

Oakland University Senate

Thursday, 10 March 1988
Fifth Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Barthel, Bhatt, Braun, Cardimen, Chapman-Moore, Coffey, Copenhaver, Dahlgren, Downing, J.Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Eliezer, Frankie, Grossman, Haskell, Herman, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Hough, Karasch, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lauer, Maschke, Miller, Millwood, Muir, Olson, Pettengill, Pillow, Pine, Rosen, Sherman, L. Stamps, R. Stamps, Strauss, Theisen, Wedekind, Williamson, Wilson.

Senators Absent: Abiko, Appleton, Brown, Cass, Champagne, Chipman, Christina, Dawson, Desmond, Faber, Fish, Gerulaitis, Hart-Gonzalez, Hartman, Jackson, Lindell, Martek, Murphy, Reddy, Riley, Stern, Tripp.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 10 December 1987 (Olson; Pettengill). Approved
2. Motion from the Graduate Council to phase out the baccalaureate program in Physical Therapy, combining it with a combined B.S./ M. P. T. program (Dahlgren; Downing). First reading.
3. Motion from UCUI to modify policy concerning computation of multiple 0.0 grades for one course in a student's grade-point-average (Downing; Hildebrand). Approved. "
4. Procedural motion to waive second reading of #3 above (Braun; Hough). Approved.
5. Sense-of-the-Senate discussion of policy draft concerning distinguished professorships.

The meeting began at 3:16 p.m., when Mr. Kleckner judged the cast of characters sufficiently in place to introduce the drama. The first item of business involved consideration of the minutes of 10 December 1987. After a moment's attempt to recall that conclave, senators approved its formal record as distributed long ago (Moved, Mr.Olson; seconded, Mr. Pettengill). Mr. Kleckner then welcomed Ms. Stamps as a new student representative; her appointment gives us both a senior senator and a junior senator from one family.

Mr. Dahlgren, seconded by Mr. Downing, then introduced a motion on behalf of the Graduate Council:

MOVED that the Senate endorse the phasing out of the current baccalaureate program in Physical Therapy and its replacement with a new undergraduate/graduate program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree, with a major in Health Sciences, upon completion of a prescribed program of study comprising 138 semester hours and a Master of Physical Therapy degree upon completion of a prescribed program of study comprising an additional 49 semester hours.

Mr. Dahlgren yielded the floor to Osa Jackson, chair of the Physical Therapy program to explain the proposal. Ms. Jackson filled in some historical background, noting that the Physical Therapy program at Oakland University is now in its ninth year and is fully accredited. This proposal calls for a major restructuring of the current B.S. program to achieve a combined Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences / Masters of Physical Therapy. She traced the momentum for change to forces inside and outside the university and indicated that the restructuring responds to the desires of faculty and present students as well as alumni advice. Program reviews indicate that revision will strengthen the program and prepare students more adequately to sit for their licensure examinations.

Speaking for the Graduate Council, Mr. Dahlgren reported that body's support for this recommendation but acknowledged a split vote of 4 to 2. Concerns had arisen in Council deliberations about costs associated with the expanded program and about the maturity of the faculty: i.e. its readiness to

undertake graduate education and supervision of research. The strongest argument for approval is the quality of students attracted by Physical Therapy to Oakland University and the enthusiasm of those students for the restructured program. If we do not approve this recommended design, he cautioned, we should probably be thinking about phasing out Physical Therapy altogether.

Mr. Downing then reported from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction. UCUI examined the baccalaureate component of the proposed program and found it academically sound. members had felt some reservations about awarding a baccalaureate that would open no specific career doors but felt satisfied that a Bachelor's of Health Sciences would qualify students for the same kinds of opportunities now afforded by other B.A. and B.S. degrees in the university's non-professional programs. Mr. Kleckner called attention also to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee's report that circulated with the agenda. Missing Mr. Tracy in the audience, he noted that Ms. Rosen was present to speak for the APPC.

The first question came from Mr. Herman, who wondered what would happen to Physical Therapy students now in the program. Ms. Jackson said that they had been informed well in advance that one degree would eventually replace the other. She and Mr. Olson made it clear that current juniors and seniors will graduate with the traditional B.S. in Physical Therapy toward which they have been working. Those now in the pre-Physical Therapy group will move into the new program if formally admitted. This prompted Mr. Ketchum to inquire how many PT students Oakland now has, how many applicants are accepted and of those accepted what percentages are Oakland students or outsiders. What demographic changes re to be anticipated from restructuring? Ms. Jackson reported that her colleagues currently accept 32 candidates annually from about 170 applicants. They will continue to admit 32 each year, although the applicant pool may rise because the combined undergraduate/graduate program is likely to be more attractive to informed applicants than the existing program. Mr. Olson indicated that current admissions practices are weighted to favor students already at Oakland University, although Ms. Jackson noted that many successful candidates transfer here after their freshman year. They have done coursework here, however, before being accepted into the program.

