



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fifth Meeting  
Thursday, 16 February 1995

### *Minutes*

Senators present: Andrews, Barclay, Benson, Bertocci, Bhatt, Bricker, Briggs-Bunting, Brown, Buffard-O'Shea, Cameron, Chipman, Cole, Dahlgren, Downing, Eberwein, Gerulaitis, Gilroy, Hansen, Hildebrand, Hough, Khattree, Liboff, Mabee, Mittelstaedt, Moran, Moudgil, Muir, Olson, Otto, Pipan, Polis, Rozek, Russi, Schmitz, Schott-Baer, Selahowski, Sevilla, Shepherd, Speer, Taam, Winter

Senators absent: Abiko, Ari, Capps, Christina, Fish, Frankie, Hovanesian, Jarvis, Kheir, Kim, Marks, Moore, Reddy, Reynolds, Rush, Schwartz, Simon, Stano, Stevens, Thomas, Wedekind

#### Summary of actions:

1. Election of nominees to the Board Advisory Search Committee: J. Bingham, A. Fosu, S. Howell, F. Jackson, V. Moudgil, B. Murphy.
2. First Reading: Motion that students may transfer applicable community college credits at any time during their course of study. However, one-half of the credits required for the baccalaureate degree must be from 4-year institutions. 32 credits must be taken at Oakland University. (Eberwein, Downing)
3. First Reading: Motion to recommend to the President and Board of Trustees the approval of a Master of Science program in Physical Therapy. (Dahlgren, Briggs-Bunting)

Observing a goodly crowd gathered, Mr. Russi called the Senate to order at approximately 3:14 p.m. He called for a motion to approve the minutes of the [October](#) and [November](#) Senate meetings. Ms. Eberwein so moved, Ms. Briggs-Bunting seconded the motion and the minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

#### Board Advisory Search Committee nominations

Moving to the first agenda item, the selection of nominees to be presented to the Board Advisory Search Committee, Mr. Russi called upon Mr. Brown and Mr. Doane of the Elections Committee. Mr. Doane explained that the Senate will choose 6 nominees and that the names he'd placed on the blackboard are nominees of the Senate Steering Committee. He then opened the floor for additional nominations, adding that for this election, any Senate member or faculty member may vote. Ms. Benson was recognized and announced that Ms. Karasch will probably be going to Brazil next summer and has asked that her name be withdrawn from the slate of candidates proposed by the Senate Steering Committee.

Ms. Eberwein then spoke for the Senate Steering Committee, describing the process and criteria used in the development of their slate of candidates. With only two faculty positions on

the Search Committee, the ideal of achieving balance is an impossible task and so the Steering Committee looked for people who reflect balance in their work and their university contributions. Candidates were considered based on their involvement in both undergraduate and graduate education, those who are widely recognized for their scholarly achievements, who are knowledgeable about outreach and who have had extensive experience reading vitae outside of their own disciplines through experience on FRPC, College CAPS, or the Research Committee. The Steering Committee was looking for individuals who have demonstrated that they are tactful and effective members of committees and those who have a university-wide perspective. She opined that the people nominated by the Steering Committee have these characteristics and proceeded to detail the individuals and their qualifications. With the withdrawal of Ms. Karasch the Steering Committee nominees were Augustin Fosu, Jane Bingham, and Virinder Moudgil. Ms. Eberwein expressed her appreciation and gratitude that these individuals were willing to serve, noting that they will face a tremendous amount of work. She remarked that the Steering Committee did not bring a complete slate so that the Senate and other faculty would have a chance to make their recommendations. She asked that members keep in mind the criteria and reminded everyone that this is not the time for special interest groups, that we need individuals with a wide perspective and understanding of the whole university and its needs.

Additional nominations from the floor with supporting comments included Sharon Howell, Francis Jackson, Ernie Schochetman, Brian Murphy, and Tom Casstevens. Mr. Bricker, seconded by Ms. Gerulaitis, moved to close nominations, a motion swiftly approved by the Senate. The Elections Committee distributed ballots with instructions to vote for 6 candidates, collected the completed ballots and went off to count and collate the results.

