



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 18 October 1990
Second Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Appleton, Arshagouni, Bertocci, Braunstein, Briggs-Bunting, Burke, Cardimen, Cass, Chipman, Coffey, Dahlgren, Dillon, Eberwein, Eckart, Eliezer, Fish, Griggs, Grossman, Hamilton, Herman, Hovanesian, Lederer, Long, Meehan, Mittelstaedt, Olson, Pettengill, Rosen, Salomon, Schieber, Schimmelman, Theisen, Tracy, Tripp, Walter, Wedekind, Weng, Witt, Wood, Zenas.

Senators Absent: Allen, Beehler, Berven, Champagne, Frankie, Gerulaitis, Hartman, Horwitz, Kazarian, Kleckner, Landry, Liboff, Mabee, Mili, D. Miller, S. Miller, Murphy, Pine, Reddy, Schwartz, Urice, Williams, Williamson, Winkler.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 27 September 1990 (Rosen; Coffey). Approved.
2. Motion to approve a new graduate program in Nurse Anesthesia (Cass; Pettengill). First reading.

Mr. Dahlgren called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m., explaining that Mr. Kleckner was at a Detroit gathering with Kellogg Foundation folk and sent his regrets to the Senate. He initiated the day's business by directing attention to the minutes of 27 September 1990. Ms. Rosen moved approval, seconded by Ms. Coffey. No discussion ensued, and the minutes won approval by voice vote. With no old business to handle, senators then turned to the single item of new business.

Ms. Cass, seconded by Mr. Pettengill, introduced the following motion to establish a new graduate program to be offered by the School of Nursing:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of a new track in the Master of science in Nursing program, a specialization in Nurse Anesthesia to be offered in partnership with the William Beaumont Hospital.

She reminded her Senate colleagues that the proposal had already passed through a formidable sequence of governance hoops, winning approval from the Department of Biological Sciences (now fine-tuning new catalog entries, the Arts and Sciences Committee on Instruction, the Faculty Assembly of the School of Nursing, the Graduate Council, and the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (APPC).

Ms. Zenas then offered a systematic overview of the lengthy proposal, clarifying several

important points. She began by stressing the important functions performed by nurse anesthetists and pointing out the shortage of persons capable of doing this work in the decades ahead. Only three such programs currently operate in Michigan: those sponsored by Wayne State University, Mercy College, and the University of Detroit. None of these is located in a school of Nursing, despite recommendations of such placement by the appropriate accrediting body. She pointed out the complexity and duration of a nurse anesthetist's service to patients, which begins before and extends beyond the surgical procedure for which the nurse administers anesthetics. The proposed program, to be offered in collaboration with the William Beaumont hospitals, builds on already close research and teaching relationships between the Beaumont system and Oakland University. Beaumont's two hospitals afford excellent opportunities for students in the nurse anesthesia program because of the full range of medical cases they handle. Oakland and Beaumont would share responsibilities and resources (as detailed in the proposal) with the hospital assuming full responsibility for the students' insurance coverage. Control of curriculum and of admission, retention, and credentialing of students remains with Oakland University. Twelve students will be admitted yearly after a complex screening process. These students, expected to be exceptionally capable, must meet standards set by the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists. The curriculum requires fifty credits, broken down into core, specialty, and support courses. Faculty in the School of Nursing see this program fitting well with both the school's and the university's mission statements.

When Mr. Clatworthy inquired why other such programs had closed in Michigan, Ms. Zenas indicated reasons that raised no concerns about the likely survival of the Oakland/Beaumont program. Mr. Bertocci then introduced another line of questioning to determine what a nurse anesthetist can or cannot do in contrast to medical professionals with other training. To respond to this question, Ms. Zenas introduced Christine Zambricki, Director of Nurse Anesthesia/PACU at Beaumont Hospital in Royal Oak, who clarified the duties and powers of CRNAS. Although CRNAs must all be nationally certified by a specialized certifying body, each state establishes its own laws governing their practice. In Michigan, a nurse anesthetist may (but need not) practice with an anesthesiologist; when they collaborate, the nurse generally administers anesthetics while the physician is available for medical consultations. Nurses administer practically all anesthesia in Detroit hospitals, except for Sinai, which uses medical residents. In rural areas, all anesthetic work is handled by CRNAS: there are no anesthesiologists, although the nurses always work in conjunction with a physician, usually a surgeon. The state places no limitations on CRNA scope of practice. When Mr. Bertocci asked if there were limits on which anesthetics a CRNA may administer, Ms. Zambricki replied that no law governs such decisions. The granting of privileges is controlled by each hospital.

