

## Oakland University Senate

Fifth Meeting  
February 18, 1999

### *Minutes*

Members present: Abraham, K. Andrews, S. Andrews, Bertocci, Boddy, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Connellan, Eberwein, Gardner, Grossman, Herman, Herold, Hildebrand, Johnson, Liboff, Long, Mabee, Macauley, Mitchell, Moore, Moran, Osthaus, Papazian, Pettengill, Polis, Reynolds, Riley, Rozek, Sen, Sieloff, Sudol, Wood; guests: Russi, Schaefer

Members absent: Alber, Benson, Blanks, Blume, David, Dillon, Doane, Downing, Haskell, Hovanesian, Jarski, Lilliston, Lombard, McNair, Moudgil, Mukherji, Olson, Ott, Otto, Schochetman, H. Schwartz, R. Schwartz, Simon, Speer, Weng

#### Summary of actions.

1. Approval of the minutes of January 14th. (Connellan, Wood) Approved.
2. Information items
  - a. Banner update (Rowe)
  - b. Library Committee update (Eberwein)
  - c. Y2K issues (Hansen)
  - d. Golf course-SBRC report (Moran)
  - e. Multi-Purpose Complex (Schaefer)
3. Old Business
  - a. Resolution to add a faculty representative to the Board of Trustees. (Moran, Hovanesian)  
Second reading. Approved as amended.
    - aa. Amendment to resolution (Andrews, Pettengill) Approved.
4. New Business
  - a. Motion to staff a Senate standing committee. (Grossman, Moran) Approved.
  - b. Motion to appoint a faculty representative to Student Congress (Grossman, Herman)  
Approved.
  - c. Motion from Campus Development and Environment committee concerning its right to be consulted (Brieger, Wood) Approved.
5. Good and Welfare
  - a. Resolution to establish an Ad Hoc Constitutional Amendment Committee to create a faculty senate (Moore, Buffard-O'Shea) No action taken due to lack of a quorum.
    - aa. Motion to amend the resolution to also address the role and membership of the Steering Committee (Herman, Hildebrand) Approved
    - aaa. Motion to amend the resolution to explore the establishment of an all-faculty body within the existing Senate structure (Papazian, Reynolds) Not approved.

Mr. Andrews called the fifth meeting of the University Senate to order at approximately 3:15 and explained that he was substituting for an ailing Mr. Downing. He called for a motion to approve the [January 14th Senate minutes](#), Mr. Connellan so moved, Ms. Wood seconded and the minutes were approved as distributed.

#### Banner

Mr. Andrews then introduced Ms. Rowe, who provided an update on the new Banner system. Ms. Rowe explained that implementation of the system is in process and was undertaken, in part, due to Y2K issues. However, it also provides the institution with the opportunity to improve its processes and

procedures and to develop ways of doing things more efficiently. Areas that will be affected include student bills, registration, scheduling, admissions, financial aid, advising, and even the enforcement of prerequisites. Faculty will be able to view their class lists, monitor adds/drops and eventually will enter grades via the web access. Registration will be implemented for the spring term and eventually students will register over the web. It is a year of huge changes she noted. And added that this important project has had a number of faculty involved in the discussions and decision making processes.

Mr. Andrews then reported that the next two items listed on the agenda, e.g. the resolutions concerning campus disruptions and the College proposal for a change in the hiring procedures, have been taken under consideration by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is in process of putting together committees to deal with them.

#### Library Update

He then recognized Ms. Eberwein who reported on the progress of the journal review. She noted that there had been a delay in getting the lists out but that chairs and library coordinators should be getting them very soon. She reminded everyone that the list is longer than the anticipated final cut list so faculty should feel free to defend those titles they consider essential. However she requested her colleagues to take the process seriously and to participate constructively to help the library develop a collection that will best meet the overall needs of the community. A second comprehensive list will be distributed before the end of the term so that units can review and comment on and, if need be, defend titles slated for cancellation. She also reported on the search process for a new Library Dean. The search committee was finally assembled in January with Mr. Lepkowski of the Library as chair. This 10 person committee has begun meeting and because of the tight time line, have decided to utilize the expertise of a consultant. The application deadline is March 31 and the committee hopes to have candidates on campus in early May so that they might meet as large a group of faculty as is possible before everyone disperses for the summer. She encouraged the group to let the committee know if they have ideas of someone who would be good to interview and emphasized that they hope to create a large, diverse group of qualified individuals from which to choose.

