

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E

Oakland University Senate

Fourth meeting
January 17, 2002

Minutes

Members present: Abiko, Aubry, K. Berven, Binkert, D. Clark, Coppin, Didier, Eberly, Eberwein, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Haddad, Henke, Hildebrand, Khapoya, Klemanski, LeMarbe, Lipman, Long, Machmut-Jhasi, Mann, McNair, Mosby, Moudgil, Osthaus, Russell, Schmidt, Schott-Baer, Schweitzer, Sevilla, Shablin, Sieloff, Willoughby.

Members absent: Alber, Bazaz, D.Berven, Blanks, Downing, Emrich, Frick, Gardner, Hansen-Smith, Jarski, Kheir, Latcha, Mukherji, Olson, Otto, Rozek, Sangeorzan, Schwartz, Sethi, Smith, Stamps, Surrey.

[Note: the list above is based on those individuals who were present at the time of the roll call]

Summary of actions:

A. Information items.

1. Update on Senate request for Faculty Liaison to Board of Trustees
2. Academic Calendar
3. Telephone Directory
4. Assessment Committee report--Ms. McNair
5. General Education process--Ms. Awbrey, Ms. Piskulich

B. Approval of the minutes of the December 6, 2001 meeting.

C. Good and welfare.

1. Motion directing the Steering Committee to nominate two faculty senators for Senate approval to represent the Senate at Board of Trustees meetings. (Mr. Russell, Ms. Sieloff)
Approved following a motion to waive the second reading (Mr. Lipman, Mr. Binkert)

Faculty liaisons to Board of Trustees

Welcoming the assembled Senators, Mr. Moudgil called the meeting to order and shared with the group copies of letters relating to the Senate's request for faculty liaisons on the Board of Trustees. He reported that the Steering Committee expressed concern that we did not get what we asked for, but he noted the letter from the Board president indicates that we are doing a better job of communicating than in the past. He suggested that one thing the Senate might do is invite members of the Board to a Senate meeting, possibly in the early fall. The advantage with this would be that the time limitations that are part of Board meetings would not be a limiting factor since the Senate would control the time and agenda. He offered to work with the President and Board to get as many Board members to attend as possible.

In the meantime he asked for suggestions as to what we can do connect us better with the

Board. He noted that we don't always get everything we ask for but indicated that he hopes to implement as many of the AARC's recommendations as possible. Ms. Nicholson has extended a friendly hand, he advised, and we need to work with it in a positive way rather than becoming confrontational. Mr. Russell commented that we shouldn't lose sight of our objective which is to have faculty input to the Board and the ability to address issues in the same way students can. The procedure for submitting cards to speak to agenda items works to some extent, but doesn't work when things come up that are not on the Board's agenda. A recent example was the building priorities decision; many people would have liked to address this issue but could not since it had not been listed as an agenda item. He felt that the Board should allow people to speak to issues being discussed before they vote. Mr. Moudgil emphasized that he wasn't suggesting that we abandon our objective, but rather we pursue it by communicating more with the Board; he also agreed that faculty and other individuals should have greater latitude to address issues that come before the Board, especially those that don't appear on the agenda.

Ms. Sieloff agreed with Mr. Russell. The faculty request was to improve communication through the creation of liaisons like the students. She added that she did not feel the communication is good between faculty and the Board, that there should be a partnership between the faculty, students and Board and that the faculty is being left out of the partnership. She also felt that the letter provided no good reason for the Board's denying our request. Mr. Graves thought it came down to the basic issue of shared governance and if shared governance means anything, there should be a strong presumption that a unanimous request from the Senate should go into effect. What we've asked for is trivial, easily enacted and all the burdens would fall on the faculty members. Under those circumstances, the rationale, the burden of proof expressed by the Board in their letter denying the request is inadequate. Mr. Khapoya noted that the request was endorsed by both the Provost and the President and wondered if one could read anything into the fact that the Board said "no."