Mr. Fish wondered, on the basis of the APPC report, whether this should be regarded as a new graduate program or simply a new track in an existing program. Mr. Tracy, who had chaired the APPC at the time of its review, explained that his committee concurred with the Graduate Council's judgment that it constituted a new program because of the heavy proportion of entirely new courses required for preparation in this specialty. The School of Nursing, however, conceives it as a track. He indicated that the APPC felt no concern about nomenclature so long as the proposal gets full governance approvals right up through the Senate and the Board. Ms. Cass and Mr. Dahlgren agreed. When Mr. Dahlgren asked Ms. Cass to explain how the Nursing community uses the word "track," she reported that their accrediting body will regard this as one of three tracks within Oakland University's Master of Science in Nursing program. All three build on common core courses. If approved, the Nurse Anesthesia proposal will result in a specialist track to supplement the generalist MSN track in Adult Health and the functional track in Nursing Administration.

Ms. Tripp then asked sponsors of the measure to elaborate on the appeal of the program. Ms. Zenas reported that, without a bit of advertising, she has 'already received 150 statements of interest from four states. There is ample evidence that many eager, highly qualified students hope to enroll, although only 12 will be admitted yearly for a total of 36 (24 of them requiring space on campus at any one time). When Mr. Dahlgren asked for information on job opportunities and beginning salaries, Ms. Zambricki said there are currently about 100 openings for nurse anesthetists in Michigan -- many more nationally. The national shortage has been well documented in a study sponsored by the U.S. government that called for tripling the current graduation rate in the field to meet predictably increasing demand in the next three decades. Salaries range from \$60,000. to \$70,000. exclusive of overtime.

Mr. Olson wondered about the status of the two new non-tenure track faculty envisaged in the proposal. Ms. Cass projected that they would initially be appointed as visiting faculty, perhaps as lecturers. These persons want to involve themselves in the school's committee structure and will be needed for that activity. Mr. Dahlgren, noting indications that the program would contribute to Oakland's goals for excellence and service, asked whether it might also advance the goal of diversity. Ms. Zenas responded that the School of Nursing and Beaumont Hospital share the university's strong commitment. The candidate pool offers promise of diversity among potential students.

When Mr. Weng inquired whether this should be classified as a training or research program, Ms. Zenas responded that a research component, culminating in a thesis, is built into the program. Masters programs in Nursing have a clinical emphasis, unlike doctoral ones. She preferred the adjective "clinical" to "training."

Mr. Bertocci, having scanned the budget, wondered where funds would come from. Ms. Cass pointed out that the budget shows a deficit in the first year because only twelve students would be paying tuition. As soon as there are twice that number or more, revenues will support the program and even release moneys that could be applied to cover the starting deficit. She envisaged ongoing negotiations with the hospital on sharing of expenses. When Mr. Bertocci sought assurance that the program would be funded by its own tuition revenues and Beaumont Hospital's contributions of space, some library materials, and other resources so that there need be no drain on funds currently used for other academic programs and no appeal to the state for new moneys, Ms. Cass confirmed his reading of the budget. on that cheerful note, Mr. Dahlgren suggested advancing to other topics of interest.

With no private resolutions offered for the good of the order, attention turned to information items. Ms. Eberwein provided the first on behalf of the Steering Committee. In response to Mr. Chipman's Good and Welfare inquiry at the September meeting, Mr. Kleckner has invited Wilma Garcia to report to the Senate early in the winter semester about the activities of the Committee on Human Relations, which she now chairs. When the Senate established that committee almost two years ago, it stipulated that the group report back to the community at biennial intervals, and this will be the first such statement of progress and concerns.

