

Oakland University Senate
May 25, 2010
Minutes

Members present: Awbrey, Chopin, Cole, Connery, Doman, Eis, English, Folberg, Giblin, Gilson, Grimm, Grossman, Guessous, Insko, Jackson, Jhashi, Keane, Kim, Latcha, Leibert, Lemarbe, Mabee, Marks, Medaugh, Meehan, Miller, Mitton, Moudgil, Norris, Osborne, Piskulich, Polis, Russell, Schartman, Schweitzer, Southward, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Tanniru, Tracy, Voelck, Walters, Wells

Members absent: Bertocci, Berven, Chamra, Chen, Free, Hanif, Hastings, Hightower, Izraeli, Kruk, Larrabee, Licker, Mili, Moran, Pedroni, Penprase, Riley-Doucet, Switzer, Tissot, Williams

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Item:

Calendar Update—Mr. Shablin

Provost Update—Mr. Moudgil

2. Motion to approve the constitution of the OUWBSOM. Ms. Osborne, Mr. Tracy. Second reading. Approved.
- 2a. Motion to postpone vote on constitution until September. Mr. Medaugh, Ms. Jackson. Defeated.
3. Motion to approve a new Doctor of Medicine program. Mr. Tracy, Mr. Russell. Second reading. Approved.
4. Motion to approve a new Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies program. Mr. Tracy, Mr. Licker. Second reading. Approved.
5. Motion to approve a new Master of Science in Mechatronics program. Ms. Miller, Ms. Piskulich. Second reading. Approved.

Calling the meeting to order at 1:05, Mr. Moudgil thanked the Senators for making time to hold this additional meeting of the year. Then he invited the Registrar to provide an update on the upcoming academic calendar. Mr. Shablin explained that based on the collective feedback from faculty, staff, and students, commencement ceremonies will revert back to being held on a single day, effective W'1. Three ceremonies will take place on 30 April 2011. The website has been revised to reflect this change. Mr. Moudgil added that the change would not be made in Fall '10 as students were already informed of the dates. Ms. Lee, commencement coordinator, confirmed that plans for the fall semester are already too far in progress to be altered.

Mr. Marks, School of Health Sciences, apprised the Senate of the second informational item, a change in program name from Medical Laboratory Sciences to Biomedical Diagnostic and Therapeutic Sciences. The SHS wishes to broaden the name for a more accurate reflection of what the program actually does.

After the secretary took roll call, Mr. Moudgil turned to the items of old business.

Old Business

Ms. Osborne read the motion:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the new [Constitution of the Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine.](#)

Mr. Moudgil then invited Mr. Folberg, dean of the School of Medicine, to address the Senate. Mr. Folberg thanked the Steering committee, who collectively and individually contributed many suggestions. Since the April Senate meeting, the SOM developed an inclusionary process and incorporated the suggestions into a revision of the constitution. The process, according to Mr. Folberg, was intended to engage members of the Senate, members of the campus at-large, and, especially, members of the Steering committee. An *ad hoc* SOM committee was formed that included faculty members Mary Bee (chair), Rick Sabina, Mitchell Cappell, and George Williams. This committee considered the suggestions and reformulated the constitution. The revised document was ratified by the SOM faculty on May 21.

Mr. Folberg reviewed a set of key revisions: the definition of SOM faculty; the organization of the School (the Department of Biomedical Science and the departments established by the SOM's affiliates that deliver clinical education and care); identification of the Standing committees, including a Committee on Committees; the reporting structure of the committees (including an annual report of each committee to the Faculty Assembly, submission of recommended actions to the appropriate associate or assistant dean according to the procedures set forth by the by-laws, and submission of minutes and reports to the Faculty Assembly and the Executive Committee of the FA). The composition of the Executive Committee shall initially be composed of six members elected by the assembly, three from the Department of Biomedical Science and three from the departments established by the affiliates.

Next, Mr. Folberg addressed the issue of SOM representation in the University Senate. The revised language: the SOM shall be represented at the University Senate by senators elected in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the University Senate. All faculty members listed in this article are eligible for election as senators: Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors; Research Professors; and Clinical Professors. The SOM will be represented at the Senate in equal proportion of faculty from the Dept. of Biomedical Sciences and faculty from the departments established by the SOM affiliates. Apportionment will be determined by the formula to determine the number of Senate seats based on the faculty in the first two categories, thus those holding clinical appointments are to be *excluded* from consideration. Language was also added to limit the number of SOM seats so as not to exceed the number allotted to the School of Business Administration, another OU professional school.

