



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 12 March 1992
Seventh Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Appleton, Bennett, Braunstein, Briggs-Bunting, Chipman, Cramer, Dahlgren, DeCarlo, Downing, Eberwein, Eckart, Fish, Frankie, Garcia, Goslin, Griggs, Grossman, Hormozi, Hough, Jackson, Kevern, Kleckner, Mabee, McKay, Mittelstaedt, Otto, Peterson, Pierson, Pine, Richards, Rush, Russell, Schultz, Wood.

Senators Absent: Abiko, Benson, Campbell, Cowlshaw, Edgerton, Eisenhower, Gamboa, Gerulaitis, Gunsberg, Halsted, Hansen-Smith, Hartzler, Heintz, Hovanesian, Kheir, Kim, Olson, Porter, Reddy, Shepherd, Stamps, Stano, Stevens, Urice, Wisz, Witt, Workman, Zenas.

Summary of Actions

1. Minutes of 13 February and 4 March 1992 (Briggs-Bunting; Kevern). Approved.
2. Motion from the Academic and Career Advising Committee to accept its "Statement on the Academic Advising System" (Mabee; Hough).
3. Motion from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to establish a graduation requirement in American cultural diversity (Appleton; Hough). First Reading.
4. Motion from the Graduate Council to change designations for certain degrees offered by the School of Education and Human Services (Dahlgren; Pine). First Reading.
5. Continued conversation on possible establishment of a University Budget Committee (Hough).
6. Resolution of thanks to the Board of Trustees and Presidential Search Committee (Hough; Garcia). Approved.

At 3:14 p.m., Mr. Kleckner introduced the meeting by requesting action on the minutes of 13 February and 4 March 1992. Ms. Briggs-Bunting (seconded by Mr. Kevern), moved approval, noting that the minutes were "wonderful as usual." No discussion ensued, and the Senate voted its acceptance.

Similar good will extended to the proposal from the Academic and Career Advising Committee to approve its "Statement on the Academic Advising System" (Moved, Ms. Mabee; seconded, Mr. Hough). Mr. Kleckner reminded senators of previous discussions, which had resulted in suggested stylistic modifications at the 13 February meeting. Ms. Mabee reported that her committee colleagues had considered those changes and decided not to introduce the word "other" before "professional advisers" nor to introduce the passive voice in place of "the adviser assists students in discovering possibilities, identifying and assessing alternatives, and

weighing the consequences of decisions." They did, however, opt to introduce the word "career" in the sixth listed item at the end of the Guidelines section to establish parallelism with language in the Role and Mission section above. When Mr. Goslin inquired about specific diction and punctuation, she stated that the amended passage now reads "clarification of academic, career, and life goals." No discussion followed; and, when Ms. Briggs-Bunting called the question, the Senate approved this motion without dissent.

That action cleared the way for concentration on the first item of new business: a motion from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction (Moved, Mr. Appleton; seconded, Mr. Hough):

MOVED that all Oakland University students must acquaint themselves with American cultural diversity by taking at least one course designated as exploring the implications of the disciplines for ethnic perspectives and interrelationships. Courses will acquire this designation through departmental application to a subcommittee of UCUI, demonstrating that at least the equivalent of three weeks of the course deal with these subjects. These courses may be in any rubric and may also be used to meet general education, major, minor, distribution, concentration, elective credit or other degree requirements. This requirement is to be implemented when UCUI has approved a sufficient number of courses to meet student need.

Mr. Appleton reported that UCUI had passed this motion unanimously last April. Even though nobody felt entirely satisfied with the proposal, committee members concluded that it was the best they could produce under existing constraints: reluctance to increase credit requirements for graduation or to add a new category to the general education program, concern for transfer patterns, and worries about staffing any single new course that would be required of all students. Although UCUI has not yet reviewed courses formally for applicability to this requirement, scanning the undergraduate catalog fosters the sense that many existing courses may prove suitable. He anticipated that many students would be able to meet the requirement within their majors or minors. For those students whose chosen curricula do not present them with issues of ethnicity, UCUI wishes to ensure that each one elects a course that devotes at least three weeks to such considerations or else a one-credit course focused on that topic. He hoped departments would develop new four and one-credit courses for that purpose. Mr. Appleton liked the idea that professors would bring their own disciplinary perspectives to bear on issues of cultural diversity and anticipated that many students would wind up taking multiple complementary courses. He expected that general education offerings might frequently be used to fulfill this requirement; at least one is already suitable without modification, and several could easily be adapted to meet UCUI's standards. A student encountering extreme difficulty fitting such a course into his or her curriculum (presumably a transfer student) could file a petition of exception with the appropriate Committee on Instruction.

