



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 15 March 2001
Sixth Meeting

MINUTES

Members present: Abraham, Alber, Andrews, Benson, Bhatt, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Carter, Chapman, Coppin, Dow, Downing, Eberly, Eberwein, Esposito, Gardner, Gilroy, Goldberg, Hildebrand, Kleckner, Kochenderfer, MacKinder, Marks, Mayer, McIntosh, McNair, D. Moore, Moran, Olson, Otto, Russell, Schwartz, Sen, Sevilla, Shablin, Sieloff, Stamps, Wood, Wharton
Members absent: Blanks, Didier, Early, Estes, Fink, Ginger, Grossman, Haskell, Herman, Laski, Long, K. Moore, Mosby, Nakao, Pfeiffer, Rozek, Rusek, Schochetman, Sudol

Summary of actions:

1. Information items (Travis Professorships; Senate Library Committee Report-Ms. Miller)
2. Motion to approve of the [minutes](#) of the February 15, 2001 meeting (Ms. Wood, Ms. Sieloff) Approved.
3. Motion to endorse the report of the International Students and Scholars Task Force (Ms. Moore, Mr. Stamps) Second reading. The report was amended by its authors to include in the goals a statement encouraging students to study foreign languages and cultures. Approved.
- 3a. Motion to include in the endorsement a provision that the role of foreign language be examined. (Mr. Brieger, Ms. Buffard-O'Shea) Withdrawn.
4. Motion to endorse the Report of the Task Force on Research and Graduate Study. (Ms. Sieloff, Ms. Didier) Second reading. Approved.
5. Motion to recommend approval of a Master of Arts degree in Liberal Studies. (Mr. Andrews, Mr. Downing) Second reading. Approved.
6. Motion to endorse the *Physical Master Plan 2001-2020*. (Mr. Coppin, Ms. Gilroy) First reading. Approved with reservations following approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Ms. Wood, Mr. Brieger)
7. Motion to recommend approval of a Master of Science Program In Embedded Systems (Mr. Andrews, Mr. Mayer) First reading.
8. Motion to recommend approval of a Master of Science Program In Information Systems Engineering (Ms. Sieloff, Mr. Andrews) First reading.
9. Motion to recommend approval of a Master of Science in Information Technology Management (Ms. Sieloff, Mr. Mayer) First reading.
10. Motion to recommend approval of a Doctorate in Physical Therapy and a Post-professional Doctorate of Science in Physical Therapy (Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Olson) First reading.
11. Motion to endorse the report of the Nursing and Health Sciences Task Force. (Ms. Sieloff, Mr. Andrews) First reading.

After calling the meeting to order at 3:20, Mr. Esposito recognized Mr. Downing who announced the establishment of the Travis Professorships. These distinguished professorships are the result of a bequest from two former Michigan residents who gave \$5000,000, the single largest gift in the history of the College. Mr. Downing announced that Ms. Schimmelman (Art History), Mr. Gillespie (Theater), Ms. Eisenhower (Dance) and Mr. White (Music) have been selected to receive this award.

Senate Library Committee

Ms. Miller, chair of the Senate Library Committee, then presented some concerns their committee has concerning the state of the library. The text of her presentation follows :

Comparisons of Oakland University's Kresge Library to Peer and Aspirant Peer Institutions with Some Commentary on Instructional Implications

March 15, 2001

Oakland University's Kresge Library faces the standard responsibilities of all academic libraries. Regardless of the medium of the information source—books, periodicals, electronic data bases—libraries must complete three steps to make that information available to its patrons. First, the information must be acquired through either purchase or lease. Second, the information must be cataloged so that it can be searched. Third, patrons must be trained in how to use the cataloging system. Each of these tasks costs money. It is this fundamental issue of money that affects Kresge Library today.

The Provost's office furnished our committee with the complete list of peer and aspirant peer institutions. (included in the handouts for the March 15, 2001 meeting) We have identified three peer institutions and four aspirant peer institutions, and will compare Kresge Library's performance against these peers and aspirant peers. These comparative schools were chosen because they are used as common reference points by the administration. The data we will be using comes from the Association of College and Research Libraries's 1998-1999 report (the most recent year from which we could get complete statistics).