Mr. Cardimen then took the floor to report on the current state of thinking about a conference center and to respond to Senate inquiries. He apologized for his absence from the September meeting, when the issue last arose. He reported that, early in 1990, Oakland engaged the Pannell, Kerr, Forester (PKF) company of Chicago to conduct a feasibility study that would assess demand for a university-based conference center in this area. PKF discovered a very

significant demand, on the basis of which the Board has authorized exploration to see whether any private corporations wish to build such a facility on the campus. He indicated that this administration has long felt the desirability of such a center, especially in the context of the Technology Park. PKF was chosen to conduct the feasibility study for several good reasons, including the fact that they do not themselves construct or operate such facilities but have a reputation for involvement with several that are working out well. PKF, he said, differed from Johnson, Johnson, and Ray's recommendation in the revised campus land-use plan two years ago to consider land along Butler Road as a site for a conference center, recommending instead that a suitable site be identified on the east campus with ready access to Meadow Brook facilities. Site criteria are now being developed so that we can issue a request for proposals (RFP) to invite detailed statements of interest from private groups wishing to build and maintain a conference center on land leased by Oakland University. He envisaged a facility of about one hundred rooms that would entail no financial investment from the university but would build in some mechanism for feeding money back to the university. The physical structure would eventually revert back to the university. The question now, according to Mr. Cardimen, is whether there are architects, developers, and builders interested in taking on this project as we propose it now that we have documented a strong market.

Other questions arose from his Senate colleagues, beginning with Mr. Tracy's inquiry about evidence collected to document the need for such a facility. As a department chair, he had received a questionnaire on this matter but had not detected much interest among persons on campus. Mr. Cardimen indicated that the survey included business leaders as well as university sources and that the idea had been favorably received by the overwhelming majority of university respondents. This report prompted Mr. Tracy to recall that he, although not eager for a conference center, had grudgingly acknowledged on his form that he might use such a facility, if constructed, sometime within the next five years. He wondered whether so tepid a show of interest might be construed as support. Mr. Cardimen thought it legitimate to challenge the study's method; his own role, he stated, was simply to serve as a spokesperson for PKF's findings. Ms. Briggs-Bunting suggested that, since the feasibility study is a public document, interested investigators should be able to look at its full documentation. Mr. Cardimen guessed that might be so. Ms. Arshagouni thought it might be helpful if senators all had copies of the proposal and perhaps also of its supportive data. Mr. Cardimen volunteered to have copies printed up, though at the dismaying cost of \$30. apiece. Mr. Dahlgren advised circulating returns on the RFP instead. (Late-breaking News!--A copy of the feasibility study has been placed on reserve in the Kresge Library circulation area. Interested members of the university community are welcome to study it there.)

When Ms. Briggs-Bunting asked for a definition of the Senate's role in this matter (whether advisory or voting), Mr. Cardimen responded that its function would be to provide advice. In that case, she wondered why the issue had advanced to the Board before the faculty governance structure had a chance to consider it. Mr. Cardimen stressed that there had been early, widespread consultation with faculty members. Ms. Briggs-Bunting then asked how closely this project was tied in to the possibility of a second golf course. Although acknowledging that the two ideas were not essentially connected, Mr. Cardimen indicated that a new golf course would definitely increase the attractiveness of a conference center by helping to bring in the kinds of persons such facilities try to attract.

Ms. Rosen reiterated her question at the previous meeting about how much money Oakland University had already spent on this study. She noted that the Provost, having promised to return with that information, had instead chosen to leave town. Mr. Cardimen promptly

reported that the direct cost for the feasibility study was \$25,000, with other costs increasing that figure to about \$32,000. This, he said, is what we have to pay to get an independent, outside study. Among the groups providing such services, PKF is among the least expensive. Ms. Rosen then asked what costs university groups would incur to use this facility, assuming that (like the Hall) its use would generate substantial charges. Mr. Cardimen cited precedents elsewhere for discounted rates for university persons using such facilities and assured her that we would certainly build such provisions into any agreement.