#### Y2K Issues

Mr. Hansen was next on the agenda and provided an update on the projects being undertaken on campus to deal with Y2K issues. He reported that every electronic device on campus is being checked; this includes hard disks, distributed computing, desktop hardware, software, laboratory equipment, fax machines, copiers, centrifuges, elevators to name a few examples. Other individuals involved in the project are Pat Beaver, John Coughlin, Bill Davis (Sprint) and Ken Eagle. The proposed schedule is as follows:

*First stage*--Awareness and discovery--to be completed by mid March. This will involve notifying the university community of the work that will be undertaken to deal with the problem.

*Second stage*--Inventory and risk assessment--This phase will run through the spring and summer terms and during this phase equipment will be checked. They will need to set up appointments with faculty to check out office and lab equipment.

*Third and final stage*--Testing and remediation

Mr. Hansen indicated that they are confident that they will be able to accomplish the task of ensuring that the campus is Y2K compliant before the end of the year. He encouraged everyone to contact him with any questions or concerns.

#### Golf Course

Mr. Andrews then introduced one additional information item dealing with the golf course and

recognized Mr. Moran. Mr. Moran, chair of the Senate Budget Review Committee, then presented the [SBRC report](#) on the financial implications of the course to the Senate.

### Multi-purpose Complex

Next on the agenda was Ms. Schaefer, Vice President for Finance and Administration, who spoke of various proposals for a multi-purpose complex. Ms. Schaefer, chair of the committee investigating this proposal, first provided a brief overview of the proposal which includes a performing arts center, a hotel/conference center and an ice arena. She explained that because of who we are, what we are, and where we are, Oakland is attracting outside agencies who are interested in becoming partners with us. Calling attention to the [document](#) that was distributed, she emphasized that there is nothing concrete in hand to evaluate, that her committee is simply exploring ways in which this might benefit Oakland, for example, image building, bringing people to campus who might not otherwise come, and, in general, adding to the university's outreach and public service mission. She opened the floor for discussion asking for any thoughts on the advantages and disadvantages of such a complex.

Ms. Eberwein expressed her appreciation of the committee's zeal in consulting around campus. She expressed her concern that the academic nature of Oakland will get swallowed up since outside groups would be running these venues. While additional performing arts space is desirable and a conference center could provide for academic conferences, she has the sense that these are very small parts of larger events which could overwhelm us. She didn't see much advantage to the ice arena. The idea that these facilities and the events they would host will enhance OU's image leaves Ms. Eberwein wondering what image are we interested in projecting. The image of a junior partner of some corporate interest? She registered her concerns that we may be selling our birthright of land and community esteem not for a mess of pottage but just for a mess. When asked by Ms. Wood about Meadowbrook Theater, Ms. Schaefer replied there are no plans to relocate the Theater. Ms. Wood opined that the Art Gallery should stay with the Theater and Ms. Schaefer assured her that the Art & Art History Department will be consulted about any plans relating to the Gallery.

Mr. Herman asked about finances and Ms. Schaefer responded that there are no details in hand but in a private partnership, the complex would be financed through private entities and there would be some sort of return to the university. Ms. Buffard O'Shea wondered if there would be enough demand for an ice rink, particularly with other rinks being planned in the area. Ms. Schaefer indicated that the idea of an ice arena has been under discussion for a number of years now and some private entities are interested in constructing an ice rink on campus but emphasized that OU would proceed only if the demand is high enough to warrant it. Mr. Liboff found the discussion reminiscent of things past, commenting that previous opportunities to branch off brought similar misgivings. He added that George Matthews used to say that the meaning of university is universal, and that the institutional umbrella should include many activities. He reminded the group that past opportunities have evaporated and felt that speedy consideration of this issue might give us an advantage, particularly in light of the proposed performing arts center for Troy.

Mr. Riley asked what role and control the university would have in running these enterprises; also what would be the ownership rights regarding the buildings. That is not clear yet, noted Ms. Schaefer and would have to be negotiated. A significant return would be expected in terms of the use of our land; she noted too that if private investors put up all the money, they will expect a return on their investment. Mr. Riley expressed concern over the loss of control of the land if we enter into a partnership with outside agencies and simply become customers to a profit making entity. Mr. Bertocci felt the question to be answered is to what extent these ventures will enhance or detract from the academic mission of the university. He saw the additional revenues and physical resources as acceptable as long as they contribute to the academic mission. Ms. Schaefer noted that it could be argued that increased visibility, such as the presence of a performing arts center would enhance the cultural image of the university, and

that there could be programmatic benefits in addition to the financial support.

