

OSU-CHS FACULTY SENATE
2019-2020
June 14, 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. Chronister, Dr. Foster, and Dr. Gignac

Members Absent: Dr. Curtis and Dr. Weil.

Administrators Present: Dr. Stroup

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

Administrative Report:

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

Dr. Stroup provided the following report. He advised he had just a few items to share, and mentioned that Most of the administrators were attending the Regents meeting in Oklahoma City. It is generally a long meeting since the budgetary aspects are covered. He said either later that day or very soon, an email will be sent providing information gleaned at that meeting. He indicated no tuition increases were anticipated this year; there was a proposed increase in fees, but that increase was only in the neighborhood of \$300 annually. Those funds will be used to support increases in technologies.

Another topic he shared was that in the next two weeks, COCA will be voting on updating the standards; they will become effective July 1. He anticipates being able to bring a summary list of some of the changes to the next meeting. In anticipation of that, our policies are being reviewed and over the next 90 to 120 days there will be focused attention on those. The three policies that will be raised at the Council of Deans meeting will be shoring up our Adjunct policy; they have been updated to 2017. Regarding physicians in a patient-care environment, he advised they must have active board certification or board eligibility. It is important for these adjunct faculty to be current. The other policy regards transfer credits. COCA does not permit the transfer of credits into the COM that do not come from a COCA or accredited school. The impact that could arise would be from courses within the graduate school; it is appropriate for us to examine policies so they are compliant.

One topic already mentioned at prior Senate meetings, and will likely be raised again, centers on the adequacy model. He provided additional background information. He said, when a person is hired there are target percentages discussed. Then at year-end, there may or may not be a match between the goal and the actual experience. He explained it is a dynamic process and serves a purpose between the chair and the faculty member. He indicated he would be happy to work with a sub-committee of the Senate to look at adequacy model and to make appropriate adjustments. He said it is not a punitive process; it is intended to provide a method of

tracking activity and whether it lends toward achieving what is desired and guiding productive efforts in a fruitful direction.

Dr. Beaman provided some examples of the usefulness of the adequacy model as a tool and said he values it as he meets with the faculty members in his department.

Some specific questions were raised and discussed. Dr. Stroup said those discussions may best be kept at the department level since they are designed for best growth in specific directions. A comment was offered that the ability to plan ahead six to twelve months is very useful. Dr. Stroup said he believes a strong value is derived from the actual dialog; he said there is also value to have it be kept within the department. He commented that the greatest growth over the past ten years has been in the graduate programs. We have faculty who are actively engaged in those programs. He believes being able to hire post-docs to help distribute the load is also a tool. It was noted that as a campus matures, a balancing is desired. Dr. Foster said she would volunteer to serve on the Ad Hoc committee; Dr. Beaman said she would be a welcome member.

The sub-topic of the need to have a lab for some research areas arose. Dr. Stroup said we need to follow the RPT Guidelines as well as being consistent. Dr. Beaman commented that even if a faculty member is a bench researcher, a lab is not a limiting factor; he mentioned the remarkable success Dr. Matt Vassar has exhibited is an example.

Discussion Item: Faculty Profiles on PURE

Mr. Jon Goodell, Director of the OSU-CHS Medical Library provided the following information for the Senate.

He projected information for the members to view and explained the organization and how the information is populated into the program. Research and projects were displayed and the value of capturing the information was explained. Senators raised questions for which he called forward examples from the information contained in PURE. He explained that faculty will be able to make entries and thereby keep their profile current and accurate. Following the presentation, there was enthusiastic discussion regarding the best path to quickly and appropriately complete the profiles. Mr. Goodell mentioned that information entered on SCOPUS could smoothly flow over to PURE from there. At the conclusion of the discussion, it was determined that keeping a departmental focus would be beneficial. Mr. Goodell indicated he would be happy to go to departmental meetings to explain and show the profiles and thereby generate interest for faculty participation. Dr. Beaman raised the aspect of how to best avoid duplication of efforts, as well as duplication of errors. He suggested that the departmental records could be linked to PURE. Mr. Goodell said that could be done. Dr. Beaman also suggested that for the clinical faculty, the biography could include what their clinical services are and what teaching they do.

