



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Eighth Meeting
Thursday, April 10, 1980
128, 129, 130 Oakland Center

MINUTES

Senators Present: Beardman, Bertocci, Boulos, Brown, Burke, Chernob, Chipman, Coon, Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Edgerton, Evans, Feeman, Felton, Garcia, Gardiner, Ghausi, Grossman, Hammerle, Hetenyi, Heubel, Hitchingham, Horwitz, Johnson, Jones, Kleckner, Liboff, Matthews, McMahan, Miller, Moeller, Maurant, Obear, Otto, Pak, Partmann, Pettengill, Riley, Russell, Sayre, Schmidt, Schwartz, Shantz, Shepherd, Stevens, Stransky, Strauss, Torch, Tower, Williamson

Senators Absent: Berger, Bieryla, Christina, DeMont, Houtz, Jaymes, Karasch, Kingstrom, Kohn, Scherer, Twietmeyer

Interim President George T. Matthews called the meeting to order at 5:25 p.m., dispensing with introductory remarks in order to proceed expeditiously to the business at hand.

Upon the motion of Mr. Ghausi, seconded by Mr. Chernob, the minutes of the March 13 meeting were unanimously approved.

A. Old Business

Motion from the Graduate Council (Moved, Mr. Johnson: Seconded, Ms. Boulos) to establish a Master of Science in Nursing Program:

MOVED that the University Senate recommend to the President and the Board the establishment of a program of graduate studies in nursing leading to the degree of Master of Science in Nursing. The date of implementation of this program shall follow endorsement by the appropriate funding agencies of the State and shall be subject to the availability of requisite resources.

Mr. Horwitz's inquiry about why the APPC statement of support of the MSN proposal made no mention of academic justifications brought a response from Mr. Russell to the effect that the APPC defines its responsibilities in reviewing new programs as limited to considering the impact of the proposal on existing University programs and on the public image of Oakland University. Curriculum and other academic issues have been reviewed and approved by the School of Nursing and the Graduate Council.

Mr. Obear noted that the APPC memorandum on the MSN proposal misleadingly suggests that

he has actually agreed to a reduced overall faculty-student ratio in the next Faculty Agreement. As the minutes of the March 13 Senate meeting indicate, more cautiously, he expects to be presented with such a request.

The resolution was unanimously approved by voice vote.

B. New Business

1. Motion from the Graduate Council (Moved, Mr. Johnson, Seconded, Mr. Jones) to establish a graduate program in Sociology:

MOVED that the University Senate recommend to the President and to the Board the establishment of a program of graduate studies leading to the degree of Master of Arts in Sociology. The date of implementation of this program shall be subject to the availability of requisite resources.

Introducing this motion, Mr. Johnson noted that the legislature has already approved funding for the M.A. in Sociology program. Implementation depends on allocation of fiscal resources, therefore, and need not wait for state-level approval. Mr. Strauss wondered when the Department of Sociology and Anthropology actually expects to launch the graduate program. Although Mr. Johnson assured the Senate that nothing will happen until the state commits requisite resources, Mr. Bertocci and Mr. Obear pointed out that this program has minimal start-up costs and can soon be launched on a modest level.

Mr. Hammerle asked whether the APPC has a specific recommendation on this proposal. Mr. Russell reported that the Committee has reviewed the program and communicated its approval to the Graduate Council. Having won approval from the Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate Council, and the Academic Policy and Planning Committee, the motion to establish an M.A. program in Sociology will be eligible for Senate action at the April 17 meeting.

2. Joint Resolution from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and the Faculty Council of Health Sciences (Moved, Mr. Russell; Seconded, Mr. Pak) to recommend to the President and to the Board of Trustees six basic principles and a detailed implementation sequence for the development of a School of Medicine at Oakland University. (Note: dismayed by the prospect of introducing stylistic or substantive errors into this complex and carefully-worded proposal by yet another copying of the complete document, the Secretary of the University Senate refers interested readers to the Senate Agenda for April 10, 1980, pages two through five.)

Before discussion began on the Medical School proposal, Mr. Russell called attention to a typographical error in the agenda copy of the Second Principle. He was assured that preventive medicine will be properly spelled in subsequent transcripts of the resolution.

Debate on the proposal focused on the following issues:

Conduct of the Study: Mr. Horwitz introduced discussion by asking why the APPC had not investigated the impact of the medical programs at Michigan State University on other parts of that institution and on the state. He thought it would be useful to investigate recent

experiences of another Michigan university. Mr. Beardslee explained that the Oakland study concentrated on four representative universities from among the institutions across the United States which initiated medical education within the last fifteen years. Michigan State was excluded from the study because it varies so drastically in size and structure from Oakland University, as do the University of Michigan and Wayne State. Mr. Pak reported, however, on his visits to all four medical schools in this state and reported his findings about the M.S.U. experience with a decentralized medical school which now requires an ambulatory care facility on campus to obviate problems created by geographically dispersed clinical facilities. He cited the M.S.U. model as an example of why Oakland should never attempt to deliver health services here. In general, he noticed no negative impact of the medical school on other Michigan State programs. Mr. Beardslee explained that his attempts to discover the fiscal impact of the medical school on the rest of Michigan State University had been frustrated by a state budget analyst's inability to dig out the necessary information.

