



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

April 14, 1983  
Seventh Meeting

### *MINUTES*

Senators Present: Akers, Boulos, Briggs-Bunting, Brown, Chagnon-Royce, Chapman -Moore, Chipman, Christina, dark, Copenhaver, Eklund, Eliezer, Evarts Feeman, Ghausi, Grossman, Hightower, Hildebrand, Ketchum, Kingstrom, Kleckner, McClory, Miller, Moeller, Pak, Russell, Sakai, Scherer, Schochetman, Sevilla Stamps, Strauss, Tepley, Tripp, Witt, Zorn.  
Senators Absent: Appleton, Arnold, Boddy, Champagne, Coppola, David, Dawson, Doherty, Downing, L. Gerulaitis, R. Gerulaitis, Gregory, Horwitz, Howes, Kurzman, Lambric, Lentz, Lindell, Macauley, Mallett, Pine, Schwab, Stanovich, Stokes, Wilson, Workman.

#### SUMMARY OF ACTIONS:

1. Motion to approve the minutes of March 10, 1983. Moved, Ms. Tripp. Seconded, Mr. Eklund. Approved.
2. Motion to approve new credit distributions for physical therapy courses. Moved, Mr. Akers. Seconded, Ms. Boulos. Second reading. Approved.
3. Motion to recommit the proposal to the Physical Therapy faculty for further study. Moved, Mr. Strauss. Seconded, Mr. Christina. Not approved.
4. Motion to recommend the establishment of a Ph.D. program in the Cellular Biology of Aging. Moved, Mr. Russell. Seconded, Mr. Sevilla. First reading.
5. Motion to appoint certain faculty to Senate Standing Committees. Moved, Ms. Chapman-Moore. Seconded, Mr. Christina. Approved.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:15. The minutes of the March 10, 1983 Senate meeting were approved as distributed upon the motion of Ms. Tripp, seconded by Mr. Eklund.

The first item of business was the second reading of the motion to approve new credit distributions for the physical therapy program. Mr. Strauss referred the Senators to his comments at the last Senate meeting. He stated that he is not opposed to the program but is opposed to the high number of credits required, noting that 162 credits are too many and are not consonant with any other undergraduate program on the campus. Mr. Christina noted that his comments at the last Senate meeting had not been recorded. He stated that it is a question of hurting the students in the program and he considers the proposal primarily a financial consideration, a way of increasing the revenues at the expense of students. Mr. Stransky responded, prefacing his comments by noting that he is not a physical therapist but has been Acting Director and thus is familiar with the program. He provided some background information concerning the program. He noted that although there was at one time concern over the quality of students in the program, a recent study indicating that the students are of

very high quality has dispelled that concern. Of the 150 applicants for the 25 positions, the average GPA of those accepted into the program was 3.55 while the students who were not accepted had averages of around 3.2. He stated that it is very difficult for physical therapy faculty to find time to do research. In addition to the time required for the teaching and clinical work, the faculty have other responsibilities. For example, a great deal of time was required recently to interview the applicants in order to select the 25 to be admitted to the program. He further stated that if anyone is disadvantaged it is the faculty. The proposal to increase credits is simply giving credit to the faculty for what they are already doing. Mr. Stransky noted that we must consider the American Physical Therapy Association's requirements along with the University's general education requirements and that our requirements are not that much different from other schools offering physical therapy majors. A list of other universities' requirements is available for anyone who would like to compare the programs. He added that this is not a problem that exists only at Oakland, but that all universities with this major face similar concerns. Mr. Kleckner commented that there is no "profit motive" involved here. Given the fact that we have 5-6 times the number of students wanting to get into the program, if we just wanted to make money, the University could authorize enlarging the class size. It's a question of maintaining the quality of the program and of the University being paid for the education it is providing the students.