Ms. Jackson raised an issue under Article 2.C. that refers to review by the University Senate, observing that there are more bodies outside the Senate that must review and approve programs, so that the language may not be as inclusive as it should be. Ms. Jackson further noted being troubled by the faculty assembly not having approval authority, as well as the fact that meeting twice a year may not be sufficient to manage the School's business. According to Ms. Jackson, nothing in the language of the constitution indicates who makes approvals, which may imply that committees are reporting to associate/assistant deans, who make decisions instead of the faculty assembly. One way to correct this, Ms. Jackson suggested, is for the assembly to meet more often. In her view, this situation presents a huge governance problem for faculty. She also pointed out that the list of committees does not indicate numbers of members, along with the fact that only the dean can increase the number of meetings of the faculty assembly. Lastly, she wondered why the dean does not serve as chair of the faculty assembly.

Mr. Folberg responded that there are mechanisms in the constitution to enable faculty and executive committee to call additional meetings if they wish. When asked by Ms. Jackson to specify that language, Mr. Folberg replied that he did not have a copy to point to immediately, but that Ms. Gillum could provide that information. Moreover, Mr. Folberg said that time would not permit him to address all the issues raised by Ms. Jackson, but he did single out as important the process by which the constitution was brought to the Senate, which involved a process of review by several committees. He described that as inclusive of the entire governance process. As to Ms. Jackson's lingering concern about the reporting structure of committees, Mr. Folberg reiterated that the faculty makes the recommendation for action, which are then implemented by associate deans. The faculty of the SOM as well as the dean believe that this is the most effective way to govern the School. Furthermore, he explained that matters were turned over to associate deans because they are in a position to advise the committees whether an action would impact another area. For example, if a committee decided to add a course to the curriculum, an associate dean would recognize that the addition of contact hours would have an impact on student affairs. Mr. Folberg does not see this as interfering with faculty governance. Faculty make the decisions, the School implements them.

Ms. Jackson stated that she still believes that the faculty assembly is the body that should have the ultimate authority, and if the committees are reporting to the assembly, the associate deans could serve as non-voting committee members where they would be able to raise issues germane to the recommendations. It concerns her that the SOM faculty assembly does not have the same level of authority that other unit assemblies have. Mr. Folberg responded that it is impractical to wait for meetings of the assembly to take action on the day-to-day running of the School, and given a situation such as a disciplinary issue with a student, it would be a legal nightmare. Ms. Jackson said that school assemblies do not deal with student disciplinary issues.

Mr. Folberg then asked Ms. Bee, chair of the committee, to comment. She referenced language from Article IV.E, which identifies the level of faculty representation on the Assembly. Mr. Polis expressed concern about the issue of Senate representation. Specifically, he wondered why half of the representatives from the SON would be individuals not employed by Oakland. Mr. Folberg reminded Mr. Polis that the Senate sets policies that affect the SOM, and therefore as faculty members who teach on our campus, it is appropriate to include them. In his view, Mr. Folberg believes that it is fair in the governance model to allow those individuals to be eligible to

participate. Mr. Moudgil remarked that the number of representatives in this category would be quite small, to which Mr. Polis responded that no number other than 0 is appropriate for anyone not affiliated with OU to serve on the Senate. Mr. Moudgil observed that they are affiliated with OU if they are teaching in the school. Ms. Jackson noted as a point of order that the Chair was participating in the debate.

Mr. Russell offered his support of the new version of the constitution and thinks that it is excellent to have faculty serving as president and vice president of the faculty assembly. Moreover, he posited that it is a good idea to have up to three Senate representatives from the clinical side of the SOM, since their viewpoint will be important. Mr. Russell asked about adjunct faculty and wondered if their status was part-time or honorary. Mr. Folberg said that in the unlikely event adjunct faculty are appointed they will be honorific titles rather than salaried faculty. Mr. Russell then inquired as to how the members of the Committee on Committees are selected. According to Mr. Folberg, it is by election. He further noted that it is a model used in many medical schools. Mr. Russell said that a similar structure is used successfully in the University of California system. Mr. Russell said that the apportionment method may require an amendment to the Senate Constitution, and that the Steering committee may need to make those amendments early in the fall.