Mr. Goodell quickly showed the Senators a path within the program that takes the user to a department or program. He said both he and Scott Murray would be happy to come and demonstrate to faculty at meetings. Dr. Beaman said he would distribute information at his faculty meetings.

Dr. Chronister suggested that what is in the pipeline and information on active projects could be added so faculty could keep current. Mr. Goodell said there could be approximately a 30 day lag in information being incorporated from some sources. Dr. Gignac asked whether images/videos could be incorporated and indicated that type of information is of greater value to him since it generates more collaborative connections in his field. A brief discussion of platform program interface followed, and that there is the potential to expand beyond the PURE capability of what is now offered. A connection with departmental web pages, or personal web pages could also be developed at some point so information provided there could be viewed.

It was suggested that handing out the .pdf on PURE would be helpful, but Dr. Beaman said it could be more helpful if Mr. Goodell would attend the Clinical Chairs meeting, and also the Biomedical Chairs meeting as well. Mr. Goodell expressed his willingness to do so—he can be contacted through the Medical Library, or email, and stated that he is happy to be of help. He thanked the Senators for their time and discussion on this important topic. Dr. Beaman assured Mr. Goodell that he and the PURE project have the Senate's full support.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes were moved by Dr. Chronister and seconded by Dr. Gignac. They were voted upon and unanimously approved.

Election of Officers:

Office of Secretary:

Dr. Sanny nominated: Dr. Amanda Foster Vote: Unanimously elected

Office of Sergeant-at-Arms:

Dr. Amanda Foster nominated: Dr. Aric Warren Vote: Unanimously elected

Discussion Item:

Dual Committee Assignments: Dr. Beaman advised that Dr. Sarah Hall was elected to serve on the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee. She subsequently was elected to serve on the RPT **Resolution** Committee. Dr. Beaman said it doesn't make sense for the same person to reviewing. This circumstance was just the outcome of the voting process. Faculty Affairs is requesting Senate consideration of their suggestion that Dr. Hall recuse herself on the Resolution Committee for any potential discussions of a case in which she was initially involved with the RPT Committee. Dr. Beaman commented that the Resolution Committee had only been utilized perhaps once since 1942; it has been very, very rare.

An alternative would be to ask Dr. Hall to step down from one of the two committees, and an absence could exist on one of the committees.

Discussion followed, following which the Senate agreed that Dr. Hall be contacted and Dr. Beaman, who serves as the Chair of the Resolution Committee by virtue of being the Senate President, will explain the circumstances. He said he believes Dr. Hall would have no problem with stepping down.

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 an item of New Business to discuss. He said it had been suggested that the Senate look at the possibility of holding a Fund Raiser for individuals, specifically faculty members, who had been affected by the recent flooding. He said he was not personally aware of any faculty members affected. He mentioned that Johnathan Franklin had significant damage, but Dr. Franklin is not a faculty member. Dr. Gignac mentioned that Dr. Finn's house had been hit by lightning and there was roof damage and some damage to electronics.

Dr. Beaman said he believes these are definitely well-meaning intentions. He said the community support system through homeowner's insurance, and through FEMA, are in place. He said the crisis intervention is resolved; the immediate need for items such as clothing, shelter, diapers, etc. is probably over. Otherwise, we would just be giving faculty money. If we would be just doing a Go-Fund-Me, we would need to know to what purpose. In summary, he said he is not recommending going forward on this. However, he would be more than happy to reach out to Dr. Finn to see if there is any assistance we could provide. Dr. Beaman mentioned that not only faculty were affected; some staff and perhaps students also.

Dr. Beaman said he would reach out to HR and Jeff Hackler to gather information.

The next meeting will be held in September. However, there is a topic that may need to be resolved electronically before then. Faculty Affairs has recognized that there is a danger in our PT process.

He gave the following example:

You submit our packet in October; your appointment doesn't start until July. So, what if you get the grant of your life in January? Does it count toward your packet? No, because you can't add anything. But the way the language is written is that--at rank--you don't get credit for anything until July.

Dr. Beaman said to protect our faculty, we should look at changing that language so that the tenured member would get credit for anything after their packet was submitted and it would be included toward their next review.

