



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Seventh Meeting  
Thursday, April 9, 1981

### *MINUTES*

Senators Present: Arnold, Beardman, Bertocci, Bieryla, Boulos, Brown, Cameron, Champagne, Chipman, Christina, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Edgerton, Evarts, Frampton, Fullmer, Garcia, L. Gerulaitis, R. Gerulaitis, Ghausi, Grossman, Hetenyi, Heubel, Hitchingham, Horwitz, Johnson, Karasch, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lentz, Liboff, Matthews, Moeller, Otto, Ozinga, Rhadigan, Reischl, Schwartz, Somerville, Stevens, Strauss, Tower, Wilson  
Senators Absent: Butterworth, Feeman, Gardiner, Hammerle, Jaymes, Jones, Kingstrom, McMahan, Miller, Mittra, Mourant, Obear, Pak, Pettengill, Pierson, Pine, Riley, Scherer, Schmidt, Shepherd

Mr. Matthews called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m., explaining his unexpected resumption of the Chair as a courtesy to President Champagne who was busily at work reviewing the budget. Mr. Champagne came to the rescue at 3:30 p.m., resuming his duties as presiding officer for the remainder of the meeting.

Upon motion of Mr. Arnold, seconded by Mr. Hetenyi, the Senate approved the minutes of its March 12 meeting without public reading, correction, dissent.

Having dispatched all old business at previous meetings, the Senate proceeded to a full agenda of new business. Mr. Christina, seconded by Mr. Ozinga, presented a resolution from the Library Council:

**RESOLVED** that the University Senate urges the President, during this period in which the University's financial priorities are being reassessed, to ensure that sufficient funding will be provided to maintain an adequate level of acquisitions of materials by Kresge Library in future years.

He noted patterns of continuously decreased library funding over the years and of last-minute rescues by the Provost's Office and other sources of funds; he explained the Council's serious concern about the long-term impact of the present freeze on book purchases and the anticipated cutbacks in periodicals. Sensing the general support of the Senate for library needs, Mr. Horwitz and Mr. Gerulaitis offered a procedural motion to waive the usual second reading of this resolution. An overwhelming majority supported the waiver and the main motion passed with unanimous approval.

Attention then turned to a resolution from the Admissions Committee, proposed by Mr. Strauss and seconded by Mr. Arnold:

**RESOLVED** that the Senate requests the President to appoint a University Commission to study the feasibility of a name change for Oakland University and to make a recommendation to the Senate by the Winter of 1982.

Mr. Strauss indicated that his committee had examined the issue of university identification at the request of the Steering Committee but felt that the issues called for a more specialized, better equipped study group; the Admissions Committee therefore proposes a University commission to consider a possible name change.

Mr. Liboff suggested that such a commission should study the desirability of a new name for the University, rather than its feasibility. Mr. Strauss agreed with the stylistic suggestion and discussion focused on desirability of a change. Mr. Liboff saw any such name change as harmful to his department which has built a national reputation for Oakland University. Mr. Beardman supported Mr. Liboff's case against changing the University's name, reasoning that local image problems relate to confusion of programs with Oakland Community College rather than to verbal echoes. He assailed retitling as a Madison Avenue gimmick to rescue a losing operation and maintained that local and national identity must be based on academic excellence.

Mr. Tower approved the Admissions Committee's interest in exploring the University's image but thought that a marketing study by external consultants would be more effective than an internal commission. Both Mr. Horwitz and Mr. Beardman supported an extensive study of University identity, although Mr. Beardman reiterated his belief that a name change would only gloss over more serious problems. Attempting to resolve one problem by glossing over others, Mr. Ozinga advised the administration to find a benefactor willing to underwrite the expenses of a first-rate library and name the institution for this Maecenas.

Mr. Champagne noted that students have expressed concerns about renaming the University and reminded the Senate that many constituencies have an interest in this complex question to which the Senate will return at its April 16 meeting.

The third item of business was a motion from the Graduate Council, moved by Mr. Johnson and seconded by Mr. Ozinga:

**MOVED** that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board establishment of a program in Medical Physics leading to the Ph.D. degree, the start of the program to occur as soon as the program's financial needs can be met.

Mr. Johnson called attention to the various supportive documents attending this proposal. He thought it a meritorious program?well thought-out and carefully worked over. Although the principal problem at this point involves money, he urged the Senate to approve the proposal for a Ph.D. program in Medical Physics on its academic and service merits. Mr. DeMent and Mr. Chipman then distributed the APPC report on their proposal and explained their reasons for support. Mr. DeMent stressed that the full committee approved the program.

Mr. Tepley, representing the Physics Department, discussed the long history of this program's

evolution, noted its interdisciplinary character based on close ties with Chemistry, Biology, and Mathematics faculty, stressed its responsiveness to state and national medical needs as demonstrated by the strong support of distinguished area physicians, and reported that the Physics Department is vigorously involved in external fund-raising efforts.

Mr. Ozinga inquired about problems noted in the APPC report and wondered whether the Senate should authorize this degree program before all legal and academic issues are fully resolved. Mr. Johnson saw no major hurdles, and President Champagne assured the Senate that the University will not proceed before clarifying legal arrangements with the hospitals. Both Mr. DeMent and Mr. Chipman stressed full APPC support for the proposal at this time, indicating that the cautionary notes in their report were intended as advice for the administration more than for the Senate. Authorization, as Mr. Hetenyi noted, precedes implementation but is not identical with it.

Ms. Schwartz directed questions about the budgetary material in the resolution, wondering what money would be required for implementation and where it would be found. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Tepley both stressed that start-up funds would probably come from private foundations and government sources, although the program should become self-supporting if ever the state returns to its official budgeting formula. Funding prospects, already good, would be enhanced by internal program approval. Mr. Beardman applauded the proposal as a well defined program which would do far more to enhance University image and build identity than any name change.