Mr. Grossman was confused by the inclusion of visiting faculty, as the Senate Constitution clearly excludes faculty with visiting status. Mr. Folberg stated that the SOM had no intention of violating that stipulation, and would strike the language to make it consistent with the Senate Constitution. Ms. Bee, representing the faculty, agreed to the change.

Ms. Jackson again asked where to find the language in the constitution that refers to calling additional meetings of the assembly. Ms. Bee replied that it is stipulated in the by-laws, and that the committee is still working on that document. In draft form, the by-laws state that at least 50 members, or 40%, whichever is lesser, can make the decision to call a meeting, with or without the approval of the dean. Mr. Tracy observed that it is standard practice to attach a copy of by-laws with a unit constitution, even though it is not voted on. Mr. Folberg confirmed that more work was needed on the by-laws. Mr. Tracy said that the document contains a great deal of valuable information and that it would be helpful to make it available for review. Mr. Folberg said that the SOM was not notified of a requirement to present by-laws with the constitution.

Ms. Jackson raised concern about not knowing the content of the by-laws. Ms. Gillum addressed a procedural matter, asking whether it is standard operating procedure to present the by-laws along with the constitution, as no one in the SOM was made aware of it. She proposed that the constitution be approved and that the by-laws be reviewed at a later date. Ms. Jackson claimed that Mr. Tracy assured the members of the Steering committee that unit constitutions were always presented with by-laws, and that he communicated that to the SOM. Ms. Jackson expressed surprise that the by-laws were not available, and, further, that as a parliamentarian, she questioned a constituent body having a document that can be changed at will and not subject to the constitution.

Mr. Russell remarked that the minutes of the April meeting will likely reflect that the provost asked for a copy of the by-laws at that time. In addition, he observed that amendments to a

constitution are not customarily made on the floor of the Senate, so he suggested that the document be remanded back to the School so that the changes could be made in the appropriate manner. Mr. Moudgil recommended that the changes be made and that the document move forward, with the commitment that revisions to the document will be made and presented to the Senate in the fall. Mr. Russell then asked the parliamentarian whether the matter could be suspended until a later date. Mr. Grossman believed that it was possible to do that, but Ms. Jackson said that it was procedurally inappropriate to suspend a meeting.

Mr. Folberg called attention to the constitution of the School of Nursing, presented to the Senate in 1977/78 without the by-laws. Additionally, he pointed out that the by-laws of the School of Health Sciences were approved five years after the Senate approved the school's constitution. [1] He wondered why the SOM should be held to another standard, beyond what other schools have been subjected to. Mr. Folberg stated that in all the work with various university committees to draft the constitution over the past few months, that no one apprised the SOM of the need to include by-laws with the constitution. Had the school been informed of that requirement, the SOM would have gladly complied. He was distressed to learn this on the day of the Senate presentation after a good faith effort to accommodate all the requests made to the SOM.

Mr. Meehan recalled that at the end of the last meeting it was clear that discussions would continue with the review bodies. He expressed frustration that the committees appear to be missing each other once again. Ms. Jackson remarked that SPRC did meet with the SOM, and at that meeting Ms. Gillum indicated that she understood the concerns about Senate representation. Moreover, Ms. Jackson pointed out that the SOM constitution was not available until the day before the Senate meeting, so that if one claims victimization, it can go both ways. She asserted that it was not rational to submit a document of such importance on short notice. Mr. Folberg retorted that it would have been helpful if the SOM had received the suggestions from the committees in a more timely fashion, and defended the time involved by claiming that the review committees strung out the meetings and that the SOM had to carefully consider each suggestion before proceeding with revision/ratification. He said that the SOM is not trying to deceive or to play fast and loose with governance.

Mr. Medaugh voiced agreement with Mr. Meehan that the discussion was repetitive of last month's meeting and that a blame-game is preventing moving forward. He moved to postpone the decision on the constitution until fall; Ms. Jackson provided a second.