Mr. Williamson requested a brief oral report from members of Oakland's delegations to other medical schools; he also asked Mr. Russell to make each committee's written summary of its findings available. Various observations by Senators who had visited other campuses emerged in the course of discussion.

Mr. Kleckner offered a detailed summary of his visit to Wright State University in Ohio. Although the faculty and internal governance groups there had never officially reviewed or approved a medical school proposal, most faculty members and administrators felt that the medical school has been a good thing for the University, on the whole. Members of departments most nearly related to the health sciences were most enthusiastic about its contributions, but even the more remote departments enjoyed enhanced institutional prestige and thought they might be attracting better students. Even the academic service administrators, who feel greatly overburdened by responsibility to provide increasing services with essentially the same resources, approved the venture as a good move for Wright State. Concerns about financing of the medical program once start-up funds run out and about the isolation of the medical school from other university faculty and the normal governance structure were negative factors which the Oakland proposal attempts to avoid. Mr. Stevens observed that his acquaintances at Wright State suggest that the medical school there resulted from pressures of a nearby Air Force base and not from academic or community-service commitments. Mr. Tower mentioned fears at Wright State about the eventual fiscal drain from the campus clinical facility?something Oakland does not need as it is surrounded by strong local hospitals.

Mr. Riley wondered whether the tendency of a medical school to establish clinical facilities on campus were not an inevitable tendency, and he inquired how we can be sure that the ambulatory care facility mentioned in our proposal will not grow into a full-scale campus clinic. Mr. Russell noted that hospitals in Oakland County are significantly better than those near most other medical schools; any ambulatory care facilities Oakland might eventually establish would be located off-campus in the more distant parts of our service area to provide residency training in counties which need practicing physicians. Mr. Pak observed that the state would surely never give us a Certificate of Need to build another hospital in this county, and he cited examples of successful decentralized medical schools in Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana. Although Oakland University will control the quality of our clinical faculty, all will be associated with local hospitals.

Mr. Liboff, who visited Brown University in the course of the feasibility study, observed that research funds there had been diverted from the Department of Applied Mathematics to the medical faculty. He noted similar diversion of biomedical research funds elsewhere.

Timing: Mr. Strauss, while commending the study committees on their achievement, cautioned that proponents of the medical school resolution seem oblivious to the disastrous state of the Michigan economy and to the transitional status of our university leadership. He thought action on the proposal now to be the worst of timing and almost sheer folly. Mr. Russell rejoined with reference to the detailed step system of capital and programmatic developments which protects our proposal from timing constraints and allows gradual progress toward medical education. He thought it best to proceed with this resolution while the university searches for a new president so that we can appoint a president and a medical dean who are committed to the most thorough possible integration of the medical school with existing academic programs and governance structures.

Mr. Strauss, still concerned about fiscal realities, moved that the resolution be withdrawn from consideration until the first meeting of the Senate next fall (Moved, Mr. Strauss: Seconded, Mr. Williamson). The proposal to table the resolution was defeated by voice vote.

Integration of Medical School Faculty: In response to various inquiries from Mr. Chipman about the willingness of science departments within the College to accept the basic medical science faculty among their members, the Senate learned that the members of the Chemistry Department now approve the medical school, as does the Physics Department and the Department of Biological Sciences. Mr. Riley cautioned, however, that faculty attitudes can not yet be fully discovered as the specific rights and responsibilities connected with dual appointments have not been defined.

Research: Mr. Liboff maintained that the Principles articulated in the document should emphasize Oakland University's commitment to research. He wanted the Senate to affirm to the legislature its strong interest in research, not just among the basic medical science faculty but in natural and social sciences, mathematics, nursing, and engineering. Mr. Pak and Mr. Russell affirmed the planning group's emphasis on research, which they see as implicit throughout the Research Faculty. Placement of basic medical science professors in already established departments should ensure general access to biomedical research funds. Mr. Heubel offered an amendment to highlight research in the proposal by adding the words "and research" after "educational" in line two of the First Principle (Moved, Mr. Heubel; Seconded, Mr. Pak). Mr. Russell supported the change as a reflection of the spirit of the APPC in formulating the original motion. The amendment will be eligible for vote on April 17.

Mr. Liboff later offered an amendment, complementing the Heubel amendment, to add the following Seventh Principle to the original resolution in order to affirm the right of other Oakland University faculties to participate in biomedical research (Moved, Mr. Liboff; Seconded, Mr. Feeman):

Seventh Principle: The University should develop strong biomedically-oriented research resources in terms of personnel, space, and equipment not only through the university-based basic medical science faculty, but also through faculties such as those in natural and behavioral science, mathematics, engineering, and nursing.