#### Community college credits

Mr. Russi then recognized Ms. Eberwein who, on behalf of the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction,

MOVED that students may transfer applicable community college credits at any time during their course of study. However, one-half of the credits required for the baccalaureate degree must be from 4- year institutions. 32 credits must be taken at Oakland University.

Hearing a second from Mr. Downing, Mr. Russi then called on current chair of UCUI, Mr. Sahu for some introductory remarks. Mr. Sahu explained that the proposal was originally sent to the Senate while Mr. Eberwein was chair of UCUI and that, despite some initial concerns, Mr. Eberwein has come to support the proposal. Mr. Sahu also strongly urged support of the proposal, stating that it comes down to a basic question of fairness to the students. You can have two students, both taking classes at the community college, and the one who has earned fewer than 62 credits will have the credits transfer and the one who has more than 62 credits will not. This proposal does not change the basic requirement that all students must earn 62 credits from a 4 year institution. As to the cost issue, it is unclear how many students would be involved and so we can't tell exactly what the financial implications will be. But, he stressed, even if it costs us, we should do it because it is fair. A number of students postpone coming to OU because of this rule and some also go elsewhere and this also costs the University. He argued that we should not emphasize the cost issue but focus on the fact that the proposed change will allow the university to deal fairly and equitably with students, that it will give greater flexibility to students and it will reduce the burden on counselors and recruiters.

Jennie Gilroy, speaking from her experience in the Registrar's Office, stated that the 62 credit cutoff for community college transfers causes a lot of problems in her office. Many of the degree programs at OU now require more than 124 credits, some going as high as 160. The 62 credit rule no longer fits well as part of a 2+2 sequence since many students cannot finish in 4 years with only 124 credits. The university is currently working on additional 2+2 programs and that endeavor is inhibited by this limit. Our competition is more flexible; Walsh will transfer up to 80 credits; CMU and EMU have no limit, although half of all credits counted for graduation must be at a 4-year institution. She described several examples of how transfer students come to Oakland. Student A may have 62 credits from a community college, 28 from another 4 year institution and finish up with 34 credits from OU. Student B may start at a 4 year institution (28 credits), then go to a community college (62 credits) and then come to OU. Student A will have all the credits earned at the community college and the 4 year institution transfer, for a total of 90 credits. Student B, even though the work may be identical will have only 62 credits transfer. Because students are disadvantaged by this rule, there a lot of petitions of exception submitted.

Ms. Gilroy also addressed the concerns of the Budget Review Committee. She is concerned about the money we are losing because students do not come to OU and go to other 4 year institutions instead. She feels community college advisors are discouraging students from coming to OU because the inflexibility of this rule. Ms. Allen concurred, stating that her perception of community college advisors is that they are not happy with this rule and their unhappiness is passed along to the students. She added that this very issue came up during a recent meeting with the Macomb Community College advisors. She feels that this policy has a negative impact with regard to students, advisors and administrators.

Mr. Liboff then spoke against the proposal, stating that we keep hearing about the need to improve undergraduate education and that one way to do that is to have students in residence or in tenure at OU. This ideal of having a sense of belonging at OU is negated when students can go off and take classes elsewhere. He added, in his department, students take extra classes because they like it here. He added we should be looking at ways of improving the undergraduate experience, to make it something real and profound, not simply bring the students to campus and run them through their courses. Mr. Moran wondered when does an OU student become an OU student? He added that this provision would deny them the sense of being or becoming an "OU student."

Mr. Bricker remarked that Oakland is a commuter campus so the ideal of the "Oakland experience" may not apply. In reality many students spend little time on campus. He stated that he has a sense, based on his classroom experience, that instruction at OU is quite different than that at OCC, and that classes, especially general education classes, are much better here. With reluctance, however, he expressed his support for this proposal, having concluded that the elimination of the 62 credit limit is necessary in order for us to compete with other institutions in the state.