Mr. Miller asked how many new faculty positions would be required by increasing the credits. Mr. Kleckner answered none, that this proposal is simply a means of attaching credit to a situation that already exists. Mr. Miller then noted that the proposal will not have any effect on the amount of time the physical therapy faculty have for research activities. Mr. Kleckner responded that in the short term that was true; however, the proposal will generate additional revenue which could in time be reinvested in the program so as to improve the faculty's research opportunities. Mr. Russell spoke in favor of the proposed change. He stated that, since the physical therapy courses are required for professional accreditation, the options are either to allow the professional schools to omit general education requirements or to recognize that including general education will impose a higher-than-average number of credits on the program. He spoke in favor of including general education courses in the program. He provided a possible scenario with regard to student faculty ratios and stated that if the program isn't allowed to generate additional revenue that could be used to fund an extra faculty position, then the University might have to use the position shift mechanism to supply that faculty position, to the detriment of some other department.

Mr. Christina said that the general education component of the program was not in question, but rather certain concerns about professional programs and what the faculty student ratio should be. He didn't think that one faculty position in physical therapy would increase the comfort level all that much. Mr. Pak commented that there are two faculty members now and that the proposal will not help the student/faculty ratio. They have however requested an additional faculty member. Ms. Custer, a physical therapy faculty member, commented that if the proposal is approved it could change the work load and provide for better scheduling. Mr. Hightower spoke in favor of the motion, adding that many schools are offering new, high-credit programs.

Mr. Copenhaver responded to Mr. Strauss' concerns. He stated that it shouldn't come as any surprise that the space requirements for professional programs have changed over time. In the past, medical training required two years of specialized training, now it's twelve or more. We used to consider the undergraduate curriculum as being four years long and around 124 credits

and here we are faced with an anomaly. The concern is the relationship between the program and the students in it and the requirements of the professional program and general education. He stated that while he doesn't much like a program that is well beyond the norm, given the choice between a large undergraduate program with general education or a smaller program done at the cost of general education, he would prefer the larger program. While he shares Mr. Strauss' concerns, he noted that we must also be aware of changes in professional programs and the impact that this will have on undergraduate instruction. Mr. Chipman said that since there are professional programs who do not purport to deliver the basic knowledge in four years, why doesn't physical therapy follow this pattern? Mr. Russell remarked that to some extent that is the situation here, that this is actually a five year program that is packaged into four years by using spring and summer terms. He reiterated his belief that general education must be maintained, even if it requires five years. Also that an administrative realignment, along with possibility of an additional faculty member, should help alleviate some of the concerns about the program. Mr. Akers pointed out that the problem is that physical therapy credits are undervalued and noted that the proposal indicates that physical therapy may require a master's degree in 5-6 years. In the light of this, the motion on the floor can be seen as an interim solution, something that needs to be done if we are to have this program and to maintain its quality. Mr. Kleckner commented that it may be an interim step, but that it's likely to be more than just a few years before the master's degree is required for entry level practitioners.

Mr. Grossman asked what will happen if the Senate does not approve the motion. Mr. Stransky replied that they haven't discussed it and Ms. Custer responded that it was possible that the quality of the coursework would suffer, that the faculty might cut back on the amount of relevant material to be presented when spending six or more hours a week for only two or three hours credit. Mr. Kleckner stated that when the request for the additional faculty member for physical therapy was originally presented to him, he did not feel he could support an extra person. If the proposal to increase the number of credits were approved then there would be extra revenue coming to the University which could be used for an additional faculty position. However, if it is not approved, he would have to give serious consideration to supplying the additional faculty member at the expense of another area. Mr. Russell suggested the possibility of devaluing the general education courses to three credits. Mr. Christina noted that they could devalue other courses as well. Mr. McCrory expressed concern over the fact that it seems that nothing will change except that the students will have to pay more money for their courses. Mr. Kleckner replied that it has been a "good deal" for the students so far and that they have been getting more than they were paying for. Mr. Miller commented that there is an assumption that if this is voted down the program will continue as it is. However, that does not seem to be the case and the possibility exists that the program will suffer. Mr. Stransky stated that he disagreed that one additional faculty member was an insignificant number. Given the heavy demands of the program, faculty burnout is a serious consequence. The University lost every Physical Therapy faculty member last year. Also, the top physical therapy programs have around 9 faculty for every 27 students while Oakland has three. Speaking to the concerns about students, he reminded the Senators that the students were consulted and also pointed out that it is a very competitive program, that there are jobs available for the graduates and that it is very important to maintain a high quality program. Also speaking to the concern about student input, Mr. Russell reported that the APPC had invited students to address this issue. He added that the education Oakland provides is a good investment, that the students are getting 5 years of education for a four-year price and that there are good jobs with very good beginning salaries waiting for the graduates.