Slides #3, #4, and #5 provide a graphic description of the comparison of three of the most important measures of a library collection—expenditures for collection, volumes, and current serials. As you can see, Oakland consistently ranks below both our peer and aspirant peer institutions in all of these categories. The most striking disparities occur in the area of current serials, a reflection of the rounds of journal cuts over the last five years.

Slides #6 and #7 provide a graphic description of the allocation of human resources to the library. In a pattern similar to collections allocations, Kresge Library fares badly in a comparison to the peer and aspirant peer institutions.

However, as you can see by slides #8 and #9, the size of Oakland University's student population is greater than that of two of its peers (and nearly as great as the third). Moreover, the graduate student population is not only greater than that of

two of the peers, but greater than that of two of the aspirant peers. These figures comparing graduate student FTE are particularly important since these students normally place a greater per capita demand on library collections than undergraduate students.

The combination of these statistics will have important implications for the instructional mission of the university. I have selected two key areas of service that have been affected by these patterns

Over time the library staff at Kresge has been asked to deliver instruction in library research methods to more students with a smaller number of professional librarians (See slide #10). RHT 160 has had a traditional three hours of instruction in library use; however, this year because of staffing shortages, the training has been reduced to 2 hours. It is entirely possible that this training will have to be eliminated completely. It is also a possibility that the library will have to restructure its service of conducting specialized instruction for subject classes.

The shortage of books and serials in the library has resulted in a higher use of ILL for borrowing. (See slide #11) Note the substantial disparity between items borrowed and items loaned, this is an indication of the weakness of the collection's ability to serve student needs. Also the cost is not described by these figures. The bill for the most heavily used interlibrary loan service (Advanced Information Consultants) rose from \$4,890.00 in FY 94 to \$37,968.08 in FY 99. Although some of this increase can be explained by a proportionally higher use of AIC, nonetheless, it indicates an important expense for the library. This expense is made to get access to information for one patron, and generally only for a brief period of time. ILL does not constitute a long-term improvement to the library's collection, but a stop-gap measure.

As you can see in the broad comparisons to our peer and aspirant peer institutions on slides #12 and #13, we do not do well. In particular, we fall substantially behind our aspirant peer institutions in nearly all categories.

The implications for this comparison can be seen in a number of specific areas. (See slide # 14) Oakland University was the last public university in Michigan to subscribe to JSTOR. When it was finally made, the subscription was not purchased out of the general collections budget, but rather was paid for out of the library gift funds (thereby substantially depleting Kresge's financial reserve). No major engineering index existed at Kresge between 1991 and 2000, despite the existence of graduate programs in the School of Engineering and Computer Science. Our students have become heavily reliant on ILL services, using them more frequently than faculty members. Seven graduate programs have been added to the curriculum for which library resources were deemed inadequate by the university. Despite the specific designation of monies to improve library resources for the Ph.D. in Counseling, the Ph.D. in Early Childhood, the Ph.D. in Educational Leadership, the M.S. in Software Engineering, the Ph.D. in Applied Math, the M.S. in Adult Health, and the M.S. in Nursing, a substantial portion of that money (\$20,188) has not been received by the library.

Three major factors have brought us to this position. (See slide #15) There has been no increase in the library's base budget since FY94. Funding set aside for collection development in specific areas has not been received by the library. There has been a 40% inflation rate within the publishing industry since 1994.

The Senate Library Committee has made three recommendations to the administration. They are:

Recommendation #1: Conform to the NCA recommendations of 1989, 1994, and 1999 that Kresge Library should receive automatic annual increases to its base budget to compensate for library inflation rates

Recommendation #2: Money appropriated for new academic programs be delivered to Kresge Library immediately after Board of Trustees approval of the program and before admission of students into the program

Recommendation #3: To keep Kresge Library in compliance with the goals of the OU 2010 Profile, the library budget of FY10 should be double the current budget. This increase should occur in regular annual increments to both the materials budget and the positions budget.

