



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Thursday, March 29, 1979
3:15 p.m.
128, 129, 130 Oakland Center

MINUTES

Senators Present: Allvin, Arnold, Blatt, Boulos; Burke, Butterworth, Chernov, Coon, DeMent, Eberwein, Edgerton, Evans, Ghausi, Goudsmit, Grossman, Halsted, Hampton, Hohaus, Hovanessian, Jackson, Jaymes, Johnson, Jones, Matthews, McKay, Merz, Moeller, O'bear, O'Dowd, Osthaus, Pogany, Riley, Rogers, Russell, Scherer, Seeber, Stanovich, Stransky, Torch, Tower, Twietmeyer, Wargo, Weiner, Williamson

Senators Absent: Bantel, Barry, Braun, Coffman, Doherty, Felton, Heubel, Hildum, Holladay, Howes, Kleckner, Kohn, Krompart, Ozinga

Mr. O'Dowd presided.

Mr. O'Dowd turned to Ms. Jean Colburn who introduced Mr. Mark Mantarian, a Student Life Scholar, and a major in biological sciences. Mr. Mantarian's concern is with handicapped students and has since December been working with Ms. Colburn in this area. His request to appear before the Senate was inspired by a formal need to begin familiarizing the academic faculty and staff to the problems and needs of handicapped students. Mr. Mantarian outlined the provisions of Section 504 of the Federal Act dealing with the requirement that public institutions enjoying federal support must so comport themselves that access to physical structures and services be made to handicapped persons on an equal basis with others. In regards to classroom instruction, this may mean provision of signers in a class, a member of which may be deaf, or of tape-recorders, readers, materials in braille for a blind person. But, beyond these evidences of tangible assistance, faculty, staff, all who encounter handicapped students professionally ought to be aware of these students' learning disabilities and needs and be prepared to attempt to enhance the learning process for them in every way possible. The University is in process of making an inventory for its resources and activities in regards to handicapped students and must, within a very few years, file with the Federal Government (and the state also in some areas) a document certifying compliance with Section 504. Mr. Mantarian is located in 131 NFH and will be happy to assist in anyway he can.

Mr. Burke suggested a one page sheet summary of the matter for faculty. Mr. Mantarian indicated he would prepare such a summary. In response to an inquiry about the number of handicapped students currently enrolled, Mr. Mantarian replied that he has identified about fifteen, and estimates there are an additional 20 to 30 with whom he is trying to make contact.

Mr. O'Dowd thanked Mr. Mantarian for his presentation.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. and attention was directed to the Agenda.

A. Old Business:

1. Motion from UCUI concerning changes in withdrawal date (Kleckner/Tower).

Mr. Moeller, seconded by Mr. Chernov introduced an amendment such that the following paragraphs would be added to the main motion:

- a. Students withdrawing from courses prior to the end of the refund period will be assigned a "W" by the Registrar.
- b. Students withdrawing from courses between the end of the refund period and one week before the beginning of the final examination period will receive a "WS or WN", as assigned by the individual instructors.

Mr. Moeller explained that his amendment would provide an absolute fit with the "WS/WN" policy and would bring undergraduate regulations into conformity with graduate regulations in this particular. The amendment was adopted upon voice vote. Attention was then directed to the main motion as amended which was approved by voice vote as follows:

MOVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT THAT STUDENTS WHO WISH TO WITHDRAW OFFICIALLY FROM ALL COURSES IN WHICH THEY ARE REGISTERED MUST FILE AN OFFICIAL WITHDRAWAL WITH THE APPROPRIATE OFFICE FOR THAT PURPOSE PRIOR TO THE START OF THE LAST WEEK OF UNIVERSITY COURSES DURING THE TERM OF WITHDRAWAL:

A. STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COURSES PRIOR TO THE END OF THE REFUND

PERIOD WILL BE ASSIGNED A "W" BY THE REGISTRAR.

B. STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM COURSES BETWEEN THE END OF THE REFUND PERIOD AND ONE WEEK BEFORE THE BEGINNING OF THE FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD WILL RECEIVE A "WS OR WN", AS ASSIGNED BY THE INDIVIDUAL.

2? Motion from the Faculty Council for the School of Performing Arts concerning power of primary faculty appointment In the discipline of Dance (Chernov/Obear).