Ms. Chapman-Moore asked about the availability of financial aid for students, whether aid is available for students requiring a higher number of credits to graduate. Mr. Kleckner responded yes, that the regulations allow for programs of longer length. Ms. Pillow commented that the students are having difficulty now because the courses are undervalued. Some students aren't eligible for financial aid in spring and summer terms because of the low number of credit hours assigned to the courses even though the amount of time spent in class is much higher. Mr. Christina commented that if there is a problem with spring/summer perhaps the solution would be to have them take their general education courses during that period.

Mr. Chipman asked why physical therapy wasn't a five-year master's degree program. Mr. Stansky replied that an M.S. program is more than just numbers of credits, that it involves advanced-level courses. He further noted that it is difficult to find qualified faculty to teach physical therapy at the undergraduate level since not many physical therapists have doctorates and the problem would be compounded at the master's level. He supported Mr. Russell's comments about the marketability of the students in the program, noting that recruiters are offering beginning salaries in the \$35,000 range. Mr. Strauss then

**MOVED** that the Senate approve in principle the offering of an undergraduate degree in physical therapy and that the proposal to increase the credit requirements be returned to the physical therapy faculty for further study, taking into consideration the concerns expressed by the Senate, and that a proposal be resubmitted to the Senate in the fall.

Mr. Christina seconded the motion. Mr. Kleckner responded in the negative to Mr. Miller's question as to whether the additional faculty member for the program could be in place by fall. Mr. Ketchum asked if there was something other than the tuition that is at stake. Mr. Pak stated that an additional faculty position had been requested and Mr. Kleckner added that he will be considering this request in the fall. Mr. Hightower queried the Senate as to what changes it would like to see in the proposal if it were to be sent back. He also asked what would happen to the accreditation of the program. Mr. Stransky replied that they don't know how the accrediting body would respond but that the course credit assignments were an area of concern during the last review by the accrediting agency. Responding to Mr. Hightower's question, Mr. Christina set forth some suggestions for the authors of the proposal, for example, they could consider hiring additional administrative staff to relieve the faculty of some of that burden, they could decrease the number of credits being requested, or they could increase the general education requirements. Given the possibility that the proposal might be voted down, Mr. Russell asked whether the Provost could not recommend the increased number of credits to the Board of Trustees and the President over the wishes of the Senate. Mr. Kleckner answered yes, it was a possibility. Replying to Mr. McCrory's query about the reason for the proposal, Mr. Stransky stated that the main concern was the faculty work load. Mr. Sevilla asked if it was true that if the proposal were to be approved, an additional faculty member was probable, if not, less probable and possibly damaging to the program. Mr. Kleckner said that the University's options would be greater if the proposal is approved.

Mr. Strauss stated that the spirit of his motion was not to damage the program. The intent of the motion was to ensure that the proposal is carefully thought out with more consultation taking place with other areas. Mr. Pak spoke in defense of the proposal, stating that a great deal of time was spent in discussion and that the implications were carefully considered and

weighed. He said that some of the specifics mentioned by Mr. Christina don't need further discussion. For example, if the money were available they would certainly hire additional staff but the dollars simply aren't forthcoming. Mr. Miller spoke against the alternative motion, suggesting that perhaps the reason behind the motion is a sense that there should be an upper limit on degree credits. He added that if the general education requirements are changed, other programs may be facing a similar situation. Considering the possibility that the general education requirements could be raised, Ms. Chapman-Moore asked whether this program would then find itself in a similar situation of having to come back to the Senate to request an increase in credits required for graduation. Mr. Griggs remarked that the physical therapy program would have to abide with whatever general education revisions are forthcoming, however, since we don't know what those revisions will be, there's no sense in trying to second guess what may or may not happen. Mr. Akers called the question on the substitute motion which the Senate then proceeded to defeat. The main motion was then voted upon and approved.