There was general discussion regarding the process and associated due dates.

Dr. Beaman said there is an easy fix. A sentence could be added stating, "Any new material after the submission of the packet will be directly applied to the next review." It was also noted that any new material should not necessarily affect the decision at hand.

Dr. Beaman advised that Matt O'Brien of Faculty Affairs will be providing materials to him, and if materials are due in October, and we move on it in September, there should be sufficient time. He indicated he would make sure we have a resolution before the next cycle comes up. He said the resolution should come from the RPT Committee; it will be sent to the RPT Committee; effective July 1, the new chairperson will be Dr. Vivian Stevens.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:54 p.m.

**Written Committee Reports
Faculty Senate Meeting
June 14, 2019**

*The committee reports are for information purposes only
and are not being submitted for Senate approval.*

College-wide committees:

Academic Standards Committee (Bill Meek)

The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) met April 12, April 26, May 6, May 10, and May 29 and June 5.

For the 2018-19 school year (fall 2018 and spring 2019), 20 MS1 students were placed on probation for Ds or Us. Three of these students exceeded the limit for courses or hours to be remediated, one was dismissed and two will be repeating the first year. Remediation continues for most of these students, some have completed remediation. Two of three repeating students will continue into the second year. One of the two did receive a U in one course. Ds or Us in courses for the fall and spring by the 20 MS1 students: 6 in BMF2, 8 in BMF3, 1 in BMF4, 2 in Anatomy, 2 in BMFV, 3 in BMFVI, 5 in Cardiovascular, 1 in Respiratory, 8 in Hematology, 3 in GenitoUrinary.

For the 2018-19 school year (fall 2018 and spring 2019), 7 MS2 students were placed on probation for Ds or Us. Six of these students received Ds or Us in their MS1 year. 12 MS2 that received Ds or Us as an MS1, did not receive Ds or Us as an MS2. Remediation continues for most of these students, some have completed remediation. Ds or Us in the fall and spring by the seven MS2 students: 3 in Neurology, 3 in Endocrine, 1 in Reproductive, 2 in Musculoskeletal/CT/Dermatology.

The ASC met with one student with 3 COMAT failure in OB/GYN and a recommendation was made to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Interim Senior Associate Dean of Academic Affairs. There were 21 students with COMAT failures since January 1, 2019, some with multiple failures.

The ASC met with one MSIV student for a ‘N’ non-cognitive grade on a Surgery rotation and a recommendation was made to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Interim Senior Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.

The ASC meet with one student for a second failure of the COMLEX Level 1 and a recommendation was made to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Interim Senior Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.

Curriculum Oversight Committee (Stacy Chronister)

Update elements from May 30, 2019 committee meeting:

Three recommendations were voted upon and approved:

- COC 18-19 A-5-30-19 Formal Recommendation: Revision of Exam Review Process; presented by Student members **Motion approved.**
- COC-V 18-19 B-5-30-19 Verbal recommendation revision for students with accommodations section to read: Students with approved testing accommodations shall arrive at the alternate exam room with their login information five (5) minutes prior to their scheduled exam start time.
Motion approved.

- COC-V 18-29 C-5-30-19 Verbal recommendation moving that: Raw scores will be released immediately following the examination. **Motion approved.**

The committee reviewed the first iteration of the Year 1 and Year 2 Fall 2019 Class Calendar. Suggestions were made and Dr. Meek took notes and will bring the next iteration for the committee's review.

Learning Resources Committee (Tom Curtis)

The committee has not met since the previous Senate meeting; the next meeting is planned for August.

Student Affairs Committee (A. Bacon and J. Hackler on behalf of Steve Eddy)

Student Affairs Committee:

- The last meeting of the semester was held on April 26th, 2019. No meeting was held in May 2019.
- Some topics of discussion included: various updates from clinical education regarding rotations, didactic weeks, trainings and financial aid. Students Affairs announcements included updates of various action memos, SGA retreat and Coffee in student lounges discussions. Also discussed were proposals of two new clubs, one was approved.

Research Committee (Anne Weil)

The following Special/regulatory committees report through the Research Committee: Institutional Review Board, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, the Institutional Biosafety Committee, and the Chemical Hygiene and Radioisotope use Committee.