Mr. Marks objected to postponement. Mr. Tracy said that he supported a vote, with the understanding that the SOM would return in fall with a revised, final version. That would allow the School to start admitting students, as well as provide time to revise the document appropriately. Ms. Jackson asked a procedural question. If the current version were adopted, it would go to the Board; what would be done with the revised document in the fall? Mr. Grossman presumed that it would be adopted then as well. He pointed out that the issue was one of a good faith effort. Ms. Guessous supported that sentiment.

The motion to postpone the vote until September was defeated.

Mr. Russell opined that the document could be approved, pending the SOM faculty ratification of the amended sections. Both Ms. Jackson and Mr. Grossman disagreed. Mr. Folberg, speaking on behalf of the faculty (upon Ms. Bee's agreement), noted that the SOM would be grateful if the Senate would approve the SOM Constitution, with the *requirement* that they return to the September with the revisions. The SOM would at that time present a revised document (likely to be ratified by that time) with the by-laws attached and any other requested information. Ms. Jackson reiterated that the section in the by-laws regarding calling additional meetings of the faculty assembly must be included in the text of the constitution. Mr. Folberg and Ms. Bee indicated their consent.

The Senate voted to approve, with four no voted recorded from Mr. Medaugh, Mr. Latcha, Mr. Polis, and Ms. Jackson.

Mr. Moudgil then turned to the next item of business; Mr. Tracy read the motion.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a [program leading to the Doctor of Medicine \(M.D.\) degree.](#)

Mr. Folberg, not wishing to take more of the Senate's time, expressed his gratitude for the Senate's consideration of the medical school curriculum and asked for support in establishing a medical degree at Oakland. The Senate voted unanimously to approve the program.

Mr. Tracy read the next motion:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees approval of a [program leading to the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies.](#)

Ms. Moore reminded Senators of the robust discussion at the last meeting, and asked for questions. Mr. Polis wondered whether those involved with the BIS program agreed with Mr. Sudol's remarks that were sent to the Senate the previous day. Ms. Moore said that they did not agree. Mr. Moudgil observed that many Senators were concerned whether the program could be exclusive to the College and asked Ms. Moore to comment. She said that initially it was intended to be a more open program, but that in response to concerns raised by the BIS council, the program has now been restricted to the College, with only rare exceptions granted.

Mr. Meehan noted that UCUI did not pass the program; rather, it was a split vote. He asked UCUI to help clarify the concerns. Ms. Awbrey made a statement about the BIS program. She noted its 35-year history, its place in the OU curriculum, and the benefits the major offers to students. Approximately 300 students are involved in the program. The focus of the program is on integrative studies, defined by the Association for Integrative Studies as "a process by which students connect knowledge and skills from multiple sources and experiences, apply knowledge and skills in varied settings, analyze diverse points of view, and understand issues contextually." The flexibility of the BIS program allows non-traditional students as well as others to benefit from a course of study outside the available majors. As chair of UCUI, Ms.

Awbrey reviewed the primary concern raised about the program, namely, that the BALS program would duplicate the BIS program. She remarked that the College addressed many of the concerns and agreed to the following changes: requiring two minors in the College (with a note that exceptions be considered); requiring that LBS100 and LBS200 be taken prior to a student's junior standing; and including a clear statement that the target audience is first year students. According to Ms. Awbrey, the College did not include an interest survey, nor did it revise a request for five graduate assistants, which seemed excessive for the size of the program.

Mr. Tracy wondered why UCUI did not pass the program if the changes were made. Ms. Awbrey responded that some committee members remained concerned, thus the vote was split. Mr. Meehan then brought attention to the report of the Senate Budget Review Committee, which did not support the proposal. Mr. Latcha, a member of SBRC, noted that the committee had problems with the number of graduate assistants given the projected enrollment numbers, the issue of duplication with the BIS program, and the lack of a statement from the dean supporting the proposal if enrollment figures were not met. Ms. Moore indicated that she asked Ms. Howell (of the SBRC) to revisit those issues, but was told that the committee had completed its work. Mr. Latcha confirmed this.