Mr. Bertocci pointed out that all the proposal does is change the way we do business, that it doesn't change the basic requirements. Students will still have to do half their work at OU. The change is not in the substance of our requirements, but just in the sequencing so that it will be easier for students to transfer credits later. Ms. Benson asked what about a student who has 62 credits and takes credits at a community college. Ms. Gilroy responded that OU operates on a 'best fit' scenario, that all credits earned are evaluated to see which ones can best be used to

meet requirements. However, once you have 62 credits you cannot take a class at the community college and receive credit for it. Speaking from her own experience as an Oakland graduate she believes in the quality of the instruction at Oakland. Right now students go to the community college first. If we modify this rule, we may get those students to take classes at OU and once they are here, they may be less apt to go to a community college as a result. Mr. Bricker expressed his approval of this last point. He added that he would feel most uncomfortable at the idea of a senior going to OCC to take a general education course. Ms. Gilroy replied that since the last 8 credits must be taken at OU, that would be unlikely to happen.

Mr. Bertocci reminded the Senate that when this legislation was originally passed, the motivation was less than for purely academic reasons. Mr. Liboff expressed his concern over the students at OU and the fact that they do not relate to the university as they might to another institution. He speculated that it may be because we are a commuter school or we have a somewhat remote location; nevertheless, he is unconvinced that that is the only explanation and wondered if it might be something else. Mr. Moran asked whether the 32 credit rule is new and Ms. Gilroy responded that it has been on the books a long time. She added that the 62 credit limit only relates to community college credit and that there is no limit on 4 year schools. Mr. Moran spoke of having taught at community colleges and expressed his belief that the quality of instruction isn't there, that community colleges have mass armies of students being taught by people with master's degrees.

Mr. Downing expressed the opinion that, for the vast majority of degrees, this proposal will not change the number of credits that are earned at OU. It simply provides a change in sequencing. He feels that the current sequencing structure acts as a disadvantage to Oakland, that students take all 62 of their first credits at a community college before transferring to Oakland. Students stay away, rather than trying a class or two at OU. By changing the sequencing, we will be able to attract them to take classes here sooner and, we hope, get them to stay. Ms. Muir noted that many classes in spring and summer terms are canceled and this provision would allow students to continue their education by taking relevant classes at a community college without interrupting their progress toward a degree.

Ms. Eberwein said that if she thought this change would adversely affect the quality of the education the students receive, she would not support it. However, she pointed out, it is only a change in timing, a change that will provide more flexibility to the students. It doesn't change the number of credits they must earn at Oakland to receive a degree.

Mr. McKay spoke on behalf of the Senate Budget Review Committee. He argued that while it is difficult to exactly quantify the costs, we must be aware of the trend to OU's becoming an upper level institution and the cost implications of that. He pointed out that WSU gets 2 times as much money per student from the state as does OU and that the community college cost half as much to attend. At Oakland, the cost of classes at the freshman/sophomore level are considerably less than classes at a junior/senior level; in effect, freshman/sophomore level classes help pay for upper level classes. Ms. Benson echoed his concern about the trend of students taking lower division classes at the community college and upper division classes at OU. She pointed out that OU is a four-year institution and if we want students to have a solid 4-year degree they should get the full spectrum of classes here, including 100 and 200 level courses.

Mr. Headley, of the Admissions Office, commented that community colleges are experiencing declining enrollments and yet Oakland applications are up by 15%. He does not see this proposal as a threat and thinks that the current policy disadvantages students who might be thinking of coming to OU.

Observing no additional Senators wishing to be heard, Mr. Russi turned to the Elections Committee for a report. Mr. Doane listed Ms. Bingham, Mr. Fosu, Ms. Howell, Mr. Moudgil, Ms. Jackson and Mr. Murphy as the Senate's nominees to the Presidential Advisory Search Committee.

#### Master of Science program in Physical Therapy

Turning to the next item of business, Mr. Dahlgren

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees the approval of a Master of Science program in Physical Therapy.

Ms. Briggs-Bunting seconded the motion and Mr. Olson took the floor to describe the highlights of the program. Oakland's current MPT program prepares students for entry level positions. This proposal for a Master of Science program is for already established practicing physical therapists who want to enhance their knowledge base and their skills in an advanced clinical area. The culminating experience will be either a master's thesis or a set of comprehensive examinations. Initially the program will focus on the specialty area, OMPT or orthopaedic manual physical therapy. Since 1988 the university has been offering a series of short courses in this specialty and have thus developed experience in funding and paying for the courses. A number of students who took the OMPT series asked us to consider offering an MS degree. The program is intended to be a self supporting program and will offer the courses generally on weekends or evening to take advantage of existing space and equipment.