Research Committee Reports for April.

The Research Committee met on Wednesday, April 24, 2019 in E393 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00.

- The meeting agenda, prior meeting minutes, and reports of regulatory committees were discussed and approved. They are attached with this report.
- The isofluorine anesthesia machines used in the animal facility have not been calibrated since purchase. Since these are shared equipment needed by many researchers, the Office of Research is financing and organizing their refurbishing and calibration. Researchers using them will be notified ahead of any unavailability to result from this process. Going forward, they will be calibrated on an annual basis as is required for ALAC accreditation.
- Dr. Amlaner gave a report put together by the Office of Research about Grants and Contracts in this fiscal year, compared to the previous three fiscal years. At the current time, FY19 looks as if it will close with a full portfolio of about \$80M (about \$29M for the project period). This surpasses the school of Arts and Sciences at Stillwater campus. This is progress toward the goals of the COM Strategic Plan
- The Research Committee agreed on minor changes to the last draft of the OSU-CHS Guidelines for Research Centers and Institutions, a modification of a similar document that was being developed in Stillwater. That document is attached with this report and is also being sent forward from the office of the OVPR to administration. It is intended to encourage and regularize the formation of Research Centers and Institutes, and also their regular evaluation. [See Attachment A]

- Dr. Amlaner had asked for comment on his Draft Policy for New Faculty Startup. Discussion at the March meeting had centered on faculty use of startup funds as a “rainy day” fund covering the replacement of failed lab equipment and historic distrust that basic resources for research infrastructure would be needed. Continued discussion at this meeting centered on the administrative
- difficulty of disbursing money over 3 years and spending it in 3 years, and on benefits to faculty members of having a 5-year period of expenditure. Conclusion of discussion was that our recommendation would be for spending over a 4-year period with an extension to five years if needed. Our recommendations on the draft document are attached with this report. [See Attachment B]
- Faculty members (including but not limited to committee members) not reading e-mail has become a pervasive problem. Dr. Goodell reports that despite multiple notifications, some faculty members are unaware that CHS now has a large-format printer suitable for research posters. It was suggested that the library could send out postcards to all faculty.

CHRUC *David Wallace, CHRUC Chair.*

The CHRUC met on April 17, 2019. There were no protocols or proposals that needed review. Items that were discussed and the action taken were:

1. Moving the chemical inventory date. Currently each lab has a different due date to submit their annual chemical inventory. The committee discussed standardizing it to the month of June each year – due July 1st. The committee voted to approve and the CHRUC chair will send out notifications in May with the new chemical hygiene manual.
2. Brief discussion of the Oklahoma State Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs new rule. This was an FYI item, the focus of this regulation change relates to medical marijuana production and dispensing.
3. The committee discussed respirator fit testing, and we were informed that Erika Teel at the clinic would be able to perform the necessary work to fit test personnel who are required to wear a respiratory device in the course of their work.

Next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 1:00PM in room E-393.

IACUC *Tom Curtis, Chair*

The IACUC did not meet since the last research committee meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for 5/6/19. During the past month, clarifications to the annual report to the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare were submitted and accepted.

IBC *F. R. Champlin*

The Institutional Biosafety Meeting scheduled for April 18, 2019 was cancelled due to the fact that all pending business is being conducted using email:

- (1) Amber has received some feedback regarding the draft update of our Institutional Biosafety Policy document. A draft will be circulated among the members for their final review in coming days.

- (2) We continue to work with the Regulatory Compliance Office to craft draft SOPs which will standardize the process of communicating BSL-2 containment criteria for new research laboratories using infectious disease or primate-derived cell culture protocols as they go online.
- (3) A discussion continues regarding how best to ensure we have a quorum of individuals who have pertinent expertise present when evaluating infectious agent and recombinant DNA applications.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the IBC will be on Thursday, May 16 in Conference Room E-102.