Mr. Moudgil stated that academics have the ability to disagree and suggested that we move forward and explore other avenues while working toward the goal. On a practical note, he pointed out that we can't get money by fighting with people. Mr. Russell suggested that we have Senate members attend Board meetings and report back to the Senate. Mr. Binkert supported Mr. Russell's suggestion, especially since the Board feels that it is getting all the information needed and that faculty input isn't needed. Mr. Henke asked if it would be appropriate to send the Board a response, explaining why we initiated the request for liaisons, the problems faculty encounter in being heard, and asking the Board to suggest ways to get a dialogue going. Mr. Russell proposed having the Steering Committee identify two Senators to attend Board meetings. Ms. Didier asked if this would be two people on an ongoing basis or rotating representatives, which might give a broader flavor of the faculty. The possibility of a motion was raised, and on the advice of the parliamentarian, was postponed to the good and welfare portion of the agenda.

Academic calendar

Moving onto the next information items, Mr. Moudgil opened the floor for discussion about the academic calendar, expressing his concern about the proximity of graduation to Christmas. He distributed a [handout](#) with data indicating that the December graduation was reasonably successful and noted that all the state-assisted universities in Michigan have December graduations. Ms. Eberwein pointed out that the Senate does not approve the calendar, the Board does, although it was brought to the Senate as an information item. Around 15 years ago, the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction recommended strongly that the

university calendar include a 24 hour reading period between the end of classes and the beginning of exams and this was implemented by the Provost. However, this year, because of the opening convocation, the reading period was truncated. Moving graduation even earlier in December would affect the reading period and she felt would adversely affect the academic success of the students. She proposed moving graduation to January--this wouldn't interfere with holidays and travel plans, most of our students remain in the area, and we would then know who has earned honors. In reply to Mr. Moudgil's concern about students leaving the area, Ms. Eberwein opined that we'd lose them anyway. Mr. Binkert commented that it would be nice to have more faculty show up, that parents and students come for the ceremony and expect to see faculty. The provost agreed, adding that this has been a concern at OU for many years, that faculty have not been highly represented at any commencement, and that we need to find ways to increase participation. Mr. Dickow thought that many December grads might have moved on and wouldn't attend a January ceremony. Mr. Sevilla pointed out that we have graduation ceremonies not to hand out diplomas or honors, but rather as a celebration for students and parents, a chance for them to revel in and be recognized for their accomplishments.

Telephone books.

Mr. Moudgil reported that, according to the information he has been given, the long delayed telephone books would be available in a week or so.

Assessment Committee

Ms McNair reported on the Assessment Committee's goals for the year. Since many units find assessment difficult to fit in, the committee is looking for ways of making it easier to do. This includes:

1. Providing more support for academic units, having people designated to do assessment and providing strategies to streamline the process;
2. The Committee is working with areas that have professional accreditation and looking for ways to utilize the accreditation reports in the university assessment process;
3. The committee is planning an assessment workshop for next September;
4. [Assessment information](#) is being posted to the web on the OIRA site. This will include sample reports so units can see what other units have done along with hints and links to other sites.

She concluded by stating that the Assessment Committee welcomes feedback on assessment and encouraged Senate members to inform the Committee of their concerns, problems and ideas.

General Education Learning Outcomes.

Ms. Awbrey opened her remarks by explaining that she wanted to provide more information on general education and especially the learning outcomes. She reminded everyone that the learning outcomes were the result of faculty input concerning what outcomes were important for general education. The Task Force did not include every idea but only those that were mentioned multiple times. The idea that these are idealistic and may not work in practice may be true but she did want to acknowledge the faculty as the source. Senate input has been helpful in determining what sorts of changes might be needed, in particular the fact that there are too many learning outcomes. The next step is to reduce the number of outcomes with perhaps 3-4 in each category and to put them in priority order. The Senate indicated that it needed to see how the outcomes might be implemented before deciding on which ones should be included, so Mr. Tracy and Mr. Graves have developed three possible [approaches](#). Learning outcomes from the General Education report are reduced in all of them. One model requires a

lot of change, one moderate change and the third, very little change. She presented the following overview:

In Approach 1, the general education courses all become 3 credit courses and all knowledge areas are included.:

Goal

- *Create a General Education program that requires all of the items identified as important to General Education in the faculty focus groups and maintains following goals:*
 - *Knowledge, Skill, and Value areas should be identified and have learning outcomes*
 - *All knowledge areas are not the same. Some are fundamental to General Education.*
 - *A capstone course should unify General Education, bring about student introspection, and facilitate assessment*
 - *General Education is fundamental to all students' educational development*
- *Roughly equivalent in credit hours to the current General Education program*