Mr. Kleckner informed his colleagues that the Steering Committee had reviewed this proposal in full and referred it to other Senate committees for their advice. Anticipating considerable impact on the general education program if the Senate adopts UCUI's proposal, the Steering Committee asked the General Education Committee for its views. Professor Marks, chair of that body, reported its findings. One member opposed having any general education course do double duty; others expressed concern about changing the focus of general education courses or de facto reduction of students' choices as a result of the new requirement's steering them

toward those selections that would serve dual purposes. Looking over the current roster of courses approved for general education, his committee noted several that might well meet UCUI's specifications, but the General Education Committee preferred not to conduct course reviews for that purpose. Its members also worried that dual focus in general education offerings might complicate the assessment problems they now confront. He concluded by indicating that the General Education Committee does not support this proposal even though it recognizes that general education courses may be appropriate choices to meet this requirement, if the Senate approves it.

The chair then called upon Ms. Garcia to report for the Committee on Human Relations, which had also been invited to respond to the proposal. She said that her committee had met several times to consider UCUI's proposal and had tried unsuccessfully to learn the reasons for the General Education Committee's opposition. Her colleagues, fearful that this requirement could go the way of the ethics one, worry that the proposal as given would water down the impact of a course on ethnic diversity. They support the motion now before the Senate but wish the community to understand that they see it only as a way, not the only or best way, of addressing diversity issues. One member of her committee describes this proposal as "the least we can do." She reported that the Committee on Human Relations might eventually come forward with a proposal to fill out and improve upon the current one. They consider UCUI's motion a way to begin and therefore support it.

Kevin Laidler, a student member of the Committee on Human Relations, then informed the Senate that he and Professor Pipan are working on a draft of legislation proposing a system for student education in cultural diversity that would be cost effective and fit in with current curricula. Theirs would be an experience/interaction-based package rather than a course requirement. Departments would sponsor programs (concerts, lectures, panels, or other programs) reflecting various components of the world, European, and American ethnic cultures that comprise this country's cultural heritage. Students would have cards stamped to prove that they had attended and participated in a suitable range of these activities. When Mr. Kleckner asked whether that proposal would then go to the Committee on Human Relations as a whole for possible submission to the Senate, Mr. Laidler said that was the case. Mr. Downing called attention to a current Chronicle article on Berkeley's new requirement that might be worth studying. He wondered whether any of the supplementary ideas now being considered by the Committee on Human Relations would be curricular in nature. Ms. Garcia said they would not, though she noted the University of Michigan's introduction of a Racism 101 course.

Mr. Kevern asked Mr. Appleton about the proposal's impact on transfer students. Would courses from other institutions count, or must they be taken at Oakland University? Mr. Appleton said that the course must be taken here, it being too difficult to evaluate portions of courses from other institutions. His Introduction to American Politics includes a substantial block of material on ethnic diversity, but similarly titled courses elsewhere may or may not. When Mr. Grossman asked whether a student could transfer a full course specifically focused on ethnic issues, Mr. Appleton thought she could. Mr. Fish requested clarification of what "cultural diversity" means. Without an operative definition, he would not know how to design an appropriate course, much less teach it. Mr. Appleton preferred to let a subcommittee of UCUI tackle the problem of definition.

Mr. Pierson then inquired what "ethnic perspectives and inter-relationships" meant. Would a course be suitable if it dealt with only one ethnic group, or must it encompass a broad range of

groups? Either would suit Mr. Appleton, who recognized that comprehensive coverage in only three weeks would be pretty light.

Mr. Chipman wondered why the General Education Committee chose not to review courses under its jurisdiction for their incorporation of multicultural material. Mr. Marks responded that his associates see this issue as distinct from existing Senate-mandated general education categories, which serve as their basis for assessment. Mr. Chipman found it incongruous that we have a committee to oversee that part of a student's undergraduate education that we want everyone to have that then chooses not to look at this matter. Mr. Kleckner suggested focusing discussion on the proposal's basic ideas rather than worrying about implementation. He felt confident that we can work out a mechanism for review by appropriate bodies.