IRB *Kath Curtis, Chair*

The full IRB did not meet in the last month. However, during April of 2019, the following actions were taken by the Director of Regulatory Compliance and Research Facilities:

3 new proposals were evaluated

- 1 was transferred from OU and was expeditedly reviewed and approved
- 1 was determined to be exempt from IRB oversight
- 1 was adjudged to be NHR (not human subjects research) and therefore does not fall under the purview of the IRB

In addition, 3 amendments to existing protocols were evaluated

- 1 was expeditedly reviewed and approved
- 2 were determined to be exempt from IRB oversight

Research Committee Reports for May.

The Research Committee met on Wednesday, May 22, 2019 in E393 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00.

- The meeting agenda, prior meeting minutes, and reports of regulatory committees were discussed and approved. They are attached with this report.
- Both Dr. Koehler's report from the CADRE Council and Dr. Champlin's report from the Stillwater Faculty Council touched on World Wide Web issues and a wide-ranging discussion ensued. Points covered include: (1) Robbie Cozad will be leaving the CHS Webmaster position and a new person will take that place; (2) At CHS, changes and updates to pages can be made through submission of a form available on the Department of External Affairs Page; (3) On the Stillwater campus, there is widespread dislike of the Stillwater Web site; (4) At CHS, Federal overseers have determined our Web site to be out of compliance with Federal guidelines. Dr. Benjamin is producing a report on areas of noncompliance to be addressed, and those will be addressed over the summer. Failure to address could result in losses of Federal funding. (5) Research Committee members note that the CHS Web site has "refreshed" itself from old files in the last month, so that the medical curriculum represented on the site is very out of date. (6) It is noted that having un-updated information (misinformation) up on the Web can render departments legally liable for damages if students or others make large life decisions based on that information. (7) Departments and many PIs would like the ability to update their own pages and have dynamic lab pages. (8) The Research Committee is notifying Dr. Benjamin of problems found with pages that have repopulated with outdated information.
- In discussion of progress made on the COM Research Strategic Plan, Dr. Amlaner reports that 14 OVPR incentive grant (internal) proposals will fund at a total of \$149,000, and that six or

seven mentor-mentee grant proposals will fund at a total of \$50,000. ROI from last year's incentive grants was about 1 to 20. The next round of OVPR grants will encourage the development of clinical research more specifically.

- PURE profiles are up and may be edited by faculty members to include additional presentations, abstracts, plenary lectures, publications in the grey literature. Mr. Goodell can arrange 1-on-1 training for faculty members in the library for those who want to learn. Faculty members are encouraged to start with more recent publications/years, and work backward. Your PURE profile is public and linked to.
- Drs. Weil and Amlaner are drafting a letter to those faculty members with long-held startup accounts on how to empty those. Continued discussion by the committee brought up the issue that some accounts have been mixed over time, with funds being rolled in every year. This practice makes an audit trail impossible and is discontinued. Also, some accounts have not been reconciled on an annual basis. The letter is being amended to reflect these difficulties. It will go out to about 18 people.

CHRUC *David Wallace, CHRUC Chair.*

The CHRUC did not meet in May due to lack of quorum and pressing business. There were a couple items that are taking place or are completed:

1. The completed Chemical Hygiene and Radiation Safety Manual were sent to the faculty the 2019-2020 year.
2. To standardize the due dates for some of the inventories that investigators have to maintain, the notifications have gone out for turning in the chemical inventory by the June 1st.
3. The chair is working with Faculty Affairs to find a replacement for Dr. Sanny who will be rotating off the committee.

IACUC *Tom Curtis, Chair*

The IACUC met on May 6. Dolores Vasquez-Sanroman has replaced Randall Davis as a scientist member. We evaluated three new/triennial renewal protocols. One was tabled until the next meeting and the PI was asked to make some extensive revisions. Two others were recommended for minor revisions prior to final approval. Two annual "mini-reviews" were evaluated and approved. A semi-annual program review was conducted and no deficiencies were noted.

IBC *F. R. Champlin, Chair*

The Institutional Biosafety Meeting scheduled for May 16, 2019 was cancelled due to the fact not enough members were going to be available to constitute a quorum.

There will be at least two applications (one IA and one RD) submitted for IBC oversight in the near future. Also, it is anticipated that the onset of high school and undergraduate summer research programs will generate applications requiring IBC evaluation as well. The IBC is next scheduled to meet on Thursday, June 20 at 10:00 am in Conference Room E-102.