Mr. Liboff asked about library needs and Mr. Olson responded that library costs are a line item, built into their budget. Ms. Muir was curious about the faculty, noting that only 2 of the people listed on pp. 7-8 have Ph.D's. Mr. Olson replied that the APTA does not accredit MS programs and that the individuals listed are experts in this particular skill area. Ms. Muir wondered then about the research component of the program. Mr. Olson explained that Ph.D. faculty would supervise any research projects but that most students would probably not be doing research but would opt for the comprehensive exams instead. Mr. Liboff again asked about the library and the impact this new program might have on it. Mr. Olson stated that many of the journals are already there, that their students also have access to hospital libraries, and that they have consulted with Ms. Merz in the Library and there's no indication that library materials will be a problem. Mr. McKay added that the Budget Committee also looked carefully at this aspect and called attention to the fact that library expenditures are built into their budget, that the program will be supporting the additional library costs through the income received via tuition and fees. Mr. Liboff further explained his concern that graduate programs may be compromised in the future since library funding may not be adequate to support necessary journal subscriptions.

Speaking on behalf of the Senate Planning Review Committee Mr. Chipman expressed their strong support for this proposal. Responding to Mr. Moran's query regarding enrollment, Mr. Olson stated that they would not necessarily be limiting their enrollment to 24, particularly if other specialties are added. The completion of the new science building will alleviate space

concerns about expanding the program. Mr. Liboff noted that the PT program is mentioned in the Strategic Plan and asked if any of their budget would come from monies set aside for implementation of the Plan. Mr. Olson replied no. Mr. McKay explained that the Senate Budget Planning Committee had looked very carefully at the program and its budget and added that the revenue and expenditures will be monitored every year. He also pointed out that the program is not asking for any university dollars, that it will be self supporting. Mr. Russi added that the overhead costs will come back to the university.

Mr. Griggs explained that, in addition to the tuition, students in the program will pay special lab fees to support the program. Mr. Russi asked how the students reacted to the special fees and Mr. Griggs replied that they have accepted the fees, that they realize the benefits of the program. Mr. Olson brought out the fact that all the students are already practicing physical therapists and that, in many cases, the hospitals are paying for their continuing education because of the value of these special skills. Mr. Liboff commented that currently our PT students are among the best students we have and asked about the admission standards for those applying for this new program. Mr. Olson agreed that we get the cream of the crop at the entry level and turned to a former OU PT student who is now practicing for elucidation on the appeal of this program.

Ms. Tomasic, a 1981 graduate of OU's PT program and currently a clinical instructor at OU, explained that clinicians are looking to enhance themselves with special skills. She stated that we will be attracting physical therapists from around the country, that many of them have been involved in continuing education courses. She feels they will be attracted by the ability to combine the continuing education courses in a particular specialty and earn a Masters degree at the same time.

There being no further impetus for discussion of the Physical Therapy Proposal, Mr. Russi then turned to Good and Welfare items. Ms. Jarvis distributed an student proposal to re-incarnate a publication similar to the Oakland Undiapered that would provide students with guidance regarding classes and faculty. She explained that the Student Congress is interested in working with the faculty in developing this publication. Mr. Russi ascertained that this was being presented as an information item and assured Ms. Jarvis that he would take it up with the Senate Steering Committee. Mr. Liboff reminisced about the Oakland Undiapered, saying that he enjoyed reading it and that it would be an excellent way of raising the quality of life on campus, that students have interesting things to say.

Ms. Muir asked about the status of the Detroit College of Law, noting that it sounds as though they are moving to Lansing. Mr. Russi replied that her assumption is incorrect and that talks are continuing. Ms. Schmitz announced that nominations for the Wilson Awards and the Student Trustee Liaison are being accepted through Feb. 27, 1995.

Ms. Briggs-Bunting moved adjournment at 3:23 p.m

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

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