Mr. Pak respected Mr. Liboff's concern but opposed the amendment as there will be no separate basic medical science faculty apart from existing schools and departments. He and Mr. Hetenyi warned against any tendency to list the departments which might participate in biomedical research for fear of imposing unintended restrictions. Mr. Russell cautioned against highlighting biomedical research as the university's special area of emphasis. He thought that the Fifth Principle should relieve Mr. Liboff's anxieties, but Mr. Liboff cited that section's recognition of medical school autonomy. Mr. Kleckner opposed the amendment as moving the proposal away, at the end, from the School of Medicine itself. The amendment will be eligible for Senate action at the next meeting.

Governance: Mr. Eberwein directed attention to Principle Six of the resolution and to Principle Four in Attachment D to raise questions about the proposed governance plan, noting implications for the administration of the entire university. He wondered whether it is necessary to reorganize the whole university in the attempt to prevent isolation of the medical school, and he noted that two provosts reporting to a Vice President for Academic Affairs distance all deans from decision-making power.

Mr. Obear and Mr. Matthews explained that the governance model proposed In Attachment D (an informational item not eligible for a vote) represents an attempt to avoid the situation at traditional medical schools with their own hospitals where independent medical deans have almost direct pipelines to legislatures and where the medical schools evade normal university governance. By emphasizing that the Dean of the medical school will be a dean among other deans and by establishing a common budgetary process for all University programs, the committee which proposed this system hoped to avoid a separate and competing power structure on the campus. They recognized, however, that the suggested two-provost model might be imperfect in lumping all the rest of the university together apart from Health Sciences. Mr. Obear noted that the planning group was divided in its judgment on this issue and mentioned alternative arrangements including the possibility that the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Provost for Liberal and Professional Studies might be one person. Mr. Russell and Mr. Obear indicated that the governance provisions outlined in Attachment D reflect thinking on important issues but are not yet graven in stone and are not official parts of the proposal on which the Senate will vote this year.

Mr. Williamson anticipated problems in integrating basic medical science faculty within this dual-school, dual-provost system. He particularly wondered whether professors would be subject to review by two CAPs. Mr. Russell projected the possibility of a joint Medical School-College of Arts and Sciences review committee for these persons. Mr. Shantz, advocating a judicious cynicism, called attention to the great expense and effort entailed in the attempt to avoid a monolithic medical-education structure. He directed attention to the kind of president and medical dean we hire and pointed out that our high hopes to achieve the principles articulated in the resolution and in Senate debate may easily be frustrated as the proposal is implemented.

Developmental Sequence: Ms. Schwartz inquired about the two-part implementation system envisaged in the resolution, asking which capital development steps would be essential preludes to medical Instruction. She thought the proposed sequence reasonable but wondered what assurance we have that it will actually be followed.

Mr. Russell announced that, if the Senate endorses this resolution, President Matthews will

present it to the Board for its approval. Should the Board make substantive changes in the proposal, the President promises to return the measure to the Senate for its deliberation. In any event, stage six of the proposal requires Senate approval of specific plans for the medical school before students are admitted; the Senate may reject all plans for a medical school at that point. President Matthews assured the Senate that, although its actions are not legally binding on the Board, they are morally and politically forceful. He indicated resistance to a medical school within the Board and felt that, if the Senate approves the resolution, it will need to persuade the Board to recommend action to the legislature, which is also likely to display reluctance. If we can win support for a medical school at Oakland University at all, he believes, we can persuade the Board and legislature to approve this model.

Mr. Obear and Mr. Russell responded to Ms. Schwartz's inquiries about capital development projects by noting that steps one through three are needed already. No medical students can be admitted without adequate facilities.

Rationale for the Program: In the course of discussion, various benefits to be expected from a medical school were mentioned, including institutional prestige and improved health care for the region. Mr. Stevens questioned whether prestige is really a fundamental reason for a decision of this magnitude. Mr. Pak thought it an important consideration but not decisive. He doubted that Oakland can become a major comprehensive university without a medical school and argued that health education would build public perception of Oakland University as a service-oriented institution.

Mr. Williamson asked whether the APPC had found a compelling need for medical education in this area, given projections of a national physician surplus within a decade. Mr. Pak responded that there are too many variables involved for us to predict an oversupply or undersupply of doctors; the problem seems to be one of geographical distribution, which Oakland hopes to correct by providing residency training for primary-care physicians in outlying counties of our service region, and of medical specialization. Mr. Riley noted the usefulness of training practitioners in such important areas as geriatrics.

Fiscal Concerns: In response to Mr. Williamson's question about the financial impact of a medical school., Mr. Russell directed attention to Attachment E, detailing APPC judgments on this perplexing question and calling for employment of a full-time budget analyst to study fiscal implications beyond the capacity of laymen to investigate. Suspicions of fiscal drainage at other schools remain unproven, but the APPC means to exercise caution. For the short term, he pointed out, approval of this resolution would entail only modest expense for further studies mandated by the proposal.

C. Good and Welfare

Judging precipitately that the good of the order required swift adjournment the presiding officer neglected section C of the agenda, thereby frustrating the Steering Committee's attempt to offer hospitality after the final Senate meeting of the 1979-80 academic year. Senators should read the agenda for April 17 with particular care.

Upon motion by Mr. Hetenyi, seconded by Mr. Heubel. the Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Jane D. Eberwein
Secretary of the University Senate

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E
Home Page