IRB, *Kath Curtis, Chair*

The IRB met on May 15, 2019.

1 protocol was submitted for Continuing Review which required Full Board Review; it was evaluated and unanimously approved with slight amendments.

After some general discussion, the IRB asked the Director of Regulatory Compliance and Research Facilities to provide guidance to investigators as needed to standardize and clarify wording in consent/assent documents pertaining to de-identified samples to be used in multi-site or multi-focus studies.

On-line submission and reporting platforms developed by the Director of Regulatory Compliance and Research Facilities are working very well to facilitate documentation and simplify the application process.

The current Chair's term of service will be complete effective June 1. Discussions about replacement are ongoing; identification of a new chair is pending final agreement by one of the current members of the IRB to assume that position.

In addition, during May of 2019, the following actions were taken by the Director of Regulatory Compliance and Research Facilities:

- 4 proposals were transferred from OU and were expeditedly reviewed and approved
- 1 new application was expeditedly reviewed and approved
- Revisions to 2 existing protocols were expeditedly reviewed and approved
- Continuing Reviews/Progress Reports for 2 current protocols were expeditedly reviewed and approved
- Continuing Reviews for 2 current protocol/Medical Device Reports were expeditedly reviewed and approved
- Continuing Review for 1 protocol was expeditedly reviewed and approved as Human Device Exemption

Committee on Students with Disabilities (Vivian Stevens)

The committee will be meeting at the end of the month for its annual review of student files.

Faculty Senate committees:

Budget and Benefits Committee (Jim Hess)

The Budget and Benefits Committee has not met since the previous Senate meeting; the next meeting is planned for September.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Matthew O'Brien)

The committee has not met since the election results were reported and has no new activity to report.

Promotion and Tenure Committee (Vivian Stevens)

The committee has not yet met for the new term.

Other committees/task forces/liasons:

Affirmative Action Committee (Tina Tappana) (A regulatory committee)

The committee has not met since the previous Senate meeting.

Biomedical Sciences Graduate Committee (Kath Curtis)

The BSGC met on Monday, June 10, 2019 at noon with Gignac, Kohler, Finn, Vazquez-Sanroman and Curtis in attendance. Also in attendance were Randall Davis, Biomedical Sciences Graduate Programs Director, and Shelli Vazquez, Coordinator of Graduate Programs.

S. Vazquez informed that she now will be coordinating special accommodations for graduate students.

K. Curtis reported on action items from previous meeting, including the distribution of an internal newsletter and a strategy for dealing with ambiguous wording on acceptance letters for graduate students from the Graduate College vs. that from the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program.

Davis reported that the Certificate program in Graduate Medical Sciences began this week with full enrollment.

M.S. applicants were reviewed and the BSGC voted to recommend

2 M.S. applicants be accepted

2 M.S. applicants be wait-listed pending receipt of additional materials

2 M.S. applicants be tabled pending input from potential faculty mentors

5 M.S. applicants be rejected

OSU-Faculty Council Representative (Sarah Hall)

Dr. Champlin provided the following report of activity at the May meeting.

The OSU Faculty Council met at 3:00 p.m. in the Council Room (412 Student Union) on May 14, 2019. The following tabulation is a summary of major agenda items addressed at the meeting which may be of general interest to the CHS Senate membership.

Items 2,3. Minutes of the previous meeting (April 9, 2019) and agenda for the present meeting were approved and are available separately with pertinent handout(s).

Item 4. Two special reports of general interest:

Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance Dr. Dawn Underwood gave a brief overview of the OVPR Regulatory Compliance program.

Dr. Ramesh Kaipa gave a brief presentation of his work with the OSU Speech-Language-Hearing clinic located in Murray Hall.

Item 5. Provost Sandefur filled in for President Hargis. He reported among other things that the recommendation of a procedure for removing names from facilities (18-10-01-Exec) was approved without much discussion by the OSU/A&M Board of Regents and is effective immediately. Faculty Council Recommendations are available separately.

Item 8. Chair DeSilva departed from the past practice of having the Chairs of the standing committees deliver their Year End Reports orally. He referred the Council to the written reports as presented in the Agenda, thereby truncating the meeting length considerably.