We would appreciate the support of the University Senate in achieving these goals.

Mr. Moran congratulated the committee for its thorough and rational report, adding that the library is in dire shape and something needs to be done. Mr. Kockenderfer reported that Student Congress has heard concerns from students about the lack of materials, particularly in the humanities. He wondered how our ILL statistics for the number of items borrowed compared to those of our peers. Ms. Miller explained that it wasn't possible to get that breakdown. Ms. Jackson reported that the Senate Planning Review Committee had just had a discussion concerning the library and the new program proposals and asked why are we approving programs when the library resources are inadequate. Ms. Wood expressed her thanks to the library for doing a heroic job and then asked whether any of the large sums of money that were to come from the new Sharf Golf Course had made it into the library coffers. The answer was no.

What do we do next, asked Mr. Esposito, and Mr. Andrews responded by suggesting that the Senate also have the Planning and Budget committees review the Library Committee report. Mr. Esposito concurred and thanked the Library Committee for its well researched report. He added that they had made a compelling case and encouraged all other committees to be as thorough. Mr. Russell suggested sending the report to the Board's Finance Committee; however Mr. Esposito indicated that he will send a copy of the report to the President and added that anyone can send information to the Board. He also noted that the Library is one of his top three budget requests.

Minutes

Turning next the [minutes](#) of the February 15th meeting, Ms. Wood, seconded by Ms. Sieloff,

moved their approval and the minutes were approved as distributed.

International Studies

Mr. Esposito opened discussion on the [Oakland International Imperative](#), noting that this is the second reading and that there is an amendment to the report on the floor. Ms. Awbrey informed the Senate that the Task Force had agreed to add to the list of goals one that would encourage students to learn a foreign language and to study foreign cultures. She distributed to the Senate a [memo](#) addressing some of the issues raised by the Senate Committees. The addition of this goal was deemed a substitute for the amendment on the floor and was approved. Mr. Bertocci then spoke to the main motion, highlighting the points made in a [statement](#) prepared by teachers of international studies classes and distributed to the Senate.

Mr. Stamps commented that there has been a 45% drop in the number of faculty teaching IS classes at OU while enrollment has gone from 8000 to 14,000 so faculty support for international studies classes is a serious concern. He also felt that it is very important to establish a centralized location on campus for students to find information on international studies. Mr. Sharma agreed, noting that it is difficult to get students who do want to study abroad to the right individuals on campus. And, for any study abroad program you do need some facility in the foreign language, Ms. Buffard-O'Shea pointed out. The main motion with the added goal was then approved by the Senate.

Research and Graduate Study

The next item of old business was the second reading of the [report](#) on research and graduate study. There was no discussion and the Senate proceeded to approve the report with Ms. Eberwein voting no.

Liberal Arts Master of Arts proposal

Mr. Goldberg opened the discussion of the [proposal](#) by stating that it is difficult to recommend new graduate programs with so many existing holes in the current infra-structure, especially in the light of the library report just presented. Ms. Papazian agreed that there are many issues on campus that need attention but argued that this proposal will not cause the problems others might because of its interdisciplinary nature and because most of the resources are already available. Mr. Gardner added that if the programs are successful with student enrollments as planned, the students will bring in money to the university. The question is whether or not the money generated by the student enrollment in the programs will be used to support the program. With no further discussion, the motion to recommend approval of a Master of Arts in Liberal Studies was approved.