Approach

- *14 modules required*
- *Only 3-credit courses are used to satisfy a module's Learning Outcomes (42 credits)*
- *General Requirements met*

Rationale

- *No knowledge areas should compete for students*
- *All students should be exposed to each knowledge area*
- *More areas can be taken if courses are 3 credits*

Strengths of Approach

- *Students are exposed to all 14 knowledge areas thought important by faculty*
- *Provides students with a common base of knowledge and understanding*
- *Fits into 42 credits*
- *Encourages interdisciplinary activities*
- *Assessment is consistent*

Weaknesses of Approach

- *Requires change from OU tradition (4 credit courses)*
 - *Students take more courses to create a full load*
 - *Requires more faculty/space than current General Education program*
-

In Approach 2 the change is moderate:

4-Credit Courses Requiring 11 Knowledge Areas

Goal

- *Create a General Education program that requires all of the items identified as important to General Education in the faculty focus groups and maintains the following goals:*
 - *Knowledge, Skill, and Value areas should be identified and have learning outcomes*
 - *All knowledge areas are not the same. Some are fundamental to General Education.*
 - *A capstone course should unify General Education, bring about student introspection, and facilitate assessment*
 - *General Education is fundamental to all students' educational development*
- *Roughly equivalent in credit hours to the current General Education program*

Approach

- *Repackage the 14 modules from Approach 1 into 11 required modules through:*
 - Inquiry and Meaning module becomes the Capstone course*
 - International Perspective moved to Global Values*
 - Gender, Race, Ethnicity moved to new Value area*
 - Natural World, Technology and Invention, and Well Being modules*
 - Combined into Physical Sciences and Technology, and*
 - Life Sciences and Well Being (3 modules combined into 2)*
- *Only 4-credit courses are used*
- *General Requirements met*

Rationale

- *Desire to have 4-credit instead of 3-credit modules to conform to majority of OU classes*
- *Inquiry module readily lends itself to being a capstone*
- *Gender, Race, and Ethnicity and International Perspective when taught in several courses might allow students to see the issues from a number of disciplinary perspectives.*
- *Combining Natural World, Technology and Invention, and Well Being still accommodates the teaching of courses that would have been in each of the modules.*

Strengths of the Approach

- *Fits into 44 credits*
- *Uses 4-credit courses that are currently more standard at OU*
- *Provides students with a common base of knowledge and understanding (less than approach 1, more than approach 3)*

Weaknesses of Approach

- *Requires more faculty and space than current General Education*

Approach 3 looks very much like our current program:

Goal

- *Create a General Education program that uses learning outcomes and maintains the selection grid concept*
- *Maintains the following goals:*
 - *Knowledge, Skill, and Value areas should be identified and have learning outcomes*
 - *All knowledge areas are not the same. Some are fundamental to General Education.*
 - *A capstone course should unify General Education, bring about student introspection, and facilitate assessment*
 - *General Education is fundamental to all students' educational development*
- *Roughly equivalent in credit hours to the current General Education program*

Approach

- *Five Knowledge Areas*
 - *Written Expression Area (1 course)*
 - *Social Science Area (2 courses) – in different disciplines*
 - *Natural Science Area (3 courses) – 1 or 2 mathematics courses, 1 or 2 natural science courses (if 2, one in both physical and life sciences), 1 course with hands-on laboratory*
 - *Humanities Area (4 courses) 1 course in each of 4 areas (Language/International Culture, History/Philosophy, Literature, Arts)*
 - *Capstone Course*
- *11 required courses*
- *At least one additional course besides the Capstone must be interdisciplinary*
- *General Requirements met*

Rationale

- *Be able to use more traditional university courses*
- *Less specificity regarding which course content will be taught*

Strengths of Approach

- *Fits into 44 credits*
- *Uses 4-credit courses, Oakland University tradition*
- *Requires fewer new faculty*

Weaknesses of Approach

- *Areas are competing for students*
- *Students don't take all knowledge areas*
- *Students have less common experience across General Education*