Mr. Gardner commented that he doesn't look at profit as a negative, and pointed out that at other institutions, the land is leased and the facility becomes part of the university after a period of time. Ms. Schaefer thought a long term lease was likely but that the land would remain part of the university. Ms. S. Andrews expressed concern that the profits might be eaten up by the facilities and was concerned about whether or not the campus community would have affordable access to the facilities. Just where do these proposals fit in with the master planning process, asked Ms. Moore. Ms. Schaefer replied that they are outside the master planning process which is just getting underway and which will take several years to complete. She explained that we are dealing with these proposals now because they are time sensitive and we don't have two years to wait. She added that the complex, if built, would occupy only a small portion of university land. How much land, asked Ms. Moore and Ms. Schaefer responded that it depends on the number of components and the configuration, but that it would be in the 30-50 acre range. Ms. Papazian agreed that increased visibility to the institution is important but argued that availability to the academic side is also an important issue.

The next steps, according to Ms. Schaefer, in deciding whether to go forward with this proposal and which components are desirable, include market research, financial projections, explorations of partnerships and an overall list of those things important to the university if negotiations were to take place. Ms. Papazian asked if there would be an opportunity for further input. The opportunity for input is now, stated Ms. Schaefer and added that the community would have to trust the administration to be sensitive to the concerns mentioned. However, she said that she will be coming back to the Senate to report and provide updates. Mr. Polis asked if any other uses had been considered for these 50 acres, using as an example, Compuware, which is looking for a new corporate headquarters. No, stated Ms. Schaefer, we are only looking at the proposals that have come to us.

With no further discussion, Mr. Andrews took the opportunity to remind the group that the Senate committee volunteer forms are due tomorrow. He noted that late forms are accepted and encouraged everyone to assist in getting these committee seats filled.

#### Faculty representative to Board of Trustees

Turning to the first item of Old Business, a motion to add a faculty representative to the Board of Trustees, Mr. Andrews reported that the Steering Committee felt a more detailed motion was in order and so provided the amended version printed in the agenda. Mr. Grossman moved and Mr. Pettengill seconded the amendment. Mr. Moran, as author of the original motion, spoke in favor of the amendment, pointing out that the changes are beneficial and strengthen the motion. The Senate then approved the amendment. Speaking in favor of the amended main motion, Mr. Moran reiterated that more contact between faculty and the Board is desirable, especially in the light of recent events. He also noted that students have had this option for several years now and no one would argue that it hasn't been beneficial. The main motion as amended was then approved.

#### Committees

Three procedural amendments were then quickly dealt with. The first, a motion to appoint Mr. Follo to the General Education Committee was moved by Mr. Grossman, seconded by Mr. Moran and approved. The second, a motion to appoint Mr. Early as the faculty representative to Student Congress, was moved by Mr. Grossman, seconded by Mr. Herman and approved. The third, a motion from the Campus Development and Environment Committee, reaffirming the right of that Committee and the Senate to be consulted, was moved by Mr. Brieger, seconded by Ms. Wood and approved. Ms. Eberwein noted that it is regrettable that it is necessary to reaffirm this right since the Senate Constitution clearly affirms the right of the Senate to be consulted. Mr. Long wondered if this motion would change or affect the language in the Senate Constitution, and Ms. Eberwein replied no.

Resolution to establish a faculty senate

Under the Good and Welfare rubric, Ms. Moore moved the following resolution which was seconded by Ms. Buffard O'Shea:

Resolved, that the Senate constitute an ad hoc Constitutional Amendment Committee with the following charge:

1. Draft amendments to the University Senate Constitution to restrict the voting membership to full-time, non-visiting faculty members who are members of the faculty bargaining unit.
2. Draft amendments to the University Senate Constitution to provide a mechanism for maintaining strong liaisons with the Student Congress and the AP Assembly.
3. Draft amendments to the University Senate Constitution to delineate the role of academic administrators with respect to the University Senate.

and, be it further resolved, that the ad hoc Constitutional Amendment Committee propose any amendments to the University Senate Constitution needed within the new faculty senate framework to maintain the current Senate committee structure, charges, and membership groups.