Master Plan

Ms. Wood indicated that she was still concerned about the encroachment of the proposed R & D park onto the natural area recommended by the Senate and her concern was echoed by Mr. Russell. Mr. Esposito reminded the Senate that the committee was an ad hoc group appointed by the President and was under no obligation to include the Senate resolution. Mr. Russell pointed out that the report contains a misstatement; that while it says "This proposal is in response to the University Senate recommendation described above" the area actually proposed for the Western Reserve in the master plan is not as extensive as the area designated by the Senate resolution. Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Sevilla then proposed the Senate endorse the report subject to the following reservations and concerns:

The Senate expresses concern over the potential encroachment of the R & D park into the natural area and the failure to include the land along Squirrel Road in the specifically protected area as recommended by the Senate (Senate Minutes 2/15/01) and the Senate recognizes the importance of the use of existing natural areas for biological research and environmental education activities by students, faculty, and members of the community.

The amendment was approved.

The report will be discussed by the Board at its April meeting, stated the Provost and asked the group whether to hold an additional meeting for further discussion or perhaps waive the second reading. Mr. Dow thought the parking structure #1 would be difficult and awkward for individuals with disabilities and thought there was a lack of concern about accessibility in general. He also thought the idea of tunnels between buildings would be very useful, noting that they could serve multiple purposes, e.g. wiring, water lines, etc. Mr. Esposito explained that the notion of tunnels was discussed but that in light of the limited resources, it simply isn't feasible. Mr. Moran commented that handicapped parking is generally underutilized on campus and added that the parking structure #1 was intended to serve O'Dowd, the new education building, the recreation center and the playing fields. Ms. Eberwein noted that none of the paths on campus are direct, making it more difficult than it should be for wheelchair users and others with disabilities to get around. Ms. Wood then moved to waive second reading, Mr. Brieger seconded and the Senate approved the motion. The main motion as amended was then voted upon with the majority of Senators voting yea, nays from Mr. Dow, Mr. Moran, and Ms. Wood and one abstention, Mr. Wharton.

Embedded Systems Master of Science [proposal](#)

Mr. Andrews moved, seconded by Mr. Mayer, that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board the approval of a program leading to a Master of Science in Embedded Systems. Mr. Stamps raised the question about resources needed for the program and Mr. Sethi, chair of the Computer Science department, responded that they can begin the program by utilizing and optimizing existing resources. However, as the program grows, additional resources may be needed. Ms. Jackson indicated that the Senate Planning Review Committee was concerned about the lack of an assessment plan. Mr. Sethi explained that the program will be reviewed by an outside evaluator as part of the accreditation process. Ms. Jackson indicated that assessment is important to outside evaluators and that it is important to have the process documented. Mr. Esposito noted that this is the first reading and that additional reports will be available for the April meeting.

Information Systems Engineering Master of Science [proposal](#)

The motion to recommend the approval of this proposal was made by Ms. Sieloff and seconded by Mr. Andrews. Mr. Stamps again asked about the adequacy of resources for the program and Mr. Sethi again responded that they have enough.

Information Technology Management Master of Science [proposal](#)

Ms. Sieloff, seconded this time by Mr. Mayer, proceeded to move to recommend the approval of the Master of Science in Information Technology Management. What's the difference between information systems engineering and information technology management, asked Mr. Esposito. Mr. Gardner explained that the engineers produce the hardware and software and the business side manages the information. Preempting Mr. Stamps query about resources,

Mr. Gardner stated that they have adequate resources for the program. Mr. Downing asked that it be noted in the record that both a representative of the School of Engineering and the Dean of Business Administration stated publicly that they have adequate resources for starting and running these programs. So noted.

Doctorate in Physical Therapy and a Post-professional Doctorate of Science in Physical Therapy [proposal](#)

Moving on to the next item of new business, Mr. Schwartz moved that the Senate recommend approval of a Doctorate of Physical Therapy and a Post-professional Doctorate of Science in Physical Therapy. Mr. Olson seconded the motion and then went on to explain that the Doctorate in PT will replace the current Masters in Physical Therapy as the entry level degree for physical therapists. The post-professional Doctorate of Science in PT will serve those individuals who already have a masters degree and will have a different curriculum than the entry level program. The profession has moved from a bachelors degree to a masters degree in the past and is now moving to the doctorate as the entry level degree. While the ability to practice depends on whether or not one is licensed, by 2002 one must have a masters degree or higher to sit for the licensing exam. There is a general move toward doctoral programs nationally and locally. The University of Michigan-Flint program reported a strong push from the accrediting agency to move to a doctoral program.

