

Oakland University Senate

15 February 2007
Minutes

Members present: Andersen, Berven (D), Cardiff, Clark, Deng, Dillon, Eberwein, Fink, Frick, Goldberg, Goslin, Grossman, Hamilton, Haskell, Hightower, Ingram, Khattree, Klemanski, Latcha, Lee, LeMarbe, Lepkowski, MacDonald, Magnan, Mili, Miller, Mittelstaedt, Moudgil, Murphy, O'Mahony, Otto, Reger, Russell, Sevilla, Shablin, Silberman, Stamps, Stein, Sudol, Townsend, Tracey, Wendell, Williams, Zhu

Members absent: Berven (K), Downing, Eberly, Eis, Giblin, Graves, Polis, Schweitzer, Thompson, Twardy, Voelck, Wood

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Items:

Change of Program Titles – Mr. Moudgil

--Education Specialist in Administration changed to Education Specialist in Leadership

--B.S. in Systems Engineering changed to B.S. in Engineering with a major in Industrial Systems Engineering

Institutional Partnerships – Mr. Moudgil

2. Approval of Minutes of 18 January (Mr. Frick, Ms. Mittelstaedt)

3. Motion to approve program in International Relations (Ms. Mittelstaedt, Mr. Lepkowski). Second reading. Approved.

4. Motion to approve Bachelor of Social Work program (Ms. Stein, Mr. Stamps). First reading.

Mr. Moudgil called the meeting to order shortly after 3:10 with the informational items on the agenda. He noted the following approved changes in program titles: Education Specialist in Administration has been changed to Education Specialist in Leadership; Bachelor of Science in Systems Engineering changed to a Bachelor of Science in Engineering with a major in Industrial Systems Engineering. Next, Mr. Moudgil informed senators about the possibility of a potential partnership with MSU in medical education, and gave a brief history of the development of biomedical sciences and related areas at the university. He noted the strength of biomedical education and highlighted some of the nationally known achievements of our faculty in research. In the 1980s, a major area hospital offered to help create a medical education program at OU. Moon J. Pak, Ph.D., M.D., spearheaded that effort, but ultimately, OU missed the opportunity to realize the program. A few years ago, the CEOs and administrators of area hospitals visited OU several times and encouraged the idea of medical education at the university. More recently, leaders in the osteopathic community initiated discussions with area institutions, including OU and MSU. MSU's response was to propose a satellite program in southeast Michigan, and OU investigated the possibility. Mr. Moudgil explained that in January 2006 he met with a group of OU chairs and faculty who engage in biomedical research, along with the Deans of Nursing and Health Sciences. All were positive and expressed excitement about the possibility of medical education. Seventeen institutions applied for consideration by MSU for expansion at their locations. President Simon and Provost Wilcox from MSU visited OU to tour the facilities. Four locations were narrowed down – Macomb, DMC, OU, and St. Johns System. MSU has indicated that a decision is forthcoming on February 23. At this time, there is nothing concrete between MSU and OU – no memorandum of understanding, no agreement, no budget. Thus, without concrete issues to examine there has not been a need for this matter to be brought to the Senate. Should anything of that nature materialize, Mr. Moudgil remarked that he would immediately inform the Senate and the university community. He then solicited questions. Mr. Slavin

remarked that in his estimation it would not be advantageous for OU to align itself with a MSU-based osteopathic association. In his opinion, OU is strong enough to pursue its own school in allopathic medicine. Mr. Dvir echoed the sentiments about OU's readiness to move to the next level, which could include many potential scenarios. Noting the exploratory nature of the subject at the present time, he expressed excitement about future possibilities. Mr. Russell then pointed out that the current political and economic situation in the state makes the likelihood of an independently developed medical school nearly non-existent. He added that the possibilities afforded OU through a liaison or collaboration with another institution was far more practical and thanked Mr. Moudgil for considering those implications and sharing them with the Senate.

Ms. Eberwein noted that from an arts and letters perspective, it is not at all clear why a osteopathic partnership situation would be preferable. In keeping the overall image and mission of the institution in mind, she remarked that an allopathic direction would be a far better option. Mr. Moudgil thanked Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Slavin, and Mr. Dvir for their comments and support, and then explained that the process of establishing an allopathic school can take up to 8 years for approval and that an association with another institution, at least in the initial stages, would be more practical and feasible in terms of resources.

The secretary proceeded with the roll call, after which the [minutes](#) of January 18 were approved (moved by Mr. Frick, seconded by Ms. Mittelstaedt).

Moving next to **Old Business** and the second reading of a new program in [International Relations](#), Ms. Mittelstaedt read the motion (seconded by Mr. Lepkowski):

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a program leading the Bachelor of Arts degree with a liberal arts major in International Relations.