and, be it further resolved, that the membership of the Committee consist of:

Kevin Andrews (CAS, Mathematics & Statistics)  
Ron Cramer (SEHS, Reading & Language Arts)  
Christine Hansen (CAS, Psychology)  
Frances Jackson (SON)  
Mary Karasch (CAS, History)  
Keith Kleckner (SECS, Electrical & Systems Engineering)  
Milly Merz (Library)  
Margaret Pigott (CAS, Rhetoric, Communications, & Journalism)  
Richard Rozek (SHS, Industrial Health & Safety)  
Joel Russell (CAS, Chemistry)  
Mary Van Sell (SBA, Management & Marketing)  
with Joel Russell as Chair.

Copies of the resolution were distributed to the Senate and Ms. Moore called attention to the back of the sheet where additional information was provided. She reported that 258 faculty members signed petitions in favor of exploring the concept of a faculty senate and also that the North Central team was puzzled at the lack of a faculty senate at Oakland. Mr. Gardner asked how the members of the ad hoc committee were selected. Ms. Moore indicated that these individuals volunteered. Mr. Russell added that the petition was circulated to all faculty and all signers were asked if they would be willing to serve on the ad hoc committee. What will be the result if the resolution is approved today, asked Mr. Grossman. Will it be a vote to change to a faculty senate or a vote to consider such a change? Mr. Moran responded that, if the resolution were approved, the committee would instigate an amendment to the Senate Constitution. Ms. Papazian wondered if, rather than creating a faculty senate, we should consider changes to the existing Senate structure and perhaps create a faculty body in addition to the University Senate. Mr. Andrews noted that the resolution states that the committee is to propose an amendment to the Senate constitution. Could one amend the resolution, asked Ms. Papazian, to instruct the committee to look at other alternatives. Mr. Liboff felt that such an amendment

would be more appropriate when the proposal is actually before the Senate, and argued that it doesn't make sense to amend it now.

Mr. Polis understood the discussion as saying that we are considering the possibility of dissolving this body and making it a sub group of the AAUP. Mr. Russell pointed out that the bargaining unit and the AAUP are two different things, that there are faculty in the bargaining unit but not in the AAUP as well as faculty not in the bargaining unit. Ms Eberwein expressed concern over the fact that this was introduced as a procedural resolution and opined that it looks like a very substantive motion. She recommended that it be treated as a substantive motion, that we take time to think about it and that it be returned for further discussion at the next Senate meeting. If we pass this, she stated, we are directing our colleagues to draft a specific amendment to change the structure of the senate. She expressed her discomfort with directing the committee to look at only one possibility when there is a lot more we should investigate. Has there been any kind of research into the various models, what are the advantages and disadvantages of each she queried. She would prefer to see some studies before instructing her colleagues to devote their energies in this way.

Mr. Moran pointed out that the resolution calls merely for the creation of the ad hoc committee and so is just a procedural motion. This was proposed after 258 faculty members signed a petition in favor of creating a faculty senate. He felt the Senate should respond to this desire and expressed his support for this resolution. Mr. Herman reported that the AP assembly had discussed this issue and that they did not feel that two voting APs are a threat to the faculty voice. He added that they enjoyed the interchange that comes from being a part of the Senate and having a voice. Mr. Herman also noted that he felt that the student representatives on the Senate were an important component . He asked what impact this proposed change would have on the Steering Committee. On behalf of the AP Assembly, he opposed the proposal, based on the loss of interchange of opinions between groups and the dissolution of a collegial model. Ms. Sieloff pointed out that the resolution, which she supports, merely calls for the appointment of an ad hoc committee. She felt that the debate would be more appropriate when the amendment comes forward to the Senate.

Ms. Papazian pointed out that the resolution does not call for any exploration of possible alternatives, that it has within it its own conclusion, namely to create a faculty senate. She expressed concern that we have jumped a step and left out the discussion of alternatives, of other models that might be beneficial. Mr. Russell countered with the fact that 74% of the full-time faculty called for the establishment of a faculty senate. This resolution simply represents what 74% of the faculty want. Ms. Papazian felt that calling for the development of a faculty senate is different than calling for the dissolution of the University Senate and felt that no one had addressed the interests or concerns of the constituents who would be displaced. Mr. Bertocci thought that this resolution is not needed, that any individual or subset of faculty can propose an amendment to the Senate constitution.