Turning its attention to the first item of new business the Senate considered a motion to recommend the establishment of a Ph.D. program in the Cellular Biology of Aging.

**MOVED** that the University Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees the establishment of a program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy in the Cellular Biology of Aging as specified in a "Proposal for a Program Leading to a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in the Cellular Biology of Aging," with implementation being contingent upon the availability of adequate resources. (Moved Mr. Russell; Seconded, Mr. Sevilla.)

Mr. Akers remarked that he has served on a number of committees considering new programs and has lacked a sense of where the university is going with these programs and where they fit in the overall picture of the university. Mr. Kleckner replied that this is one of a triumvirate of doctoral programs in the biomedical sciences. Two of the programs, Medical Physics and Health and Environmental Chemistry, have already been approved and this proposal is the third. He added that he knows of no additional doctoral programs in the works although there is some preliminary discussion underway concerning the possibility of a Ph.D. in Administration. Ms. Tripp called attention to the phrase "contingent upon the availability of adequate resources" and asked what that meant. Mr. Kleckner referred the Senators to p.19 of the proposal. He stated that if the motion is approved the department will be asked which of the resources listed are already available and which are yet needed. Once final dollar figures are presented to him as to what is needed he would determine if the money is available. If so, the program could begin, if not, it couldn't. Responding to Ms. Tripp's query about grant recovery, Mr. Kleckner stated that while grant recovery is an item that can't be guaranteed, the Biology Department has an excellent track record in this area. Mr. Miller raised two questions: at what point would the training grants mentioned on p. 11 be requested; also the summary indicates a need for additional space?how much and at what cost? Mr. Unakar remarked that the proposal must be approved before grants can be requested and that in the initial years of the program the lack of space should not be a major problem. Mr. Copenhaver commented that Biology has been very cramped for space for some time now. However, this problem is being addressed by moving the Psychology Department to Pryale thus freeing up some additional space for Biology. He added that Biology's record as a garnerer of grants is second to none and should give us every confidence in their ability to continue.

Mr. Hightower asked if there is a mechanism in the program whereby graduate students could pursue research outside of the area, that is collaborate with other departments. Mr. Unakar replied yes, that in fact the program has three faculty from other departments, two' from Chemistry and one from Psychology and that it would draw on the expertise in the University community as needed. Mr. Hightower said that as long as the collaboration was in the College of Arts and Sciences there would be no problem but wondered about the Institute for Biological Sciences. Mr. Kleckner stated that he wasn't sure who would be in the position to answer that question. Mr. Eliezer noted that NIH grants are usually awarded based on past results and we would probably need time for the program to establish itself before grants could be assumed. He added that although the three Ph.D. programs in the triumvirate are departmental ones, they are all interdisciplinary in nature. Mr. Unakar pointed out that the department would be utilizing research grants along with the training grants, adding that NIH will allow funds for doctoral students but not master's level students. Mr. Stamps asked how many graduate students are currently being supported. Mr. Unakar said that it varies from year to year. There are currently around 16-20 in the master's program and they anticipate having 2 doctoral students admitted per year, or a steady state Ph.D. enrollment of 8. Responding to Mr. Stamps' question about the success rate of the first two programs, Mr. Kleckner pointed out that neither has been implemented yet. Mr. Stamps asked if the faculty wanted the program to go forth and Mr. Unakar replied that it would not be at this stage if there were no support. Mr. Butterworth added that in the faculty vote on the program it was 15 for, 2 against. Ms. Boulos then moved to have the motion moved directly to second reading; there was no second and the motion died.

