered that had differing details and extensive discussion ensued. The comment was offered that faculty were hired under a specific set of conditions, and now it appears without further clarification that those conditions are being changed. A question was raised asking whether there was a redress option on this.

Dr. Weil, chair of the Research Committee, offered some observations that funding that had been stipulated many years ago had not yet been used. She did note that the culture had been to hold on to funds as long as possible since some needed equipment or furniture that would be needed could not be included in the research awards. Dr. Beaman also mentioned that trying to do audits on older research office records must prove to be most difficult. Dr. Weil said the plan that the Office of Research proposed would allow a couple of years to spend funds rather than a prompt upsweep of money. She mentioned the difficulty for having funds for start-up for junior faculty. The proposed plan would provide some of that new start-up funding. She explained for many faculty there was no MOU, or no expiration date for start-up funding mentioned.

Comments continued; the next steps—which are already planned—include new communications being sent from the Office of Research to the faculty, and those messages are to have the correct individual assessment information specifically appropriate for the addressee. It was noted that some faculty have intended left-over start-up funds by design, particularly when federal funds are utilized in lieu of start-up funds—which, of course, has the start-up funds then continue to be available for use on other projects. It is a prudent use of available funding to do so. Some of these funds are used for student seed funds, and the results have shown that it produces basically a 50 to 1 return on the monies thus spent—specifically, for \$50K spent, and \$2.5 million have been achieved in grants.

In summary, Dr Beaman advised that he will contact Dr. Amlaner and raise issues emerging from this communication to some of our research faculty members. Dr. Beaman believed it would be beneficial for Dr. Amlaner to hear from the faculty. Senators recognized that with the variety of conditions that exist, including no MOU, no sunset clause, no expiration date for use of funds, etc. an attempt to use one overarching communication or one approach that does not take into consideration the variety of existing conditions, is not the best approach to achieve whatever the goal the Office of Research was trying to accomplish. It could more appropriately be addressed on a case-by-case basis with an individualized assessment.

Dr. Beaman thanked the Senators for their attendance and their input on this important topic. He said he valued the ongoing service the Senators do on behalf of faculty colleagues.

Senate President's request:

Dr. Beaman raised the issue of modifying the frequency of Executive Committee meetings to only being held when there is a specific topic from the administration to be presented at the Senate meeting. The members of the Executive Committee will be advised each month whether the EC meeting will be held.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:53 p.m.