Mr. Sudol explained that the proposers were not allowed to speak with the SBRC despite repeated offers to do so. He expressed disappointment with this as it runs counter to a long tradition of program proposers meeting with respective review committees to discuss and answer questions. He noted that the program is cost-free to run, to which Mr. Moudgil inquired whether there would be requests for new faculty. Mr. Sudol asserted that he has refused to provide a dean's letter assuring financial support, as no dean (or provost) is in a position to make such promises or guarantees. Every new program has a five-year grace period in which to demonstrate success. The BALS program does not need additional funding, as the faculty and courses are already in place.

Mr. Meehan made the observation that no chairperson in the College wrote to support the BALS program, and further noted that there is strong top-down support, but that he is not so sure about bottom-up support. As far as the program being cost-free, Mr. Meehan pointed out that chairs would be required to ask for part-time faculty funding to replace the faculty teaching in the program. Thus, it is not free. He asked what the incentive would be for chairs.

Ms. Moore said that the College already supports the MALS program, thus the BALS program would be building on the program we already have. Mr. Sudol reiterated that discussions took place with the chairs for over two years, and that COI was involved intensively as well. Further, Mr. Sudol stated that the internal issues within the College have already been discussed at the Assembly. Mr. Latcha supported the idea that the program was not cost-free, noting that it was clear in the budget to be the case. He also asserted that all other deans asked to submit letters of support for new programs have done so. Vice-President Beaghan also stated at an SBRC meeting that such a letter would be helpful. Ms. Jackson observed that the SPRC was the only review committee to approve the program, but that it too had a list of questions. One major problem for the committee was that the proposal was not authored by faculty members. The lack of a dean's letter was also troubling, particularly since the proposal itself was authored and generated by the dean's office. Ms. Moore pointed out that a similar process took place with the

MALS proposal, and said it was obvious that a College-wide proposal approved by College governance has full support of the dean.

Ms. Jackson called for a division of assembly, which entailed a roll-call vote.

Yes: Connery, Eis, Folberg, Grossman, Insko, Keane, Mabee, Marks, Mitton, Piskulich, Russell, Schartman, Schweitzer, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Voelck

No: Chopin, Cole, Doman, English, Grimm, Jackson, Kim, Latcha, Leibert, Medaugh, Meehan, Osborne, Polis, Southward, Tracy, Wells

Abstain: Awbrey, Giblin, Gilson, Guessous, Jhashi, Lemarbe, Miller, Walters

With 16 in favor, 16 opposed, and 8 abstentions, Mr. Moudgil cast the deciding vote to pass the motion, with the expressed encouragement that the proposers return to the Senate in the fall to address the lingering problematic issues.

The last item of business was moved by Ms. Miller:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a [program leading to the Master of Science in Mechatronics](#).

Without discussion, the Senate voted to approve to program.

Mr. Moudgil then thanked the Senate members for their hard work over the year, and noted that through all the discussion, both positive and negative, the governance process works and makes the Senate a stronger body. The Steering Committee had a particularly difficult job and Mr. Moudgil recognized their leadership over the past year. He also took a moment to recognize Bill Keane, interim dean of the School of Education and Human Services, to thank him for his good work and his presence on the Senate. Diane Norris was recognized for her new role as acting dean of the School of Nursing. Lastly, Mr. Moudgil recognized the work of the secretary, Ms. Jhashi, in coordinating all the work of the Senate, as well as the contributions of the parliamentarian, Mr. Grossman.

The Senate adjourned at 2:50.

Respectfully submitted,
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi
Secretary to the University Senate

[1]CORRECTION:

The minutes of the May 25, 2010, University Senate meeting correctly recorded the following comment: “Mr. Folberg ... pointed out that the by-laws of the School of Health Sciences were approved five years after the Senate approved the school’s constitution.” At the time I thought this statement was in error but wished to make certain before asking for a correction to be made.

The initial constitution and by-laws for the School of Health Sciences were both approved by the Health Science Faculty Council on February 10, 1984 and subsequently both approved by the

University Senate on April 23, 1984. The April 23, 1984, Senate minutes mentioned only the constitution but both documents were presented and approved as noted on the file copies in the School of Health Sciences Dean's office. Both documents were developed under my leadership while I served as Interim Director for the Center for Health Sciences.

Joel W. Russell