Mr. Stransky inquired whether the decision to move the dance program to SPA had been made and if so when and by whom? Mr. Stransky was referred to Senate legislation (2/16/78) and Board action (3/22/78) which established the Faculty Council and which contained provision for Dance as a performing arts discipline in SPA. Mr. Chernov pointed out that PAFCO was granted the right to activate the Dance (DAN) rubric by UCUI in accordance with the provision of the original Senate legislation. The question whether dance could be offered by Physical Education any longer was raised by Mr. Stransky and Mr. Van Fleet. Messrs. Eberwein and Matthews explained that Physical Education might conceivably continue to offer dance courses if it so chooses, but not under the DAN rubric. Mr. Van Fleet traced (with deserved pride) the history of dance at the University under the auspices of Physical Education since 1967 and regretted its loss to that agency: Mr. Coon expressed concern with the effect of this measure upon the budget of SHES. Agreeably to the house, the question was called and the main motion

unamended was approved by voice vote as follows:

MOVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE BOARD THAT THE FACULTY COUNCIL FOR THE SCHOOL OF PERFORMING ARTS BE AUTHORIZED TO RECOMMEND PRIMARY APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY IN THE DISCIPLINE OF DANCE.

3. Motion concerning approval of a program of graduate studies leading to the Education Specialist degree (Johnson/Coon).

Mr. Hovanesian inquired whether Mr. Briod was prepared to report on enrollments in this degree program at other Michigan institutions? Mr. Briod was prepared to report on six out of the seven institutions offering this degree (NMU being inaccessible); UMAA and WMU had small programs (due to the presence of PhD programs at those institutions) numbering about 15 graduates a year; CMU, EMU and MSU graduated about 40 a year with entering classes of about 60; WSU graduated about 64 a year. On the question of a new faculty position for this program, Mr. Coon explained that for the moment present faculty would handle the load, but that if enrollments justified, then later on a new position would be added. Upon call of the question. the main motion unamended was approved by voice vote as follows:

MOVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE BOARD THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM OF GRADUATE STUDIES LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF EDUCATION SPECIALIST, EFFECTIVE UPON AUTHORIZATION BY THE APPROPRIATE FUNDING AGENCIES OF THE STATE.

B. New Business:

1. Motion from the University Committee for Undergraduate Instruction and Center for Health Sciences concerning raising the credit limit of the Medical Technology degree program from 128 to 136 moved by Mr. Moeller, seconded by Mr. Jones.

Mr. Moeller indicated Ms. Lynne Williams would respond to questions. Ms. Williams attested the proposed credit limit fitted the general pattern around the state. Mr. Moeller inquired what effect University adoption of a three credit course mode would have on the Medical Technology credit distribution. Ms. Williams replied that she thought the credit limit might be reduced, but that this matter should be considered at the appropriate time. Mr. Matthews pointed out that should a three credit mode be adopted virtually all undergraduate programs would need to be reexamined. Mr. Butterworth asked for elaboration on the subject of the internship (senior) year. Ms. Williams responded that 28 credits were allowed for clinical internship, the studies being entirely at hospitals: 28 credits is low, we have shaved this component to a minimum. She explained that the MT clinical internship was not standardized in the state; however- all but MSU are on a three-plus-one pattern; MSU requires a four year baccalaureate with student responsibility to find a suitable location for the clinical (fifth) year. Mr. Dement inquired about the credit distribution of the full program as it might be under the proposed 136 credits.

Ms. Williams passed out a summary of the credit distribution. Mr. McKay wondered whether our program was of less academic substance than that of MSU? Ms. Williams emphasized that

MSU is the only institution in the state on the four-plus-one pattern; in order properly to fit the program into the common three-plus-one pattern, 136 credits are needed to give OU's program sufficient academic weight. Mr. O'Dowd remarked that the three-plus-one pattern, may be a consequence of the reluctance of insurance companies to permit hospitals to finance hospital schools .from insurance sources; thus, hospitals turn to universities to incorporate clinical studies in their budgets. In reply to a question of Mr. McKay's, Mr. Obear stated that the University appoints appropriate hospital personnel as adjuncts, and where necessary as instructors of record in the rank of lecturer. Mr. Riley wondered what control the University has? Mr. Obear replied that the control came in the Center for Health Sciences' appointment process. Ms. Rogers wanted to know whether Nursing and Engineering planned to raise the credit limits for their programs. Ms. Boulos and Mr. Ghausi, speaking for their schools, replied they had no such plans. Mr. Obear inquired what the effective date of the change would be? Ms. Williams replied that the effective date would be Fall, 1979, and would apply to students entering then and thereafter in a formal sense, but that most students already in the program would, in fact, graduate with at least the 136 credits.