After reviewing the pros and cons of the three approaches she opened the floor for questions. Mr. Willoughby asked how models 2 and 3 would affect assessment. Ms. Awbrey replied that assessment for all the models would be embedded in the course. If there are three or four learning outcomes for each of the knowledge areas and two to three for the skills and values areas, then whatever course being taught would have those embedded outcomes in it and

students would be assessed based on those outcomes. She thought perhaps students might develop a portfolio or web site as they progress that would serve as an assessment tool and pointed out that all students would take a capstone course. In response to a query about how this would affect transfer students, Ms. Awbrey indicated that a subcommittee is looking at this. She added it will fit in very well with recent changes at OCC. Mr. Lipman, commenting on model 1, noted that it isn't clear that requiring more faculty is a weakness, that more faculty per student is in fact positive. In response to his comment that it is difficult to evaluate the models since we haven't blessed the outcomes, Ms. Awbrey pointed out that the Senate wanted to see the models in order to evaluate the outcomes. Ms. Awbrey also encouraged everyone to e-mail her their ideas regarding the knowledge areas and learning outcomes that should be a part of every student's education. Mr. Russell reported that the Senate Planning Review Committee is also looking at learning outcomes and will be bringing their report to the Senate.

In response to a concern about the professional schools, Ms. Awbrey indicated that the schools were well represented both at the dialogue dinners and on the Task Force. She suggested that professional schools could get involved by proposing general education classes that would meet the learning outcomes. Ms. McNair asked about assessing learning goals in the area of out-of-classroom experience, and Ms. Awbrey said they'd have to look into it. Mr. Grossman noted that currently some general education classes can be used to fulfill the requirements of the major and asked if that is likely to continue. Ms. Awbrey responded that we need to find a way to do this so students aren't unduly burdened. She added that there's some concern about the number of courses that will ultimately be accepted and that the General Education Committee would be responsible for determining which courses and how many courses will satisfy the requirements. She emphasized the importance of the learning outcomes, assessment and the addition of a capstone course for coherence.

Ms. Eberwein asked for additional information about the capstone course and how it will work. Ms. Awbrey indicated that right now it is open for development and that the faculty may exercise its creativity in putting together a course that will be an integrating experience for students. Mr. Binkert asked if one course would satisfy one skill. Ms. Awbrey indicated no, that a particular skill, for example, critical thinking, might be a part of many different courses.

Having dispensed with the general education discussion, the Senate then turned its attention to the roll call and the approval of the [minutes](#) of the Dec. 7th, 2001 meeting. The minutes were approved following Mr. Mann's motion and Mr. Coppin's second.

Good and welfare.

With no old business or new business to occupy the group, attention then focused on good and welfare. Mr. Russell moved and Ms. Sieloff seconded the following motion (which has been slightly reworded with the approval of the movers to incorporate all the suggestions from the floor):

MOVED that the Steering Committee nominate two faculty Senators for Senate approval to serve as Senate representatives to the Board of Trustees for the duration of their Senate terms.

Mr. Lipman moved to waive the second reading, Mr. Binkert seconded, and the Senate approved the waiving unanimously. The Senate then proceeded to approve the main motion, also unanimously. Ms. Schott-Baer asked if the Board would officially be notified that this was

approved, and Mr. Moudgil responded that he would take care of it.

Ms. McNair reminded the Senators of an upcoming teleconference on critical thinking. And with no further business to transact, the chair entertained Mr. Sevilla's motion to adjourn at 4:45.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate
2/12/02

COMMENCEMENT REPORT

December 22, 2001 Commencement Ceremony

Number of degree candidates that applied and were invited to commence (Sprint, Summer and Fall 2001)

CAS, GS & SHS(10:00 a.m.)	540
SECS & SBA (1:00 p.m.)	545
SEHS & SON (4:00 p.m)	591
Total	1676
	(228*)
	1,448

*Of this estimated total, 456 were Spring 2001 graduates. During the transition, Spring graduates were invited to attend either the May 2001 or December 2001 ceremonies. We used the assumption that half attended each ceremony. In the future, the December 2002 ceremonies will be comprised of only Summer graduates and Fall degree candidates.

Estimated number of degree candidates that participated:

CAS, GS & SHS (10:00 a.m.)	192
SECS & SBA (1:00 p.m.)	257
SEHS & SON (4:00 p.m)	263
Total	712

Percentage of attendance: 49.2%

Past percentages

September 10, 2000 (spring & summer) 45.4%
 May 5, 2001 (fall and winter) 58.3%

Number of guests (through turnstiles):

CAS, GS & HSH	1,189
SECS & SBA	1,607
SEHS & SON	1,654
<u>Total</u>	4,450

Feedback:

The President's Office received numerous positive comments regarding the ceremonies (venue, time, and overall atmosphere) from graduates, guests, faculty and platform party. Some faculty expressed concern that the December 22nd date was too late in the month.