When Mr. Ketchum pressed his questioning about enrollment patterns, he was assured that the majority of current applicants to Physical Therapy are indeed our own undergraduates. Mr. Stamps inquired what happened to pre-PT students who are not admitted to the program. Ms. Pillow pointed out that more qualify than it might seem on the surface. Last year, 50 persons were accepted either to our Physical Therapy program or another. Some disappointed candidates reapply the following year, while others switch majors-sometimes within Health Sciences and sometimes into completely different fields. Mr. Kleckner noted that this situation characterizes Physical Therapy programs throughout Michigan. When Mr. Grossman asked what kind of attrition generally hits the current program, Ms. Jackson said that her colleagues seldom lose more than two students a year although exceptional circumstances this year cost them several additional people.

Ms. Braun then introduced a new line of questioning by asking how the proposed new faculty position would be funded out of tuition. If class size remains the same, will the difference between graduate and undergraduate tuition pay a professor's salary? Mr. Olson noted that there would now be a third class of 32 students and that these persons would be paying graduate tuition. He thought that tuition revenues would substantially support the additional faculty member-though not, perhaps, fully. Committee review had called attention to hidden costs. Ms. Rosen responded that this issue had been a serious concern to the APPC, which feels strongly that no program is ever paid for by tuition. Who knows, she queried, where the new revenue actually goes? Ms. Braun responded that "We all have our suspicions." Still, Ms. Rosen stated, the APPC judges this to be a good program that brings outstanding students to the university. Ms. Braun wondered whether some other unit would wind up losing a position if Physical Therapy gains one. Mr. Kleckner agreed that there is inevitably some additional cost in

expanding a program. If Physical Therapy could make an outright profit, he observed, we would be opening our doors to multitudes of aspirants. The question he thought the university community must confront and with which the board would ultimately have to deal is whether the Physical Therapy program is viable at all as currently constituted. It may be that additional expense is necessary simply to maintain this program.

Mr. Grossman directed attention to the issue of faculty preparedness for graduate teaching. He asked about current levels of staffing in Physical Therapy and the ranks and educational credentials of those persons. Mr. Olson counted 5 full-time faculty in Physical Therapy, 2 of them currently doctorally qualified and others pursuing their degrees. The new person envisaged in the proposal would have the Ph.D. This prompted Mr. Horwitz to ask about possible problems with retaining accreditation. Both Mesdames Jackson and Pillow expected accreditation to be much more readily accomplished under the proposed new system because it extends instruction to include competencies that have just recently been required by the accrediting body. Mr. Horwitz's concern, however, was about specifications for faculty degrees. According to Ms. Jackson, current standards call for 50% of full-time faculty to hold the doctorate and to function in traditional professorial roles within the university. A national problem of low supply among doctorally prepared Physical Therapy faculty means that their accrediting group cannot yet require such credentials within every subject specialty. Mr. Olson observed, however, that a national trend exists to prepare physical therapists at that level so that recruitment should eventually cease to present the challenge it does at present. Mr. Barthel questioned whether the staffing would be adequate as proposed or would need to get larger. Ms. Jackson figured that a full-time faculty of 6, assisted by part-timers, would meet national staffing norm so long as class size is held to 32. The only circumstance in which Mr. Olson foresaw need for additional hiring would be if grant-funded research should withdraw someone from teaching for an extended period. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that the enrollment limits, from which staff size derives, are set in large measure by clinical placement concerns.

Mr. Hough wanted to know whether the faculty plan local clinical placement for their students. Ms. Jackson indicated that they would continue to use the same training sites, most of them fairly local. A few students pursue clinical opportunities outstate. Ms. Coffey shared the concerns raised in the APPC report about preparation of these students for the statistical aspects of their research. She advised the faculty to consider requiring STA 226 rather than 225. With all these issues taken into consideration, the Senate then turned its attention to the next item of new business.