Mr. Lepkowski initiated discussion by raising the issue of the IR faculty's response to the absence of a budget to acquire PAIS reference materials. According to Mr. Lepkowski this is an essential database, containing information that cannot be accessed elsewhere. Moreover, every school, except one, that was benchmarked in the proposal has this resource. Mr. Lepkowski urged reconsideration of this issue before on the program. Mr. Moudgil inquired about the cost of the database, and Mr. Lepkowski gave him a figure of \$5500. Mr. Moudgil offered to take care of the cost so that students were provided with the appropriate library resources for the program. Mr. Stamps then added his strong support of the program and its current relevance for students. Mr. Goslin inquired about the budget issues in regard to the program, to which Mr. Klemanski explained that the budget questions were answered (including the SS budget, a clarified *pro forma*,) and conveyed to the SBRC. Mr. Hightower voiced his support of the proposal moving forward. The Senate then voted unanimously to approve the new program.

The item of **New Business** was then addressed: a motion to approve a new Bachelor of [Social Work](#) program, moved by Ms. Stein and seconded by Mr. Stamps.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a program leading to a Bachelor of Social Work degree.

Ms. Mosby was invited to make a brief overview of the program. She pointed out the numbers of students involved in the social work concentration who move on to graduate programs. She noted that students not pursuing a graduate degree end up licensed as social service technicians, with low salaries and little chance for advancement. According to Department of Labor statistics, the

country is facing a shortage of social workers. A BSW at Oakland would provide the only such program in Oakland and Macomb counties. Ms. Mosby also observed that community linkages are already very strong, and that students could take advantage of excellent internship opportunities. Mr. Shepherd then recognized Dr. Karen Newman, who assisted in preparing the proposal.

Mr. Goldberg asked about the timing of accreditation; Ms. Mosby indicated that the application process has started and that a site visit would probably take place in the fall, with a total time of about two to three years before approval. Mr. Goslin wanted clarification about whether this program would be linked to the program at Michigan State. Mr. Shepherd remarked that there is no connection between the two programs, but that OU students would be eligible for advanced standing in a MSW program at MSU or any other program in the country. Mr. Moudgil reiterated that the agreement with MSU would begin only when it is financially feasible, which has not yet been determined. With no further questions, Mr. Moudgil thanked Ms. Mosby for her presentation and reminded senators that this was the first reading of the proposal.

Good and Welfare

Mr. Russell read the following statement:

For several years I have been very uncomfortable with the operation of the Senate. This level of discomfort has increased each year since the year the faculty first voted for a Faculty Senate and then voted against a Faculty Senate. Kevin Andrews and I were the primary sponsors of the move for a Faculty Senate to better fulfill the faculty's role in shared governance. After that vote Kevin walked away from the Senate and faculty governance. I never gave up on the Senate although as events have unfolded since the faculty voted for and then against a Faculty Senate I find it is more and more difficult to avoid Kevin's pessimism about the academic principles of our faculty. Kevin may simply be much smarter than I am and at first glance recognized a windmill.

For those Senators and guests who have not spent their academic careers as I have carrying a copy of the Red Book as Senator Byrd carries a copy of the Constitution (he literally and me figuratively), let me give a short summary of the AAUP model of collective bargaining and faculty governance. The AAUP views these two aspects of faculty life as separate, complementary, and synergistic. The union bargains wages, benefits, and working conditions; establishes procedures to ensure fair and equitable treatment of faculty; and provides the enforcement mechanism for faculty governance instruments. Shared governance has three branches - faculty, administrations, and governing boards. Each of these three groups is involved in all aspects of governance and each has specific areas in which it has the primary role. Governing boards have preeminence in hiring, reviewing, reappointing, and terminating a president; setting the overall goal and mission of the institution; and ensuring the institution's fiscal integrity. Administrations have primary responsibility for budgets including resource acquisition and allocation, the physical plant, public safety, and oversight of faculty hiring, reappointment, and promotion. Faculty have preeminence in faculty hiring, reappointment, and promotion; curriculum; degree requirements; and academic programs. These faculty roles are usually established under the structure of a faculty senate and its standing committees; college/school assemblies, executive committees, and committees on instruction; and departmental bodies.

I believe the AAUP has fulfilled its responsibilities in the collective bargaining area. However, I feel the Senate is not fulfilling its responsibilities in the shared governance area. It is not fulfilling its duties both in its primary areas noted above and in its secondary advisory roles to the administration and governing board. As the influence of the Senate has eroded over the years many more items of significant academic consequences moved to the informational section of senate agendas rather than the action section. We have experienced use of special administrative appointed task forces rather than Senate standing committees to deal with topics within the charges of those committees. We have accepted a code of silence to listen and not question and debate as we attend meetings with agendas the Steering Committee searches to fill to avoid canceling more meetings. Any discussions we do have are dominated by senators explaining or defending narrow areas of academic turf rather than addressing the broad issues of the academy and our university. Look at the results of our one effort at tackling a global issue in recent years – general education. All our efforts merely added an assessment component to the old model. The Senate failed totally to resolve the academic calendar issue such that the AAUP had to bargain a solution. We have used Senate

committees more for vita padding for faculty reviews than substantive governance investigations. One of the most important governance committees with respect to academic standards, although not a Senate committee, the FRPC, has had a very difficult time in getting full professors to agree to serve. This committee is now most useful for those wishing a leg up in a subsequent review for professor rank.