Registrar:

Fall commencement date must be determined by march 2002 to be published in Fall Schedule of Classes. However, many students plan for this day even further in advance.

The December 21,2002 commencement date is already published on the Web site but has a disclaimer as being "tentative."

The Board of Trustees has approved the 2002-03 & 2003-04 academic calendar. Any changes would require their approval.

The Registrar conducted a survey in 2000 - 14 of the 15 Michigan Public universities conduct commencements in December (attached [below]). Oakland was the exception.

Fall Commencement [Report prepared by Steven J. Shablin]

Current Procedure:

Oakland University schedules two commencements for graduating students. One is offered in May and the other in September. Students who attend the May commencement have either completed degree requirements the previous Fall term (around 700 students) or awaiting certification of degree completion requirements as of the Winter term (around 1,200 students). Students who typically attend the September commencement have completed degree requirements as of the Spring (about 450 students) or Summer terms (about 500 students).

Proposed Recommendation:

Change the Fall commencement date from September to December. The majority of students that graduate during the academic year, complete degree requirements at the end of the winter term, with Fall the, second and Spring/Summer last.

One option is to schedule the Fall commencement date prior to final examinations or on the last day of final examinations or the other option is to schedule the Fall commencement immediately after final examinations.

Both of these models are used by the other 14 Michigan public institutions. Please see the Michigan public university data below:

University	Fall 2000 Start Date	Fall 2000 End Date	Last Exam Date	Commencement
Central Michigan	8/28 Mon	12/9 Sat	12/15 Fri	12/16 Sat
Eastern Michigan	8/30 Wed	12/12 Tue	12/18 Mon	12/17 Sun
Ferris State	8/28 Thurs	12/8 Fri	12/15 Fri	12/16 Sat
Grand Valley	8/28 Thurs	12/9 Sat	12/16 Sat	12/16 Sat
Lake Superior	9/16 Wed	12/15 Fri	12/22 Fri	12/22 Fri
Michigan State	8/28 Mon	12/8 Fri	12/15 Fri	12/8-9 Fri-Sat
Michigan Tech	8/28 Mon	12/16 Sat	12/22 Fri	12/16 Sat
Northern Michigan*	8/30/99 Mon	12/11/99 Sat	12/18/99 Sat	12/18/99 Sat
Oakland University	9/5 Tues	12/11 Mon	12/19 Tues	5/5/2001 Sat
Saginaw Valley	8/28 Mon	12/9 Sat	12/16 Sat	12/15 Fri
U of M - Ann Arbor	9/6 Wed	12/13 Wed	12/22 Fri	12/17 Sun
-Dearborn	9/6 Wed	12/12 Tues	12/20 Wed	12/17 Sun
-Flint	8/31 Thurs	12/11 Mon	12/19 Tue	12/17 Sun
Wayne State*	9/7/99 Tue	12/15/99 Wed	12/23/99 Thu	12/16/99 Tue
Western Michigan	8/28 Mon	12/2 Sat	12/8 Fri	12/9 Sat

*Fall 2000 dates are unavailable, Fall 1999 dates used instead.

The majority of these institutions schedule the Fall commencement the weekend before the holiday weekend. For example, for the Fall 200 term, this date is wither Saturday, December 16 or Sunday, December 17. At Oakland University, Fall 2000 final examinations continue through Tuesday, December 19. Michigan State University has the earliest December commencement date, Friday, December 8 and Saturday, December 9. Lake Superior State University has the latest December commencement date, Friday, December 22.

The Registrar recommendation is to schedule Fall commencement the Saturday before the holiday weekend. The effective term will be Fall 2001. The proposed date of Fall 2001

commencement will be Saturday, December 14, 2001.

Letter from the Chair of the Board of Trustees

Office of the Board of Trustees
203 Wilson Hall
Rochester, MI 48309-4401

Gary D. Russi , President
Oakland University
Rochester, MI 48309-4401

RE: Faculty Liaisons

Dear Dr. Russi:

Thank you for forwarding the University Senate's endorsement of the motion requesting that the Board of Trustees create two faculty liason positions.