Since American ethnic groups come from all over the world, Mr. Grossman thought it might make sense to consider our existing International Studies courses as introductions to ethnic studies. He wondered whether the committees had considered the possibility that Oakland's curriculum already meets this proposal's requirement. Mr. Appleton said that would be so only if International Studies courses devoted substantial time to the experiences of persons from different parts of the world here in the United States. Mr. Kleckner noted that the UCUI proposal should be viewed as an addition to the International Studies requirement now featured within the general education program.

Mr. Pierson commented that, if the purpose is to foster understanding within American communities, it is important to include the experiences of certain ethnic groups. He mentioned African-Americans, Hispanics, and groups just now making themselves known and felt. He raised the concern that this proposal may not adequately prepare students to deal with conditions they find around them. Referring back to Mr. Fish's inquiry, Mr. Braunstein thanked him for asking the question about what the committee meant by "cultural diversity." In the School of Business Administration, faculty members have chosen to include ethnicity in a broadly inclusive way throughout the curriculum so that students consider issues of equal employment opportunity with attention to differences of race and gender and learn about marketing to diverse cultures. His colleagues felt their approach should satisfy UCUI's requirements but wanted assurance. Mr. Appleton said his committee would need to examine syllabi. If the Senate wished to specify particular groups in this motion, he would be glad to refer suggestions to UCUI. Mr. Kleckner noted that Mr. Braunstein's point called attention to ways of integrating multiculturalism throughout the curriculum rather than trying to deal with all ethnic groups in one course for three weeks. He noted that UCUI's hope is to take a minimal step that might foster students' continuing inquiry. He thought it a matter of faculty trying to incorporate a number of enlightening experiences within a the curriculum rather than relying on one course.

Glancing through the catalog for an example of a course that might or might not meet the requirement for cultural diversity, Mr. Appleton hit upon ENG 342, now titled The Black Experience in Literature. In the past, when it was offered as Black American Writers, it would have been an obvious option. Ms. Garcia, who teaches it regularly, said that the original title reflected actual course content. Ms. Eberwein noted that the new title allowed for inclusion of African and Caribbean authors.

Mr. Fish redirected the discussion by asking what prompted UCUI's proposal? Was the impulse really to learn more about multiculturalism in our society or to hone in on racism? He

thought the course instituted recently at the University of Michigan indicated that racism itself could be handled specifically, including that lately directed against Japanese-Americans. He considered the proposal before this Senate less effective in addressing the real focus of interest. Mr. Appleton responded that multiculturalism rather than racism had been UCUI's focus. His committee specifically disclaimed any intent to instruct faculty on how to handle this subject matter. Mr. Fish then asked about the charge UCUI had received. Who directed it to develop such a proposal? Mr. Appleton said there had been no particular charge; he had himself brought this issue forward. Mr. Pierson then reminded senators of the St. Clair retreat, which had deliberated on Oakland's response to racism. One suggestion made there was that a course focused on racism be introduced. He agreed that questions of racism might need to be addressed, including "How do you deal with people;" "How do you treat diverse people as human beings;" "How do you help persons of other cultures?" These questions could be more important than questions of ethnicity, which he would also find interesting to discuss. Mr. Kleckner commented that these things all come together. Ms. Garcia recurred to ENG 342: she did not see how one could teach a course on African-American authors without dealing with issues of racism as well as cultural diversity and ethnicity. Although she did not herself know how to make such a distinction, she had some fears that the proposal under discussion might foster course segments that attempt to separate these matters.

