



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, January 13, 1983  
Fourth Meeting

### *MINUTES*

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

#### SUMMARY OF ACTIONS:

1. Motion to approve the minutes of December 9, 1982. Moved, Mr. Gerulaitis. Seconded, Mr. Ghausi. Approved.
2. Motion to recommend the establishment of a Ph.D. program in Health and Environmental Chemistry. Moved, Mr. Russell. Seconded, Mr. Copenhaver. First reading

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 by Mr. Kleckner. Since Mr. Champagne had another engagement later in the afternoon, the order of the agenda was changed and the meeting began with the President's remarks. Mr. Champagne began with an update of the economic situation facing the University. The governor's decision to defer payments for January and February to an indefinite future date came as a surprise to many. Of the \$135 million deferred, Oakland's share is \$3.5 million or around 17% of our appropriation. This will cost the University lost investment income of approximately \$40,000 provided repayment begins in March. However, while it is difficult for us and for other state universities, Oakland is in better shape than some. The Governor was aware that the universities had cash from recent tuition collections and could bear deferrals better now than later. Mr. Champagne said that the governor's action dramatizes the seriousness of the state's financial position and the need of a tax increase. However, it isn't expected that a tax increase this year will suffice to eliminate further expenditure cuts. Furthermore, no action to increase taxes is expected from the legislature until late spring. The University's cash flow situation is adequate provided repayment begins in the next few months. The University can do some inter-fund borrowing (such as from pension, workmen's compensation, and retirement reserves) during this time. Also, a line of credit has been negotiated with the National Bank of Detroit at a rate slightly lower than the prime so that if the deferral goes on longer, we could obtain cash to continue operations. Mr. Champagne added that while a deferral is better than a cut, the governor left the door open for a cut.

Moving onto more positive developments, Mr. Champagne reminded the senators of the study being undertaken by the fund-raising counsel, Brakeley, John Price Jones, Inc., to assess the University's readiness to engage in a major fund-raising campaign. The preliminary analysis is encouraging and it is hoped that we will be able to mount a campaign in the fall. He reported that the President's Club now has 511 members. Including 200 new memberships added in the last year or so. He sees the success of the membership drive as a positive sign of our efforts to relate the University to the community and to establish ties with business and industry. Mr. Champagne reported further that the University is engaged in a series of discussions concerning the development of a technology park adjacent to the University, adding that there is considerable interest in OU and its environs. Comerica Corporation has acquired 212 acres across Butler Road for an Operations Center employing around 600 individuals, an encouraging sign of interest in this area. Oakland University is also working with a number of other enterprises to attract them to the area. Thus, while funding from Lansing seems uncertain, the development of new university-business relationships is moving along well.

Mr. Champagne then commented briefly on the collective bargaining situation. He stated that the University is not insensitive to the requests of the union but that it must deal sensibly with the difficult economic situation in which it finds itself. It is difficult for him to have it felt that the administration is not sensitive to the needs of the faculty, adding that all academic administrators have come from the faculty ranks and will likely return someday. He stated that it is not a difference of philosophy but rather a difference in opinion as to what the economy will do and how quickly recovery will occur. He added that while the administration is in deep sympathy with faculty and very much aware of the problems of work load, faculty salaries, fringe benefits and the like, the challenge is to find solutions that will provide a good place for faculty to work, yet maintain the institution's viability.

Following the President's remarks, Mr. Kleckner reiterated the interest that is evident in the development of a technology park, emphasizing that it is a major feather in the University's cap. He sees it as a way of providing equipment, laboratory facilities, and research opportunities for faculty and students through cooperative efforts between the university and private business without having to rely entirely on general-fund revenues.

Mr. Kleckner then called for consideration of the minutes of December 9, 1982 which were approved as distributed upon the motion of Mr. Gerulaitis, seconded by Mr. Ghausi.

Attention turned directly to the only item of old business, a motion from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee to recommend the establishment of a PhD program in Health and Environmental Chemistry (Moved, Mr. Russell; Seconded, Mr. Copenhaver)

**MOVED** that the University Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees the establishment of a Ph.D. program in Health and Environmental Chemistry as specified in "A Proposal for a Program Leading to a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Health and Environmental Chemistry," with implementation being contingent upon the availability of adequate resources.

Mr. Copenhaver initiated the discussion by emphasizing his firm and enthusiastic support for the proposal. Mr. Sevilla provided some background information concerning the history of Ph.D. program proposals in science at Oakland, adding that this proposal is one of several that were presented to the legislature in 1980 and that were given the go-ahead. Noting that the

proposal has been reviewed by a number of university committees, Mr. Miller asked what those committees considered as they looked at the program. Speaking as the chair of the APPC, Mr. Russell stated that they looked at the impact the program would have on other university programs and how it would fit in with the role and mission of the university. They also determined that it did not duplicate other efforts in the state, that resources were available now, and that it was likely that external funding could be relied upon for future development of the program.