This was a motion from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, moved by Mr. Downing and seconded by Ms. Hildebrand. Mr. Kleckner reported that the Academic Standing and Honors Committee had collaborated in development of this proposal. indicating that UCUI had continued to deliberate on this matter right up to the last minute, Mr. Downing distributed to his colleagues a revised motion approved by his committee as of 11:59 that morning. This wording replaces that in the agenda:

MOVED that a grade of 0.0 earned after August 31, 1988, when repeating a given course, will replace all prior grades in that course and will be the only grade for that course used in computing the student's grade point average.

He presented the background of the proposal, dating back to the Senate's passage of the new undergraduate grading system in 1984 that called for the new 0.0 grade to be computed into the student's grade point average just as N's had been incorporated into the phased-out API. Since N's were recorded cumulatively in the API, the Registrar's office has been following the same practice with multiple 0.0's resulting from repeated attempts to pass the same course. Any better grade eventually received in that course would eventually wipe out all those accumulated 0.0's. The issue surfaced last

year when faculty advisers began noticing the effect of this practice on students, especially those who had changed programs after despairing of passing a multiply-failed course. UCUI, to whom the question was first referred, asked the Academic Standing and Honors Committee for its advice and found that body in agreement that the current situation is an historical anomaly that should be corrected.

Mr. Kleckner stressed that the existing practice works most to the detriment of students who change majors and therefore stop trying to repeat a course that has discouraged them. Mr. Herman declared himself very much in favor of the change, pointing out the effect of multiple 0.0's on financial aid eligibility. Mr. Grossman, who had served on the Senate in 1984, reported that the proposed policy is what he thought he was voting for then. Mr. Horwitz inquired about its practical effect. Would all existing 0.0 grades in a course be eliminated once a student receives any grade in the course after August 1988? Assuredly so, declared Mr. Downing. 'Even if the student fails to file a repeat card?' pursued Mr. Horwitz. Eventually, yes, responded Ms. Millwood and Mr. Bartalucci. By the time of graduation, the Registrar's office would accomplish the change. The basic innovation here, according to Mr. Downing, is that a 0.0 would now be treated as a numeric grade.

Ms. Muir wondered why we need to wait until August. Is it simply a case of the catalog? Mr. Downing noted that all changes in academic policy carry with them some implementation date, and this is a standard one. It would be hard to get the new wording into the *Schedule of Classes* before the catalog deadline. Mr. Grossman inquired if the policy change could be made retroactive. Mr. Downing envisaged a flood of petitions to committees on instruction requesting permission to take a course for the fourth time in order to expunge the devastating effect of three failed efforts. He reported that committees examining this issue had given considerable thought to retroactivity and had concluded that it would be impossible to track down all cases and reconsider all effects--both direct and indirect. Since all other policies have enactment dates, this one does. Mr. Dahlgren saw retroactivity built into the motion, at least to the extent that students who now repeat courses can rescue their grade point averages.

When Ms. Braun asked whether students knew they would get several 0.0's built into their records, Mr. Downing responded that they could learn this dismal news from the *Schedule of Classes*. Mr. Bartalucci offered to read the pertinent passage, but people seemed content to know it was there. Mr. Downing then concluded discussion by calling attention to the advantages of the revised policy from the advising standpoint. Currently, advisers must often prudently dissuade students from trying a course again if there is any chance that they might devastate their academic records through another failure.

Perhaps, Ms. Braun suggested, sentiment might exist to waive a second reading. Her colleagues responded enthusiastically, and a procedural motion to do just that (Moved, Ms. Braun; seconded, Mr. Hough) passed with unanimous approval. So did the actual motion, which becomes academic policy.

Mr. Kleckner then asked the Senate to function as a committee of the whole by advising him on a "draft, draft, draft" policy statement on the rank of Distinguished Professor. he was not asking for immediate Senate action but only for wise counsel. Should grave concerns about the draft statement emerge in this discussion, he promised that a committee of faculty members and deans would get busy resolving the problem.