I have not been nearly as forceful as I should have been in recent years in the Senate in pointing out these problems and have thus been a participant in the Senate's decay. The message we each received last week from our parliamentarian and primary defender of the faith, Jerry Grossman, jolted me out of my stupor. I am concerned for the issue Jerry raised but my greatest reaction was to see evidence that my views of an operational faculty senate had actually existed at Oakland and was not a failing memory. The stakes were much higher in the Medical School I debate when the result would have been the Oakland University Medical School rather than the MSU-O or MSU-MCC-O Medical School. The minutes of the two April 1980 Senate meetings show a level of debate that should shame current senators. If you have not yet read them I urge you to do so. For the medical school discussion, 17 separate senators participated to the extent of being named in the April 10, 1980 minutes and 13 in the April 17, 1980 minutes. You will also note that the faculty (and deans) were quite able to conduct this discussion. The president and provost only needed to make short statements concerning the proposed administrative organization, finances, and governance structure. How long has it been since we have heard a president state what George Matthews did on April 17, 1980.

President Matthews assured the Senate that, although its actions are not legally binding on the Board, they are morally and politically forceful.

In addition to demanding a full review of any proposal for association of Oakland University with any medical school (through the Senate's standing committees and special committees the Steering Committee or Senate deems necessary), there are other issues of significant academic importance that the Senate should consider. Does the faculty and thus Senate have no concerns about the operational priorities of the university and how these are established? Operational priorities are those that reflect actual actions. These priorities must be deduced by observation since they often differ from what appears on paper. My observations lead me to conclude the operational priorities of the university today are, in decreasing order:

1. Growth in student enrollment.
2. Establishment of Division I athletics
3. Growth in physical facilities
4. Addition of academic programs particularly at the doctoral level
5. Growth in number of faculty

I could comment at length on each of these priorities and question if these are the priorities the faculty would support. Let me make only a few limited comments now. The number one enrollment growth priority has resulted in those responsible for admissions to use this priority to establish our admission's standards and, over the objection of the academic advisors, to allow admission until the last day for adding classes each term. A former Wilson Hall administrator told me that universities can gain recognition in three ways – hire outstanding faculty, recruit outstanding students, or emphasize Division I NCAA athletics. He told me Oakland had adopted the quickest and cheapest of these three – the athletic route. My recommendation to the search committee in the recent CAS dean search was to support the candidate who best understood what was needed to begin addressing the other two tactics for public recognition. Under Provost Moudgil we have seen a commitment to add new full-time faculty positions to help us begin to catch up with our enrollment and move this priority to a higher position. The Senate must support the Provost in every possible way to enable him to make further progress.

Perhaps the time has again come to see if a Faculty Senate would help us better fulfill the faculty responsibilities in shared governance. I would be willing to help investigate if this is the appropriate solution to the problems of the Senate or if there are other ways to cause the faculty to become active participants. The AAUP model demands open communication and mutual respect between all three branches of shared governance. A direct communications link between faculty and our Board of Trustees would likely place the Provost in an untenable position with the current Senate arrangement. If any of you or any of your colleagues is interested in exploring a Faculty Senate, I urge you to contact me.

Mr. Sevilla commented that the Senate is not speaking in a robust way, to which Mr. Russell added that communication is lacking between the faculty and the Board. He noted that Provost Moudgil has done an excellent job in fostering communication between the faculty and the administration, but that the faculty link to the Board is non-existent. Mr. Hightower remarked

that the decline in engagement with the Senate is not a product of any structural flaw with the Senate itself, but rather with individuals increasingly involved in their own agendas, with greater demands of time for teaching, research, and other endeavors. Ms. Otto added that debate is generally lacking among Senators themselves, and that a key result of not talking is not being heard by administrators. Mr. Moudgil then wondered why a wedge between faculty and administration should exist and that an adversarial relationship is extremely detrimental to faculty, students, and administration alike. He noted that his office is always open, and that dialogue is always welcome. Working together is the only way to achieve success, he asserted, and added his conviction that administration exists to serve faculty and students.

Mr. Russell identified the major roadblock as the lack of communication with the Board of Trustees, and that in the current structure all matters for the BOT need to go through the General Counsel's office. Mr. Stamps then asked Mr. Moudgil to remind Senators of the process of getting an item on the Senate agenda; Mr. Moudgil replied that contact with any member of the Steering Committee is the appropriate channel. Ms. Eberwein suggested that the Senate move out of the Elliott Hall auditorium, a space she described as designed to shore up authority, so that Senators can converse more comfortably and look at each other. She also supported Mr. Hightower's statement about Senators taking their responsibilities more seriously. Mr. Magnan then spoke about the Senate being a "rubber stamp" group and challenged his colleagues with a call to involvement. He recounted that when he became a member of the Senate he expected vigorous debate and interaction with colleagues from across campus. Mr. Dillon suggested that the Senate move back into the Oakland Center and that a social period before the meeting could foster more involvement. He also looked to the Steering Committee to be more aggressive and "activist" in identifying issues and making sure that issues are debated. With no more discussion, Mr. Moudgil thanked the senators for a good discussion. Mr. Latcha moved to adjourn and the meeting concluded at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi
Secretary to the University Senate