Item 10. New Business. Chair DeSilva thanked departing members and welcomed their replacements. Dr. Sarah Hall will represent the CHS Faculty Senate on the OSU Faculty Council.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the OSU Faculty Council will take place in August of 2019 on a date TBD at 3:00 pm in the Council Room, 412 Student Union.

Routinely, the agenda, Minutes, and Council Recommendations to the Provost can be requested through the Senate Office. They are extensive and have not been included here due to the Senate's decision to practice "green" methods in order to preserve resources.

Faculty Advisory Council of the State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE-FAC)

Anne Weil, Faculty Senate President-elect and therefore the Representative for 2019-2020

The Faculty Advisory Council has not met since the prior Senate meeting; the next meeting is scheduled for September.

Attachment A

Oklahoma State University Center for Health Sciences Guidelines for Research Centers and Institutes

Definition of Research Centers and Institutes

Research centers and institutes advance research and should also integrate and advance the teaching and service missions of the University. Administered by a Director and reporting to a Dean or Vice President (or designee), henceforth to be referred to as “Supervising Administrator,” they foster interdisciplinary and collaborative endeavors among students and faculty in targeted areas of scholarly inquiry. In accordance with the mission of a land-grant university, research centers and institutes promote scholarly participation in areas with local, national, and global significance, including discovery, learning, service, and community engagement.

A research *center* should be focused on the advancement of scholarly inquiry and discovery, with teaching through mentorship and community engagement encouraged among the broader impacts arising from research.

A research *institute*, which can include more than one *center*, should in addition to advancing research offer academic components. These may include certificates, degree programs, and academic components contributing to degree programs.

Establishing a Research Center or Institute

Faculty members may propose a new research center or institute by submitting an application with the following components:

1. Names of charter faculty members
2. Name of the proposed research center or institute
3. College within which the research center or institute is proposed
4. Rationale and need for the research center or institute
5. A comprehensive statement of the mission of the research center or institute
6. Enumeration of the specific objectives of the research center or institute
 - Evidence of the likely success of the research center or institute; include a description of what metrics will be used to gauge the extent to which the research center or institute is meeting or exceeding its objectives
7. Description of the Proposed Organizational Structure
 - Positions must include a Director and may include others such as an advisory board, faculty roles, and/or staff positions.
 - Proposers should describe positions and their responsibilities, and compensations (if any) in release time or salary.
 - For each administrative position include % of time/effort devoted to the research center or institute.
 - Faculty Affiliate status should be defined (requirements, expectations, etc.)
8. Accounting Statement
 - Proposers should describe a budget, identifying initial and recurring expenses and proposed funding sources.
9. Sustainability Statement

-Proposers should describe a plan for the fiscal sustainability of the research center or institute.

10. Required Resources

Proposers may include physical space, personnel, equipment, or supplies necessary for the establishment and operation of the research center or institute.

If approved, points 1-7 will constitute the charter of the research center or institute.

Review and Approval Process

Proposals for new research centers or institutes are submitted by the proposing faculty to the relevant Supervising Administrator's office, with copies to the Department Head or School Director of each proposed charter faculty member. If any charter faculty members are from another college, then a copy of the proposal should also be sent to the office(s) of the other involved Supervising Administrator(s). Each college may establish a review and recommendation procedure to ensure that relevant governance bodies are consulted. A Supervising Administrator considering a proposal should also consult with other involved Deans and with any relevant Vice Presidents before making a final determination. All such processes are advisory to the Supervising Administrator, who will make the final determination on the establishment of the research center or institute.

Research Center and Institute Directors

Once a proposal for a research center or institute has been approved, the process for appointing a Director takes place. Within two weeks of approval, the charter faculty members of the research center or institute will nominate a candidate for Director and submit to the Supervising Administrator a brief statement of the candidate's qualifications. The Supervising Administrator can approve the nomination or call for a new one; in the latter case, the Supervising Administrator will provide a written rationale for rejecting the previous nominee.

The term of the Director should be between two and five years, as determined to be appropriate at the time of appointment. Three months before the Director's term has elapsed, the faculty affiliates of the research center or institute will select a nominee for the subsequent term and submit nomination materials to the Supervising Administrator, who will follow the process as described above. Directors may be nominated for, and serve, consecutive terms.