Mr. DeMent inquired what the state licensure requirements were for Medical. Technology? Ms. Williams stated that in this case, the licensure is not state but federal. She indicated she would report about licensure requirements at the next meeting. Mr. DeMent was distressed that only 24 credits were assigned to general education. Mr. Matthews assured the Senate that the Commission on General Education was reviewing the problem and would make recommendations in due course.

No amendments were offered.

2. Motion from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and the Provost concerning power of primary appointment of faculty in the Institute of Biological Sciences, moved by Mr. Obear and seconded by Mr. Jones.

Mr. Russell inquired whether faculty in the Institute were (and would be) budgeted in the general fund? Mr. Obear replied that currently nearly all such positions were at least partially on general fund dollars; no tenured positions are fully on "soft" grant money and it is his intention to continue with this practice. Mr. Stransky remarked that on some campuses, such appointments bear the word "research" in the professional title. Mr. Obear agreed this was the case, but not at all universally? many universities use titles similar to what is proposed here. In our case, research will be the primary responsibility, but some advanced undergraduate and graduate instruction is occasionally assigned to Institute faculty members. Mr. McKay returned to Mr. Russell's initial question: he felt that ultimately faculty in the Institute were dependent upon "soft" grant money. Mr. Obear maintained it was a question of definition at the current time, taking indirect cost recovery into consideration; the Institute earns money for the University and the University budgets Institute salary support in the general fund account. Mr. Obear indicated he expected this pattern to continue in the future. Mr. Russell wanted to know whether a new faculty appointee would be made aware that her/his position might be in jeopardy should grant money dry up? Mr. Reddy pointed to the strong sense of collegiality in the Institute which permits a member to be carried by colleagues over short-term grant less times. Mr. O'Dowd wondered what would happen should an individual's grant support totally dry up? Mr. Obear reflected that conceivably in the remote possibility of a severe dry-up of federal funds for the Institute, staff reductions would have to be made; but, in such a case, the Institute would be treated on equity with other academic units in the University. This is, in Mr.

Obear's view, most unlikely.

Mr. McKay wondered what faculty bodies had been consulted in the process of framing this measure? Mr. Obear replied that in the absence of a Senate sanctioned faculty affairs committee, he had to ask the Steering Committee to steer the measure and that the Steering Committee had identified APPC as the only committee whose charge reasonably covered the case. Mr. Williamson asked whether the Department of Biological Sciences had been consulted? Mr. Butterworth replied that in any formal sense it had not. Mr. Torch remarked that only recently the department had determined not to make appointments of the sort here being considered. Recent appointments have been made through the Center for Health Sciences.

Messrs. Edgerton and Grossman were concerned about the appointment review procedure to be followed. Mr. Obear replied that the Health Science CAP would be used in order to avoid development of yet another such body; procedures have already been developed to accommodate Institute faculty review and would be in accordance with the faculty contract as a matter of course. Mr. Russell, still not satisfied about the "soft" vs. "hard" money issue, requested Mr. Obear for definitive statement. Mr. Obear replied he would reconsider this matter and perhaps be able to provide further classification at the 4/12/79 meeting.

No amendments were offered.

At 5:15 p.m., Mr. O'Dowd departed for shores unknown and Mr. Matthews assumed the chair.

C. Good and Welfare: Private Resolutions

None were offered.

Noting that the minutes of 3/29/79 had not been considered at the usual time, Mr. Matthews asked that the minutes be approved as distributed. Upon motion of Mr. Arnold, seconded by Ms. Rogers, the minutes of 3/29/79 were approved by voice vote.

Upon proper motion, duly seconded and approved by voice vote, the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page