

Oakland University Senate

Fourth Meeting
December 9, 1999

Minutes

Members present: Andrews, Carter, Coppin, Downing, Early, Eberly, Eberwein, Esposito, Fink, Grossman, Herman, Hildebrand, Long, Mayer, McNair, Mili, Mitchell, Mosby, Nakao, Pfeiffer, Riley, Rozek, Russell, Schwartz, Sen, Shablin, Sieloff, Speer, Stamps, Sudol, Wood

Members absent: Alber, Benson, Blanks, Boddy, Braunstein, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Chapman Didier, Dow, Estes, Gardner, Kleckner, Liboff, Marks, D. Moore, K. Moore, Moran, Olson, Otto, Polis, Rusek, Schochetman, Sharma

Summary of actions:

1. Approval of the minutes of the November 18, 1999 meeting. (Eberwein, Schwartz) Approved.
2. Motion to increase the credit requirements for the Nurse Anesthesia program. (Sieloff, Early) Approved following approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Andrews, Sieloff)
3. Motion to recommend approval of a Ph.D. in Biomedical Sciences with a specialization in Biological Communication. (Andrews, Downing) First reading.

Mr. Esposito called the meeting to order and directed the Senate's attention to the [minutes](#) of the November 18th meeting. Ms. Eberwein moved that they be approved, Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion and the minutes were approved as distributed.

Mr. Esposito then explained that a proposed change in the 2000-2001 academic calendar that would have delayed the start of classes until Wednesday has been scrapped. The idea was to provide for the new student convocation on the Tuesday after Labor Day. However, the plan would have either meant that grades would not go out until after Christmas or that the study day would have been eliminated. Neither of those options was acceptable and so the change is no longer under consideration for next year. It may, however, be instituted in future years, depending on the calendar. Ms. Eberwein asked why change the calendar for the new student convocation. Mr. Herman responded that, in addition to the convocation, there are a number of orientation activities the university would like to undertake on that first day. He added that many students are still registering for classes or going through drop and add, that students could use the time to deal with financial aid matters and advising, and that not holding classes would also ensure adequate parking for the convocation. He felt it was a good idea but that it just didn't fit the calendar this coming year. One option would be to just hold the night classes, stated Ms. Eberwein. It is a possibility, responded Mr. Esposito and added that the institution needs to be careful to maintain a minimal number of class days.

Nurse Anesthesia Program

The first item of new business, a motion to increase the number of credits required in the Nurse Anesthesia Program to 55 was moved by Ms. Sieloff and seconded by Ms. Early. [Background information](#) was provided at the last meeting. With no questions or discussion following the presentation of the motion, Mr. Andrews ventured a motion to waive the second reading. Ms. Sieloff seconded and the motion to waive was approved by the requisite 3/4 vote of the Senate. The Senate then proceeded to approve the main motion.

Ph.D. in Biological Sciences

Moving on to the second item of new business, Mr. Andrews then moved that the Senate recommend to the President and Board the approval of a [Ph.D. program](#) in the biological sciences, with a concentration in biochemical communication. Mr. Downing provided the second and then spoke briefly about the program. He noted that the program has been in the development stage for several years and that it advances the University's commitment to developing niche-based graduate programs and addresses a need for graduates in this area. The program grows directly out of the strengths of the faculty and our relationship with Henry Ford Hospital. A strong infra-structure is in place and, although housed in the Department of Biological Sciences, it is an inter-disciplinary program that will also involve Chemistry, the ERI and Henry Ford Hospital. The proposed level of graduate stipends is feasible due to the support of the Hospital and faculty grants. The problem of library resources is a long standing one but students can use interlibrary loan and area library resources as well as personal libraries of faculty members. Of the four faculty positions included in the proposal, one has been hired and a search authorized for a second. He pointed out that all four positions need not be filled to launch the program but would be needed in a few years. In conclusion he stated that as the university grows, the resource base grows and so the introduction of this program will not necessarily and should not mean reductions in other areas of university support. [[Full text](#) of Mr. Downing's comments].

Mr. Russell asked if the concerns raised by the Senate [Planning](#) and [Budget](#) Committees have been addressed to the satisfaction of those committees. All we have are the reports that were included in the agenda, Mr. Esposito stated. There has been no further discussion with the committees since the reports were submitted. Mr. Downing indicated that he addressed a number of the issues raised in the reports in his comments. Mr. Moudgil added some additional background. Assessment is addressed in the proposal he pointed out but may need to be enhanced. He stated that the marketability of the program's graduates should be excellent since biotech and pharmaceutical firms are booming. He noted too, that Nobel prize winners in recent years have been in this area. Mr. Moudgil expressed his hope that the program will attract international students as well as national and local ones and quoted from a letter from the Rockefeller University which spoke to the strength of OU's undergraduate program. Ms. Papazian suggested that a written response to the issues raised could be prepared for the Senate's next meeting.