Mr. Hough looked forward to receiving the Committee on Human Relations' proposal for an experience-based program rather than a course-based approach to such concerns. He wanted to find ways of getting students out of familiar environments, especially getting our suburban students into the inner city or into a barrio. He doubted that a three-week snippet of a course would be likely to accomplish that. Ms. Garcia responded by reminding the Senate that her committee supports UCUI's proposal. The program her committee may propose would be something more than this, not instead of it. Mr. Peterson mentioned programming plans under consideration by the University Student Congress to focus student attention on various minority groups. Congress is now deliberating on which minority groups to feature and how many they can hope to encompass. He recognized how little can be accomplished even by a full 4- credit class and emphasized the importance of extra-curricular supplements to instruction. Mr. Laidler also supported the UCUI proposal. The program on which he and Professor Pipan are working would move beyond that starting point. He also felt the university should be addressing women's issues, gay/lesbian concerns, and questions of religious tolerance in addition to race and ethnicity. It should respond to any areas of oppression within our society. Mr. Peterson added to this by commenting on ignorance of international influences. Although we are situated on an international border, he doubted many students could name fifteen famous Canadians. On his recent vacation, he had been shocked to find more Canadian Studies activity in Florida than in Michigan. With our students so attentive to the bottom line, he found it hard to stimulate cultural awareness. Mr. Kleckner, recognizing the need for realistic expectations about what a student could learn in a few undergraduate years, concluded this discussion by pointing out that the idea behind UCUI's proposal is to foster continued learning. He then deferred further discussion until the next meeting.

Attention then turned to a motion from the Graduate Council, for which Mr. Dahlgren offered substitute language:

MOVED that the M.A.T. degree offered by the School of Education and Human Services in the areas of Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership; Early Childhood; and Special Education be designated as a M. Ed.

Mr. Pine seconded the revised motion, which both sponsors preferred as more accurate in stating that the degrees are offered by three departments rather than in specific subjects. Mr. Kleckner, reporting that this proposal originated in the School of Education and Human Services, invited Dean Pine to explain his colleagues' reasoning. Mr. Pine began by noting the historical origins of the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in the early 1960s at Harvard and Yale. It had been developed as an initial certification degree for persons aspiring to become teachers rather than as a continuing professional degree. Oakland University's idiosyncratic use of the M.A.T. has puzzled accrediting bodies, most recently a team from NCATE. Surveys of our graduate students and of school system officials reveal strong support for modified nomenclature that more accurately reflects the nature of these programs. Mr. Dahlgren stated that the Graduate Council had reviewed and approved the School's proposal. When Mr. Kleckner asked whether the retitling indicated any change in actual teaching or simply modified language, Mr. Pine said both things were true. Ever since coming here, he had been uncomfortable about Oakland's use of the M.A.T. title in a way that did not reflect program content.

With no further questions arising, Mr. Kleckner moved on to the third item of new business. Mr. Hough launched discussion by distributing a draft charge and membership specification for the budget committee that had been discussed as a reasonably lively possibility at the Senate's February meeting.

University Budget Committee

Charge:

1. To track the budget process and advise the University Senate on matters pertaining to the University budget.
2. To track the University's development programs and advise the University Senate on matters pertaining to the University's development efforts.
3. To engage in such comparative budget studies as will best support the budget making process.

Membership: Six faculty and the Vice President for Finance and Administration, who shall be ex-officio and voting.

Mr. Kleckner noted that this proposal failed to qualify as a motion because it had not been circulated long enough in advance. With copies distributed at this meeting, he suggested dealing with the measure informally in continued conversation mode. It will reappear in April as a formal motion, at which point the Senate can move to waive a second reading if satisfied that its merits have been fully discussed. The Senate may also conduct the usual two formal readings. He mentioned that timing precluded delaying the familiar faculty volunteer sheets for Senate committees, which will soon go forth, but said he would include a statement inviting volunteers to serve on a Budget Committee, if established by the Senate. Mr. Hough responded that he and Mr. Edgerton, whose Arctic venturing for the Presidential Search Committee had prevented the two of them from developing this proposal for earlier distribution, found the provost's suggested procedure satisfactory.

Mr. Russell hoped that the Steering Committee would provide background on the Senate's former Budget Committee and the reasons for its demise, along with information on the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and its involvement in the budget process. Mr.

Hough pointed out that the current APPC charge has it viewing the budget as a fait accompli rather than participating in its development. He could recall no Senate committee that ever tracked fully with budget processes and development activity. He suggested that the proposed committee be thought of as analogous to the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget. Mr. Kleckner volunteered that Steering Committee members could burrow into Senate archives. He recalled a Budget Committee that perished in the committee restructuring that resulted in the APPC'S charge. Mr. Russell, who had served on both the Budget Committee and the APPC, remembered that there was at least one time when a Senate committee provided advice to the provost during actual preparation of the budget.