We note that you previously forwarded the Senate's endorsement of the recommendations made by the Academic Affairs Review Committee, and that those recommendations include the same request. As you know, I advised the Chairman of that Committee that the Board gave a great deal of thought to that recommendation, but chose not to create faculty liason positions at this time.

The Board feels that the recommendations assume a lack of communication between the faculty and the administration that is not consistent with the level of communication and cooperation currently being demonstrated on campus. Furthermore, the Board is very comfortable that it obtains all information necessary to carry out its duties, and that it does so responsibly and effectively.

Although the Board will not create faculty liason positions, faculty members are of course welcome to attend all scheduled open meetings of the Board and address the Board with a cross-section of faculty views and opinions when recognized to do so. The Board recognized that those communications can be, and are normally made through the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. However, the Board has also found the faculty lunches and visit to schools and departments that have been scheduled in the past to be most informative, and the Board encourages your administration to facilitate similar opportunities for the Trustees to meet and talk with faculty members in the future.

Finally the Board supports your stated intent to continue to improve communications between the faculty and the administration. In that regard, you have the full confidence of the Board as we all work toward improving Oakland University to endure that it continues to provide an outstanding educational experience for our students.

Very truly yours,
Ann V. Nicholson
Chairperson

January 7, 2002

Dr. Virinder Moudgil
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Oakland University
Rochester, MI 48309-4401

Dear Dr. Moudgil:

Immediately following the receipt of your December 11, 2001 letter (attached [below]), I forwarded it to Oakland University Board of Trustee Chair Ann Nicholson with our support and asked for a response. Today I received her response (attached [above] on behalf of the Board of Trustees.

While the Board does not choose to create faculty liaison positions, the Board Chair outlined some potential approaches to foster faculty and Board interaction which I endorse. Of course, there may be additional approaches that should be considered. I encourage you to visit with the University Senate Steering Committee to establish meaningful opportunities for the Board to interact with the faculty.

I would appreciate it if you could share the results of your conversation with the Steering Committee so I can give feedback to the Board.

Sincerely,
Gary D. Russi
President

December 11, 2001

Gary D. Russi
President
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan 48309-4401

Dear Dr. Russi:

At its December 6, 2001, meeting the Oakland University Senate endorsed the following motion:

1. Motion from the Steering Committee to re-endorse the resolution the Senate approved concerning faculty liaisons to the Board of Trustees (Mr. Khapoya)

MOVED that the Senate re-endorse the resolution approved February 18, 1999, concerning faculty liaisons to the Board of Trustees:

*Whereas, the development and promotion of teambuilding to work toward goals consistent with the university mission and vision is a process which implements Strategy 7 of the Oakland University Strategic Plan 1995-2005, and
Whereas, it is consistent with that process and strategy to increase communication between the Oakland University Board of Trustees and the Oakland University faculty through regular and structured means, and
Whereas, the Board of Trustees has previously increased communication between the Board and Oakland University students through the creation of two student liaison positions,*

Therefore be it Resolved, that the Oakland University Senate requests that the Board of Trustees create two faculty liaison positions; and be it further Resolved, that such faculty liaisons may

- a. attend all scheduled open meetings of the Board*
- b. address the Board when recognized to do so*
- c. provide a cross-section of faculty views and opinions to the Board*
- d. make periodic reports regarding Board activities to faculty groups*
- e. participate in an orientation program*
- f. receive such materials and participate in such other activities as the Board shall determine; and be it further*

Resolved, that such faculty liaisons shall serve staggered two-year terms which shall begin in June of each year and with the first year of implementation beginning in June 1999; and be it further

Resolved, that to achieve staggered terms, in the first year of implementation one faculty liaison shall serve a one-year term; and be it further

Resolved, that such faculty liaisons shall be elected from and by those full-time nonvisiting faculty holding the ranks of Instructor, Special Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor; and be it further

Resolved, that faculty liaisons who shall have served for four consecutive years at the end of their current terms shall not be eligible for immediate re-election; and be it further,

Resolved, that said election be conducted by the Senate Elections Committee.

I would like to bring this information to your attention and offer my support and cooperation in forwarding this recommendation. May I also request that you forward this information to members of the Oakland University Board of Trustees.

Sincerely,
Virinder K. Moudgil
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

cc: Senate Steering Committee members

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page