Once appointed, the Director has responsibility for promoting the work of the center, overseeing the budget, and supervising any personnel. The Director also submits an annual report to the Supervising Administrator and a five-year report, as described below.

Annual Reports

The Director submits an annual written report to the Supervising Administrator on the center's status and activities; the respective Department Heads and/or School Directors, and other involved Deans will also receive a copy of the annual report. The report is based on the academic fiscal calendar and is due by July 31st each year. It should summarize the work of the research center or institute towards its objectives in the previous year, give an account of the center's finances, describe plans, and make requests for the coming year.

Five-Year Reviews

Every five years, the Director will prepare a five-year summary report on the activities and achievements of the research center or institute; the respective Department Heads and/or School Directors, and other involved Deans will also receive a copy of the report. A Supervising Administrator considering a five-year review should also consult with other involved Deans and with any relevant Vice Presidents before making a final determination. All such processes are advisory to the Supervising Administrator, who will make the final determination regarding the continuation, remediation, or dissolution of the research center or institute. The Supervising Administrator will notify the Director and all involved Department Heads, School Director(s), Dean(s), and Vice President(s) of the final determination.

Amending Charters

The charter of a research center or institute may be amended by submitting the proposed changes for consideration according to the process used for establishing new centers. If approved, the research center or institute continues operation under the modified charter.

Affiliated Faculty of Research Centers/Institutes

Any interested faculty member may apply to the Director of a research center or institute to become affiliated with it. The Director then determines the appropriateness of the particular applicant, based upon the approved charter's definition of Faculty Affiliate.

Funding and Support

Funding for a research center or institute may include a combination of College (or other university) support, extramural grants, and philanthropy. Directors may request new support and resources in annual reports to the Supervising Administrator.

Current Centers/Institutes

Once these guidelines are adopted and communicated to the campus community, existing research centers or institutes should begin following these guidelines, and should, within a period of one year, produce and submit a charter document as described above. The research center or institute will then be placed on a five-year review cycle.

Draft of 04/29/2019

Incorporating changes approved by the Research Committee April 24, 2019

Attachment B

Research Committee Recommendations on the Draft Guidelines for New Faculty Startup Awards

At regular meetings held on March 27 and April 24, 2019, and on SharePoint in between these meetings, OSU-CHS's Research Committee discussed the Draft Guidelines for New Faculty Startup Awards provided by the Office of the Vice President for Research in March for comment and recommendations. These are as follows:

1. The Research Committee is not comfortable with the proposed three-year limit on spending start-up funds for the following reasons:

- Infrastructure at OSU-CHS has, in the recent past, not worked for unpredictable intervals. Future outages or breakdowns could negatively affect the timing with which intended expenditures are made. New hires for the Tahlequah campus will come into a building that is not completed at the present time.
- Accounting difficulties have, in the recent past, significantly delayed disbursement of staged startup funds. Disbursing funds over stages in three years and spending them over three years may require more coordinated accounting than faculty members are used to encountering.
- Other schools do have the option to spend startup monies over a 5-year period.
- "Rainy Day" use of startup funds to replace equipment that departments have had no budget to fund has been crucial to the research success of at least one current committee member.

With this in mind the Research Committee **recommends a minimum upper limit of four years to spend start-up funds, with a one-year extension to five years possible without unreasonable difficulty.** We believe that this will be advantageous to junior faculty, helping to ensure their success as researchers.

2. Members of the Research Committee have suggested **additions to the allowable items** that could be funded with startup money.

- Publication costs: publication in open-access journals can be particularly expensive but is universally accessible and therefore has the potential to reach more readers and to get more citations.
- Technician salary: This can help to establish a lab quickly and increase the new faculty member's ability to secure extramural funds within the first 3-5 years.

3. Under the heading, "Initiating a Startup Award," an "annual request for approval to recruit new faculty members," is assumed. We recommend that this language be changed to, "a request for approval to recruit," so that it may **apply to any new faculty hire**, regardless of time of year that approval is sought.

Respectfully Submitted,
Anne Weil, Ph.D.
Chair, Research Committee