Ms. Marcoux went over some of the highlights of the proposal, noting that our requirements are in line with other institutions. She added that 34 states allow direct access to physical therapists and while Michigan is not yet one of those states, we still need to prepare the students to practice anywhere. Copies of their [response](#) to the Senate Committees was distributed. Ms. Jackson raised concerns over the lack of doctorally prepared faculty, the lack of electives, and the lack of a specific approach to vulnerable groups or ethnic minorities. Mr. Moran also wondered about the faculty in the program who have doctorates but not in physical therapy. Mr. Olson responded that all the faculty are in doctoral programs and when the program is implemented they will have three faculty with doctorates in PT. Also that board certified faculty will be teaching the clinical skills classes. Ms. Marcoux added that OU's four board certified faculty are more than anyone else in the state and pointed out that until recently, there was no way to get a doctorate in physical therapy since the program simply didn't exist. Responding to a question about the number of tenure faculty, Mr. Olson stated that two of the special instructors will become associate professors. Ms. Eberly pointed out that the DPT is actually a clinical doctorate, more like a MD rather than a traditional PhD.

Mr. Downing wondered whether or not the physical requirements for space and labs would be sufficient. Ms. Marcoux responded yes, noting that not all research projects require lab space. Mr. Stamps then raised the question about resources needed and Ms. Marcoux replied that additional office space would be required and eventually more faculty but that revenue would be forthcoming from the student tuition and fees to pay for these additional resources. In response to Mr. Russell's question regarding the typical faculty for such a program, Mr. Olson stated that OU has the best prepared faculty in the state right now and when the faculty progressing toward doctorates are finished, we may have the best prepared faculty in the nation. Mr. Russell cited the USC program which has 19 full time faculty with 12 Ph.Ds. Mr. Olson stated that they didn't have them when they started, that they graduated students with doctorates and then hired them to teach. In response to Mr. Moran's concern about a professional organization driving the curriculum, both Mr. Gardner and Mr. Esposito indicated that it is not uncommon for professional associations to have an impact on the curriculum. Mr. Olsen indicated that it would be misleading to say the professional association is leading the

curriculum, that the students and faculty are moving to the doctorate level because they believe this is the way they should go.

Nursing and Health Sciences Task Force [report](#).

Ms. Sieloff, seconded by Mr. Andrews moved that the Senate endorse the report of the Nursing and Health Sciences Task force. Opening the discussion, Mr. Olsen recommended that the Senate not endorse the report, noting the task force did not answer the questions that were posed to it. He argued the administrative superstructure that is proposed as a solution won't address any of the existing problems. Ms. Jackson stated that she thinks the report is very clear. She also indicated that the School of Nursing dean search needs to be activated because permanent leadership is needed and indicated her unhappiness that the search for a Dean of Engineering has already begun while nothing has been done for the nursing Dean. Mr. Esposito noted that he is trying to respect the governance process and that involved waiting for the report to be completed, which didn't happen until January 2001. Mr. Russell noted that the proposed Center in the report would be directed by faculty, not administrators. Ms. Sieloff spoke in favor of maintaining two separate schools. She stated that we've been through this process before and the answer then was the same, that they should remain separate.

Good and welfare.

The only good and welfare item was raised by Mr. Andrews who wanted assurances that no new business would come before the Senate in April and thus necessitate an additional Senate meeting. Mr. Esposito provided those assurances and then entertained a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned then at 5:15 p.m.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

3/28/01

Back to
The logo for the Oakland University Senate Home Page. It features the text "Back to" in a small font above a horizontal yellow bar with "OAKLAND UNIVERSITY" in black. Below the bar, the word "SENATE" is written in large, bold, black, serif capital letters. Underneath "SENATE", the words "Home Page" are written in a smaller, italicized, black, serif font.

SENATE
Home Page