Mr. Russell expressed concern over recruitment of the students and over the budget, in particular, the proposed stipend and the impact it may have on current programs. Mr. Moudgil responded that the question of stipends is a long standing issue and that the biomedical sciences couldn't attract top level students if it weren't for the option of pooling resources, e.g. creating 3 fellowships out of 4. He indicated that hospitals have research funding and are interested in helping. He noted too that the new faculty in biology all have federal funds and are supporting a graduate student in their labs. Mr. Stamps expressed

support for the program but worried about the fact that funding is contingent on support from Henry Ford Hospital and soft money from research grants. What happens if some of the funding sources dry up, he asked. Mr. Moudgil replied that mechanisms are in place to deal with fluctuations in funding. Mr. Downing concurred, explaining that the College provides bridge funding when needed.

Mr. Schwartz wondered where the budget concerns would be addressed if the Senate were to approve this proposal. Mr. Esposito responded that he wasn't sure, that it is not clear what the program would require from the institution. Mr. Moudgil pointed out that the proposal is interdisciplinary and not exclusively dependent on up-front funding. Some of the budget items may not be applicable, for example, some students may not need a housing allowance. Ms. Papazian stated that the budget represents the absolute of what is needed and that, at best, there would be a great deal of support from Henry Ford and grants. At worst, the university would have to find ways to fund the program. In reply to a query about RA's vs. TA's, Mr. Moudgil stated that the emphasis on RA's was due to the connection with Henry Ford Hospital, that the students would be working there and HFH would share responsibility for their training. Mr. Stamps asked if the new faculty were part of the overall growth of the institution or were the result of positions being lost from other units on campus. Mr. Downing replied that they are incremental. Mr. Esposito stated that he likes the proposal, and thinks it builds on the institution's strengths, but added that he needs time to consider the implications and to find out the absolute minimum that the institution would need to supply. The program needs to know what it can rely upon from the university and the university's commitment needs to be clear to everyone.

Mr. Russell expressed concern about the impact on other programs; does this mean we fund these graduate students at a different rate than the others on campus he asked, adding that he doesn't want to see a group of graduate students becoming second class citizens. Graduate student stipends are currently \$8900. Mr. Moudgil responded that we don't pay all professors the same amount and he doesn't see the need to pay all graduate students the same.

Mr. Downing pointed out that there is a mechanism in place for new proposals, that each new program generates a new budget that is incremental to the base and which must be reviewed after five years to see how things are going. This process provides the opportunity to address issues relating to performance and a chance to look at the overall level of graduate support. Ms. Papazian added that the problem of graduate student support is a long-standing one and needs to be addressed. She added that work is being done on this but that while it is an important issue, it is also a separate issue from the program on the floor. Responding to a question about a line item of \$14,000 in instructional salaries, Mr. Moudgil said this pay would be for existing faculty to teach an extra course if necessary. Mr. Schwartz asked if the preliminary budget of \$1,400,000 included equipment and laboratories. Some is lab and equipment, replied Mr. Moudgil but noted too that a lot of the equipment is already in place. This budget item is to address the specific needs of individual faculty. Mr. Downing said that a major part of this item relates to the start-up costs for new faculty and Mr. Esposito added that it is normal to have these costs although the amount can vary a great deal. Mr. Moudgil pointed out that research grants provide the institution with income through the recovery of indirect costs and that he believes that the support for the program is something that can be worked out while maintaining the high quality of the program. Mr. Esposito stated that he will work with the proposers of the program to develop a response that would address the university commitment to the program. He agreed that approving a program with different levels of support from those already in place does have implications for other programs on campus. There was no further

discussion on the proposal and the Senate turned its attention to good and welfare items.

Good and welfare

Mr. Stamps asked for an update on the various task forces. Mr. Esposito responded that the International Task Force has been meeting, that subcommittees are working on various projects and that a report is due at the end of winter term. The [Enrollment Planning Committee](#) may have a draft report ready by the end of January and the report will then be shared with the university community. Mr. Stamps also wondered what was happening with the C/T bargaining and Mr. Esposito responded that the parties had agreed to go to fact-finding. Concerning the Senate Constitution, Mr. Esposito stated he will be meeting with the Board next week to discuss the amendments.

He also reported that possible future plans include:

- a. the formation of a committee to look at the area of Graduate Studies and Research and to consider whether these should be separate or combined administrative units;
- b. a [General Education](#) Planning Group to take the information gathered at the general education dinners this fall and to develop goals and learning objectives;
- c. the creation of a planning group to consider the idea of a [Teaching and Learning Institute](#);
- and d. the development of an Instructional and [Information Technology Strategic Plan](#), particularly in the light of plans to create an Instructional and Information Technology Center on campus.

No additional items were brought up for discussion, Mr. Esposito wished all a happy holiday and the Senate then adjourned, following a motion to that effect by Mr. Andrews.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate 1/18/2000

Back to

S E N A T E
Home Page