Mr. S. Andrews asked about the time frame for the ad hoc committee, wondering if there should be a specific due date for the committee's work. It is possible to add a due date, Mr. K. Andrews responded; he also noted that ad hoc committees have been created without specific reporting back requirements. Ms. Moore reiterated that the intent of the resolution is to bring the process to the Senate and to encourage as much discussion as possible. Mr. Herman moved, seconded to Ms. Hildebrand, to amend the resolution by adding an item 4 directing the committee to:

4. Draft amendments to the Senate Constitution to redefine the role and membership of the University Senate Steering Committee to include an equal number of faculty, staff and students in order to maintain effective communication between the faculty, staff and student governance bodies.

Mr. Herman explained that if the amendment to the Constitution is approved, there needs to be a mechanism for interchange, an umbrella group that would represent all constituencies. He added that the APs understand the need of the faculty for a strong faculty voice in the governance structure but the APs also feel there should be a lot of interchange between the students and staff and faculty; thus there needs to be a body where that interchange could take place. Mr. Liboff argued that this scenario would prescribe the Steering Committee's composition and felt that, if there is to be a faculty senate, then that group should decide who will be on the Steering Committee.

In reply to Mr. Gardner's question about the percentage of faculty vs. non-faculty on the Senate, Mr. Grossman responded that there are 42 faculty positions, approx. 2/3 faculty, 1/3 non faculty. Mr. Gardner said that with those numbers, anything the faculty felt strongly about could certainly be passed. He wondered why faculty would feel that an all faculty senate was necessary and why they wouldn't want the input from other constituent bodies on campus. Mr. Russell responded that the University Senate may not represent the faculty as a whole; 74 % of the university faculty signed the petition, 63 % of the faculty Senators signed, but only 42 % of the current Senate membership supported it. Ms. Moore stated that the intent is not to eliminate input but to come up with some creative ideas; she felt that a faculty senate would not keep people from participating in the discussions. Mr. Moran referred to a number of votes over the past few years where the faculty wanted one thing but the University Senate voted otherwise; he felt that the Senate as it is does not reflect the opinion of the faculty.

With regard to the issue of what the Steering Committee would look like, Mr. Grossman thought that the ad hoc committee should address this issue. Mr. Andrews pointed out that this issues could be addressed when the amendment comes back to the Senate. Board of Trustees approval would be needed, noted Mr. Liboff and they might include some added governance structures. Ms. Papazian spoke in support of the amendment. Ms. Sieloff pointed out that parts 2 and 3 of the charge are exploratory in nature and direct the committee to look at establishing liaisons with other units; she thought that the proposed amendment seems to fit under item 2 of the resolution. Mr. Herman expressed the need for a liaison relationship if AP's and students are no longer to be part of the senate. At Penn State, he noted, there is a tricameral senate and a strong tricameral steering committee and thought Oakland should consider this as part of the overall governance structure to ensure that all constituencies are represented.

Mr. Liboff opined that there have been times when faculty have felt their voice was not being heard and that the present University Senate represents interests outside of the academic mission as viewed by the faculty. Often the discussion involves fiduciary matters when the faculty are more concerned about what is best for the students. He felt that the faculty has a better view of the academic mission than do the deans and APs and staff. While he hasn't studied university governance bodies, he stated that this resolution expresses the will of the faculty. With no further discussion, the question was called and the amendment was approved.

Ms. Papazian, seconded by Ms. Reynolds, then moved to amend the resolution to instruct the ad hoc committee to explore the possibility of establishing an all faculty body within the

existing University Senate system. Mr. Moran stated that this amendment contradicts the resolution. Ms. Papazian argued that, if the concern is that the faculty is not being heard, the establishment of an all faculty caucus would address that issue. She is not persuaded that dissolving the existing senate structure is in the best interests of the institution and asked the committee to consider other possibilities. Mr. Moran argued against the amendment, stating the body being proposed would be inferior to the Senate. Ms. Papazian countered that, in fairness, other alternatives should be considered, since the proposed resolution affects constituencies other than faculty. Mr. S. Andrews didn't feel the faculty need a separate caucus. Speaking in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Liboff stated that these issues can be settled when the ad hoc committee brings its motion back to the Senate.