Ms. Tripp expressed concern about the financing of the program and asked why, on replacement page #26, the category "grant recovery" was changed from \$44,000 to \$63,000. Mr. Sevilla responded that the original figures were too conservative and that even the revised estimates are considered to be low. He added that Chemistry already receives \$250,000-\$300,000 per year in research grants and that some of the grants now held by the department could be used in this new program to help support student research. Mr. Copenhaver commented that, for as long as the university has been keeping records, the College of Art & Sciences has been responsible for 72% of the external research grants to the university and of that 72%, the majority has gone to the departments of Chemistry and Biology. He noted that both departments accomplish this without the advantage given to them by having a Ph.D. program. Mr. Russell added that a research grant request had recently been submitted to the Department of Defense, an organization that grants around 10 million dollars a year to universities. One of the DOD's criteria in awarding grants is that of training graduate students and it would have helped if this program had been in place.

Mr. Grossman questioned why the cost of the jr. faculty salary did not increase. Mr. Sevilla responded that the figure reflected the anticipated cost of a junior faculty member's salary, adding that the instructions said to exclude inflation factors. Ms. Kurzman asked whether money is available for supplies and services and staff to support these courses assuming a fall starting date. Mr. Sevilla responded that they estimated the amount of supplies and services needed to support two students to be \$4000 for the first year. Whether the money is available depends on who the students are working for and what grants are available but that the department anticipate no problems. He added that the number of students admitted to the program in the future will depend on how well we do the job, on the economy and on grant support. The eventual costs of the program may vary because of these uncertainties.

Ms. Kurzman then asked for reactions to Mr. Feeman's proposed name change. Mr. Sevilla responded that there doesn't seem to be much difference in the two names and that while the department doesn't think its worth changing, there would be no strong objections to a modification. Mr. Copenhaver found the two names basically the same but expressed a preference for the original.

Mr. Dawson commented that, having taken part in the review of a number of academic programs in the past year, he could think of no one more deserving than Chemistry. He then asked the Dean of the Graduate School to comment on what he meant by "the adequacy of resources." Mr. Feeman responded that he had used the word "adequate" because that is exactly what he meant, that we don't have excessive resources available at this time. Given the available resources and the uncertain future there are some anxieties about beginning this program. He added however, that Chemistry has a good history of program planning and implementation and a good history of achieving grants; also that the department has managed its resources extremely well and has established a strong managerial style over a long period of

time. He stated that the program is a good one, it is needed, the resources are here to begin it and that he has no doubts that the program will be a strong one. With regard to the name, Mr. Feeman said that he found the use of the word "Health" in the title to be misleading since the program is basically chemistry; also that using that word might interfere or cause confusion with future program developments. He stated that while he doesn't feel that strongly about the alternative title he proposed, he does think that the title should be changed to more clearly reflect what the program is. Ms. Kurzman suggested that perhaps we could switch the arrangement of the words in the title to read "Environmental and Health Chemistry", adding that it is clear that Health is an important component and should not be taken out completely.

Mr. Ketchum noted that the dates of the reviewers' letters indicated that they were written some time ago and asked whether the department had any updated information, specifically, whether there is still a demand for such a program. Mr. Sevilla replied that while it is true that the federal government is cutting back, there are still opportunities available in private industry. Mr. Russell added that individuals with degrees in environmental and health chemistry are qualified for jobs in a variety of areas and that placement should not be a problem. Ms. Tripp asked whether there would be students interested in such a program. Mr. Sevilla responded that they anticipate no problems in recruiting graduate students and that the problem will probably be one of having more students apply than can be accepted. Mr. Copenhaver noted that one of the good things about this program is that, based on our available resources, it can be supported at this level. Mr. Tepley commented that he hated to see the afternoon end without connecting this discussion with the President's remarks concerning the proposed technology park, noting that the program is the sort of one that will lend itself well to the development of business and university cooperative efforts.

There being no further discussion of the motion, no new business, and no private resolutions, Mr. Kleckner then presented several information items. The University is to be visited in April by the North Central Association for a focused accreditation review of our Ph.D. programs. The last full . accreditation visit was in 1979 and at that time OU was accredited as a mature institution at the baccalaureate and masters levels, which means among other things, that we can institute new programs at those levels without special North Central review. At the doctoral level, however, we are still required to seek separate North Central review of each new program, with a full review of all doctoral-level programs to occur in 1984. The introduction of the Health and Environmental Chemistry program at this time has prompted Oakland and the North Central Association to agree to combine its review and the previously scheduled 1984 review into a single visit this April. He added that North Central is particularly interested in how the programs are reviewed and monitored. Mr. Kleckner also reminded the Senators of the change in the time module for MWF classes that added a few minutes to some class sessions, a change required by the Veteran's Administration. All faculty have received a memo to this effect and in the future changes will be printed in the Schedule of Classes. There being no further discussion or business the Senate adjourned upon the motion of Mr. Arnold, seconded by Mr. Gerulaitis.

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

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

*Home Page*