Moving from Medical Physics to more entertaining topics, Mr. Kleckner (seconded by Mr. Stevens) offered a resolution from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee to establish an academic unit in theatre:

**MOVED** that the Senate recommend to the President and to the Board of Trustees the establishment of an academic unit in theatre. The unit shall have the authority to appoint faculty, offer courses, and conduct professional degree programs in theatre.

Mr. DeMent reported that the APPC approved this resolution, expressing doubts only about the propriety of a faculty in the School of Performing Arts offering one of its degree programs entirely in Arts and Sciences. As the College Dean has formulated guidelines for such cases, the APPC feels the establishment of a theatre unit should proceed.

Ms. Gerulaitis questioned whether the term "academic unit" means department. Mr. Hetenyi expected that theatre would eventually develop into a separate department but indicated that it will be allied in one administrative unit with dance for the immediate future. Mr. Heubel pursued the question from a contractual standpoint to discover whether the School of Performing Arts and its two constituent units, the Music and Theatre/Dance departments, would count as three separate academic units. Mr. Hetenyi thought there would be a few school-wide appointments but expected most faculty to be appointed to a specific department. Mr. Ghausi wondered why a departmental structure would be preferable to the area divisions now used in the Schools of Engineering and Human and Educational Services. Mr. Hetenyi responded that problems might arise with subject areas so disparate as the three included in Performing Arts, and Mr. Eberwein observed that Music has a long history of departmental status.

Mr. Stevens traced the lengthy history of plans for a School of Performing Arts and saw this proposal as the culmination of long-term plans for a theatre program at Oakland University. Mr. Beardman expressed his strong support for the proposal but noted a primeval plan for emphasizing all the presentational arts in the academic program, not just performance. He saw this proposal as a positive step toward rectifying the imbalance between the University's academic programs in the arts and its emphasis on the community entertainment resources it provides through the gallery and Meadow Brook events.

Ms. Gerulaitis inquired whether any formal relationship is envisaged between theatre faculty and the Meadow Brook Theatre. Mr. Hetenyi hoped for a gradual bridging of the deep chasm between Varner and Wilson Halls and Mr. Stevens pointed out faculty interchanges which already exist. In response to Mr. Liboff's questions about budget needs and position allocations, Mr. Hetenyi saw no disadvantage to other schools from the reallocation of theatre faculty. He envisaged no new positions beyond those which might be required in the normal course of program expansion.

The fifth item of new business was a motion from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee to authorize a BFA program in Dance (Moved, Mr. Kleckner) Seconded, Mr. Hetenyi).

**MOVED** that the School of Performing Arts be authorized to initiate a program leading to the BFA degree in Dance.

Mr. Hetenyi reviewed the seven-year history of work toward this proposal and emphasized the vigorous and growing student interest in dance. He noted pressure from external groups for such a degree program in this area. Ms. Halsted elaborated on his endorsement and cited the national attention Oakland University has won on the basis of the guest artists we have attracted here for summer programs.

Expressing support for the program, Ms. Gerulaitis objected strongly to the paragraph in the agenda commenting on job opportunities for dance majors. She and Mr. Beardman rejected employment prospects as a consideration in artistic training. Mr. DeMent confessed to having raised the issue for the APPC on the basis of assuming that professional programs might be presumed to have career implications.

Ms. Schwartz raised questions about the curriculum and budget, wondering how so few faculty could offer and even require so many courses. Ms. Halstead and Mr. Stevens thought the plans realistic, as most courses are two-credit offerings and Dance faculty teach exceptionally heavy loads. They agreed with Mr. DeMent that the seventy-two-credit major and corequisite program conforms to national standards in such academic programs. Mr. Hetenyi noted an extensive general education degree component balancing the artistic training.

With regard to this and other proposals discussed earlier in the meeting, Mr. Champagne wondered why budget projections accompanying proposals make no allowance for predictable cost inflation. Mr. Hetenyi recognized the imaginary quality of fixed-cost projections but thought that revenue projections lie equally in the area of fancy. Mr. Matthews and Mr. Kleckner thought that Oakland University had gotten into the habit of constant-dollar projections in response to state budget forms which mandate this fiction. Even so, Mr. Grossman suggested, increases in faculty pay scale can be anticipated, whatever the value of

the dollar may be within five years. Like the preceding motions for a name study commission, a Medical Physics doctoral program, and a theatre unit, the proposal for a Dance program will come up for a Senate vote at next week's meeting.

As the last item of new business, Ms. Hitchingham and Mr. Christina move approval of Steering Committee nominations to fill vacancies in Senate standing committees. Mr. Horwitz expressed concern about the absence of either Engineering or Economics and Management faculty on the Research Committee, and Ms. Schwartz urged appointment of a woman to that highly educational body. Both directed their advice to the Graduate Council which has yet to announce its designated representative on the Research Committee. The Senate then voted unanimously to approve the nominations as listed in the April 9 agenda.

Having called in vain for private resolutions tending to the general good and welfare. President Champagne reminded his colleagues of the additional Senate meeting scheduled for Thursday, April 16, to conclude the year's work. He then apologized for his late arrival, which was necessitated by work on budget recommendations. He preferred not to answer questions immediately for fear of spreading misinformation but promised to distribute a budget report early next week. It is his hope that next week's Senate meeting may provide occasion for a better discussion of this sensitive issue.

In response to the President's call for adjournment, the Senate disbanded at 4:36 p.m. (Moved, Mr. Hetenyi; Seconded, Mr. Gerulaitis).

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

*Back to*  
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY  
**SENATE**  
*Home Page*