When Ms. Tripp inquired what benefits a conference center would bring to Oakland University, she was told that such a facility supports our public-service mission while showing the university's commitments to continuing education and lifelong learning. Mr. Cardimen mentioned that at least two other academic institutions in the area are eager to get into the conference business on such a scale. Mr. Tracy then picked up on the matter of tie-ins to Oakland's strategic guidelines. Looking at models of such university-sponsored conference centers in Michigan, he denounced the Eastern Michigan model as one to be avoided because of its failure to establish a clear connection with the university. On the other hand, he recognized Michigan State University's Kellogg Center as an admirable model. If Oakland should involve itself with such a facility, he insisted that it should contribute to institutional image through clear association with Oakland University -- not simply with the Meadow Brooks. Mr. Cardimen responded that the EMU structure, mainly sponsored by the UAW, was very different from anything envisaged here. An excellent model he identified was the conference center at the University of Maryland, an example Mr. Meehan believed should be explicitly incorporated into any Oakland University request for proposals in order to make the venture more palatable to the academic community.

Ms. Rosen wondered who would be using the conference center: Would gatherings of nurse anesthetists be succeeded by those of used-car dealers? Declaring that she conceives of this as nothing more or less than a business venture, she wished to know who or what would limit access to the facility since that determines the image it might project of Oakland University. Mr. Cardimen agreed that institutional image mattered to him also, though he reminded her that the university already hosts all sorts of gatherings each year -- not all of them academic or even professional. Mr. Dahlgren's inquiry about possible use of the center for Continuing Education elicited an enthusiastic reply from Mr. Cardimen, who envisaged a great many university groups using the structure for credit and non-credit programs.

Mr. Bertocci, identifying himself as "a typical faculty worry-wart," inquired about fiscal matters. Would Oakland University put out money for this project? No. Would it draw money in? Mr. Cardimen indicated that it would, somehow, depending on details to be negotiated. Mr. Bertocci expressed concern that we get a direct financial benefit, not just wait until a superannuated building gets dumped back on our hands. He also wondered about competition from hotels springing up in the area, although Mr. Cardimen denied that these are geared to educational conferencing. He saw no threat from hotels but only from other academic institutions such as Walsh College and Wayne State. In response to Mr. Fish's inquiry about a conference center's impact on Meadow Brook Hall's business, Mr. Cardimen indicated that we would like to reduce conference pressures on the Hall, which was never really set up for such purposes. He foresaw comfortable integration of the Hall with the center, with the Hall providing hospitality of the sort it does well (tours, dinners, receptions). He thought lost income could be picked up in other ways.

With financial affairs commanding attention, Ms. Theisen cautioned her colleagues about tax implications of such ventures for non-profit institutions, pointing out that Internal Revenue Service audit problems have recently arisen elsewhere in connection with conference centers. Mr. Cardimen noted that we have already been alerted to this concern by PKF. Mr. Dahlgren, trusting that any agreement would be set up to protect the university from liability in case of the conference center's failure, asked whether the state would intervene in that eventuality to put the facility to an alternative public use. Mr. Cardimen acknowledged that the matter needed exploration. Mr. Burke then picked up on an earlier statement from Mr. Cardimen to the effect that, even if we could afford it, he would not recommend the university's investing in such a conference center. Why not? Mr. Cardimen, professedly wearing his faculty hat, declared himself hesitant to commit money in a risky venture rather than devoting resources to academic purposes -- especially in light of the fiscal pressures that have confronted us in recent years.

Ms. Arshagouni, sensitive to issues of pronoun agreement, wondered who "well had been throughout this discussion. Mr. Cardimen identified "well as the administration. The Board, he said-, is just taking the next step in testing the conference center idea and has not as yet expressed either favor or opposition. Mr. Clatworthy asked about the role of the Senate's Campus Development and Environment Committee and was assured by Mr. Cardimen that its members would be actively involved. Exploration is still at a very early stage of this process, he reminded his colleagues, and plans may either develop rapidly or die just as fast. The Senate, in any case, will be informed about what is happening.

On that note, Ms. Tripp called for adjournment at 4:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Jane D. Eberwein
Secretary to the University Senate

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page