The petition signers were not offered any alternatives other than dissolving the university senate and creating an all faculty body, noted Ms. Papazian. She further stated that we are talking about a major change and that she would want information in the broadest sense. Ms. Eberwein was concerned that, if we send it forward, many of the petition signers were not aware of the implications of the petition, that they were just generally unhappy with the way things were being done. This resolution directs the ad hoc committee to bring in a recommendation for a faculty senate and she argued for broader consideration of the topic. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea stated that faculty feel very strongly about establishing a faculty-only senate and that they did know exactly what they signed. However, Ms. Wood's impression was that some people, including herself, who signed the petition were also open to other alternatives and that they would not oppose a committee that would discuss other possibilities.

Mr. Bertocci thought that the petition that was circulated did not correspond exactly with the resolution. The petition was clear and direct, stated Mr. Moran; the intent is to establish a faculty-only senate and to dissolve the University Senate. What would be the harm, asked Ms. Papazian, in considering other alternatives. Mr. Gardner agreed, adding that signers were not given any other alternatives and averred that it would not hurt to explore other options. Mr. Liboff read the language of the petition: Petition to establish a faculty senate and dissolve the University Senate. He didn't think anything could be clearer.

Ms. Papazian also felt that any petition to dissolve a body, should be sent to all members of the body, adding that she doesn't believe in disenfranchising members. She also disagreed with the fact that the foregone conclusion was included in the resolution. Mr. Russell asked who would vote on such an amendment to the constitution and Mr. Andrews replied, the Senate membership. Mr. S. Andrews opined that since a large number of faculty have requested this change, the Senate should respond to their wishes. Ms. Papazian expressed discomfort with the finality of the resolution and with the fact that the ad hoc committee is not representative of the Senate membership but rather a subset of the Senate. She stated that everyone should have a part in the process.

Mr. Moran countered that the resolution is an effort to go through a slower process. The constitution allows for an amendment process and he pointed out that an actual amendment could have been brought forth for Senate consideration today. Mr. Liboff asked Ms. Papazian for examples of alternatives. Ms. Papazian explained that she hadn't explored the issues and didn't know what all the possibilities are, but thought perhaps a faculty caucus might be one way of providing a strong and distinct faculty voice on issues. Mr. Herman stated that many campuses have Senates with subgroups representing faculty, students and staff and bills from each subgroup filter up to another body. All constituencies have a voice and he argued in favor

of looking at a more comprehensive, representative model. At this point, the question was called and the amendment to instruct the committee to look at other alternatives was defeated, 10 in favor, 15 opposed.

Mr. Connellan commented on the wording of the resolution versus the wording of the petition, noting a subtle shift. He noted that he did not vote for either amendment because they were directive in some sense and he would prefer a resolution that would explore all options rather than directing a result. He added that he did not vote on the faculty representative to the Board of Trustees motion since he felt that was a faculty issue. He thought it strange that the body which just requested representation on the Board of Trustees is willing to direct a committee to disenfranchise and eliminate student and other representation from the Senate. Mr. Polis asked if a quorum was needed for the vote and if so, was one present. A count of Senators present (27) fell short of the quorum required to conduct business. The consideration of the resolution was discontinued and the resolution will be carried forward to the next meeting.

#### Other

A second good and welfare item was brought up by Ms. Eberwein, relating to an Oakland Post article concerning graduation dates. She is concerned about the change in the graduation date and the effect it might have on the awarding of university or departmental honors. If the change in date means that honors would be determined as of the fall semester, she stated that it might disadvantage some English majors who often take three or four of their major courses in their last term. She also asked if the Academic Standing and Honors Committee had been involved in this decision. Mr. Shablin replied that he had been quoted incorrectly, and that although the graduation date had been moved, possible honors candidates would be identified in the fall but actual awarding of honors would be based on the total academic record, and that will include the winter term. Mr. Grossman wondered if this would affect the printed program which would have to be printed before winter grades are in. Mr. Shablin responded that the program lists "candidates" for graduation and honors and that actual degrees and awards are issued based on the total record.

And finally Mr. Pettengill asked if there was any feedback from exit interview with the North Central Accreditation team. Mr. Russi responded that Oakland will be reaccredited for the usual 10 year period but that the NCA committee indicated that there are some areas that will need attention. With no further good and welfare items being brought forth, Mr. Andrews entertained a motion to adjourn and the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Submitted by  
Linda L. Hildebrand  
Secretary to the University Senate

[Return to Senate Home Page](#)

feb9rmin  
3/4/99