The first concern emerged from Mr. Horwitz, who worried about the effect of the proposed criteria, as currently worded, on recruitment in professional fields such as business. On the surface, he regarded the document before the Senate as a helpful one, likely to facilitate negotiations with eminent persons we might wish to attract here--persons like Virgil Thomson or Governor Williams. On the other hand, language descriptive of academic, artistic, and civic distinction could present obstacles to hiring

prominent business leaders. He would like to see achievement recognized other than as a performer. What, he wondered, would happen should Mr. Hewlett or Mr. Packard consider coming here upon retirement from business? Mr. Kleckner suggested that the language under Public Service might be extended to embrace "professional or public service." This struck Mr. Horwitz as inadequate. Ms. Braun supposed the dean might want to include "financial success." Not necessarily, according to Mr. Horwitz. He simply wanted to recognize prominence in all fields covered within this institution. Ms. Braun judged that some people, however successful, would not fit here and properly should not. Mr. Barthel inquired whether 'financial' were the apt word. Ms. Braun offered 'pecuniary' as an alternative. How about 'business leadership,' inquired Mr. Barthel? Mr. Copenhaver suggested it might help Mr. Horwitz's point to include words like 'civic' or 'corporate' within the text. That gentleman, pondering, sensed differences even among senators about terms of distinction. Mr. Kleckner assured him, however, that the intent of those who drafted this document was to admit distinction in every area of this institution, 'even the business school." Mr. Hough noted that the penultimate clause of the criteria text, now ending with 'into external agencies and committees," could easily be expanded with reference to corporations.

Another question came from Ms. Braun, who inquired whether these would be indefinite appointments. Mr. Kleckner recalled a statement in the Faculty Agreement saying that a person, once awarded this title, bears it thereafter. Both Mr. Gr@smn and Mr. Eberwein found equivalent language in this draft proposal.

Mr. Grossman confessed puzzlement about seemingly contradictory references to salary. What, he wondered, was the operational significance of item 4 on the second page? What was intended by item 6? It was his understanding when the entry regarding this rank was inserted into the contract that it was added specifically to attract scholars qualified for appointment to endowed chairs, not just to attract prominent retirees from beyond academia. Mr. Kleckner responded that the title should be awarded only as merited, not merely to justify a salary beyond the contractual scale. Nonetheless, the policy articulated in this draft should make it possible to add a stipend to what would be an ordinary salary, both for persons elevated from within the university and those attracted from without. Both he and Mr. Grossman hoped that Oakland could discriminate between truly distinguished persons and those who are simply expensive to hire. Mr. Copenhaver noted that, with a faculty of about 450, it would be unlikely that we would have so many as 30 or 40 distinguished professors. His memory was that item 4 served to caution against throwing in extra money just to recruit senior people in costly fields. Mr. Kleckner thanked him, saying he knew we had a good reason to maintain a dean of Arts and Sciences. On this happy note, he promised to move ahead with efforts to define and establish both distinguished and emeritus faculty titles.

With formal business thus concluded and no items proposed for the good of the order, Mr. Kleckner proceeded to the first of two information items. He provided a brief status report on proposals to reinstate baccalaureate programs in Theatre and Dance in the wake of their phase-out several years ago. Revival of these majors would present no ostensible cost issue, since the Department of Music, Theatre, and Dance pledges to operate for the first five years of their renewed existence on current staffing levels, but it does raise a larger question about the university's programmatic decisions at a time when it has insufficient funds to support growth. Despite the times, however, he thought Oakland must find ways to allow for beneficial change. Thus, he is prepared to recommend these programs, like the Physical Therapy proposal now before the Senate, to the president.

Mr. Kleckner's second piece of news was that the architectural firm of William Kessler and Associates had been ratified by the board to design the new science building. Paperwork should be accomplished soon in Lansing to allow work to move ahead. He noted with satisfaction that Mr. Kessler takes a lively interest in this project and has interesting ideas about how to call attention to a building located in an

inherently inconspicuous position behind Dodge Hall. When Mr. Williamson inquired whether the architect had passed physics, Mr. Copenhaver rejoined that it was more important that he had passed good taste. Mr. Kleckner said that a campus committee would soon initiate planning.

Mr. Williamson then took the floor to express concern about the coordination and publicity of campus events. He noted that two departments had each brought in visiting lecturers that noontime, thereby dividing the likely audience. Hating to see good opportunities for enrichment slide by, he hoped a means might be developed of informing students and faculty about what is happening each day. He called attention to Representative Judith Miller's plan to make herself available the next day in the Fireside Lounge and urged Oakland people to talk to her about our concerns. Mr. Kleckner confirmed her planned visit, noting that she is our good friend in the legislature and well informed about our funding problems. Ms. Stamps then inquired about the current status of the secondary education proposal, noting that its fate (and consequently their own) is a matter of interest to the students she represents. Mr. Kleckner reported that the proposal is still in the hands of deans and committees. He doubted it could reach the Senate until the next academic year. With business thus accomplished, he adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane D. Eberwein
Secretary to the University Senate