Mr. Stamps asked whether the source of support for the faculty position listed on p. 19 would be grant-funded or a regular full-time position. Mr. Unakar stated that the faculty would bring in grant support and would also be teaching in the undergraduate and master's level programs. Mr. Miller suggested that perhaps the question was whether this position would be a regular faculty position or one totally dependent on grant support. Mr. Christina stated that he assumed that this program will cause some position shifting. Having at this point no further concerns or comments concerning the motion the Senate then turned its attention to the next item of business, the approval of Committee assignments.

Ms. Chapman-Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Christina, that the list of faculty members nominated for Senate Standing Committees for 1983/84 be approved. (The list was distributed as part of the April 14, 1983 agenda.) Mr. Kleckner remarked that since the General Education Committee has only been in place for half a year, the Steering Committee was not presenting any names or proposing any changes at this time. Several corrections were made to the rosters of continuing members: Tung Weng, not James Ozinga, is on the APPC, Shirley Laffrey is not on the Research Committee. The motion to appoint members to committees was then approved.

Having dispensed with all of its business the Senate then turned its attention to information items. Mr. Kleckner reported on North Central's visit, commenting that their summary was generally positive and that he has no doubt that they will recommend continuing accreditation at its current level. He is hopeful that they will classify Oakland University as a mature institution which means that, rather than North Central reviewing every new program as it is developed, the University would be able to begin new programs without North Central's approval and that all future reviews would be on a periodic basis. The North Central team pointed out that we sell ourselves short, that we are good; also that there are some areas needing improvement, additional space, additional support for the library, none of which comes as any surprise to us. The accrediting team will send its draft report to the President and

we will be able to respond to any errors in it. Their final report is due May 13. Mr. Kleckner extended his thanks and appreciation to Mr. Feeman, Mr. Freeman and the members of the Graduate Council for their time and efforts in preparation for this visit. He mentioned that some of the information prepared for this visit might be of interest to the Senate, calling attention to the summary sheet included with the agenda and the other documents listed on p. 5 of the agenda.

The Senate was reminded that there will be another meeting on Tuesday, April 26, 1983 in room 156 North Foundation Hall.

Mr. Grossman asked what happened to the grade revision proposals. Mr. Kleckner replied that the Steering Committee had received a proposal from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and a memo from the APPC suggesting a number of changes to be made in UCUI's proposal. Rather than bringing the issue before the Senate at this late date in the semester, the Steering Committee sent the documents back to UCUI and the APPC, instructing them to get together and come forth with a unified set of proposals to be presented to the Senate at the first meeting in the fall.

Noting the absence of presidential remarks, Mr. Kleckner reported that Mr. Champagne was at home, helping to care for their new baby, Joanna. He added a few comments concerning the fiscal situation. The recently passed state tax increase should bring an end to payment deferrals and replenish the University's coffers. In fact, the first payment is due soon and by the end of the fiscal year, we should have 85% of our funds restored. The budget for the coming year looks like it will include a modest increase over last year's base. There are signs that there will be some stability, that the University will be allowed to keep what is allocated and that there will be modest increases in funding. He noted that the state's priorities for increased expenditures are jobs, corrections and education, in that order. Mr. Russell asked about the \$789,000 cut in education. Mr. Kleckner replied that it will be cut in September and that 60% of it should be restored in the course of the following 12 months. Mr. Chipman asked if there were any information on the MacNamee commission concerning the duplication of efforts in higher education. Mr. Kleckner answered that the MacNamee amendment would set up a commission to study coordination, that it was an alternative to more stringent moves to coordinate higher education offerings in the state. He added that it is possible that all efforts to establish a coordinating agency will die in this legislature.

There being no further business, the Senate adjourned at 4:45, moved, Mr. Miller, seconded Ms. Briggs-Bunting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Linda L. Hildebrand  
Secretary to the University Senate

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

*Home Page*