When Mr. Downing asked what types of questions its sponsors envisaged the new committee actually voting upon, Mr. Hough replied that it would report to the Senate. Mr. Chipman pursued that inquiry, wondering whether this would be like those Senate committees that advise the Senate on issues the Senate itself is required to vote upon or whether it would be one of those (like the Committee on Human Relations) that report regularly in order to facilitate discussion of important issues. If the latter, then he would like to see a report schedule built into the committee's charge so that the Senate could anticipate a specific point of time when the reporting function would be carried out, whether that would be at the time when the completed budget is to be approved or when the Senate might still have input into the developmental process. Mr. Kleckner asked what the Senate wished such a committee to do. Should it report regularly like the Committee on Human Relations or, as with most committees, come to the Senate only when it proposes specific actions?

When Mr. Hough asked Mr. Russell how he would have structured a year's work for the earlier Budget Committee, Mr. Russell noted that the work cycle had varied in response to changing styles of university leadership. While recognizing that much depends on a new president's method of operation, he judged it most useful to share in the input stage of the process when funding priorities get discussed. Mr. Braunstein agreed about the importance of input. He also hoped the new committee could preserve the community from surprises, given that academics make professional plans with long lead-times and need to know whether they can anticipate institutional support.

Mr. Russell hoped the Senate would not be misled by this proposal into thinking that the APPC has done nothing about budget matters in recent years. The provost has been reporting regularly to that body twice a year, explaining current outlays in the fall and anticipating the next year's prospects in the winter. Their overview has been limited, however, to the Academic Affairs area of the budget. Mr. Kleckner noted that the state itself often fails to anticipate its fiscal situation in timely fashion. Mr. McKay, who described himself as concerned with the interface between a Budget Committee and the APPC, said he had reviewed the existing committee's charge and found that it included advising the Senate on budgetary implications of program introductions and discontinuances. Yet the APPC has not been in a position to examine suspicions that the university's budget as a whole may be weighed too heavily against Academic Affairs. If that is the case, the Senate should know it. If, on the other hand, other divisions are hurting equally, the Senate should know that. He stressed that the community would benefit from general understanding of what resources exist and whether any of them can be shifted to provide support for academic programs. Looking at the proposed committee charge, he welcomed the idea of a Senate body's responsibility for developing comparative studies and reviewing trends over time. He hoped Oakland University would install a president who would give high priority to those matters. Whether this would be the committee to do it, he could not say at this point, but he hoped for wide sharing of accurate budgetary information.

Mr. Kleckner assured him that there is no reason why the Senate should not have full information. The real question is whether people want a committee of this type. He said that the Steering Committee would try to digest comments and examine other committee charges -- both those to historical committees that undertook related tasks and those to current bodies whose duties might be modified with the introduction of a University Budget Committee. Ms. Garcia agreed that such work would be very helpful, especially as the community comes to know the new president's plans. Mr. Kleckner said he would rather do this work right than quickly, and Mr. Russell encouraged the Steering Committee to dig into archival materials from the time of the former Budget Committee's disappearance.

Mr. Downing urged senators to bear in mind both sides of the ledger. It is not just a question of allocation but of determination of projected FYES numbers. Although enrollment plans have great influence on the budget, he noted that the Academic Affairs division was not always involved in setting each year's target.

Mr. Laidler raised a concern about the committee's membership, indicating that it should have a student member. Mr. Kleckner said he would solicit expressions of interest in serving. With discussion thus concluded for the time being, he asked for Good and Welfare proposals.

Mr. Fish responded by asking how much money the university is saving by having our halls and offices cleaned during the day rather than at night. He yearned for the good old days when professors could go about their work without noisy obstacles. Ms. Garcia said that the persons doing the cleaning wished for the same advantage. Mr. Kleckner, who thought the monetary figure was somewhere in the upper five figures, promised to locate that information.

Turning to information items promised on the agenda, Mr. Kleckner reported that the Board of Trustees had voted the day before to offer our presidency to Dr. Sandra Packard. Mr. DeCarlo said that Mr. Sims had contacted her and is attempting to schedule a meeting for negotiation of her contract. Dr. Packard will be on campus in the near future. The remaining information item concerned budget developments in Lansing. Mr. Kleckner noted that the annual ritual of institutional budget hearings had begun. Governor Engler recommended no cuts to higher education; his position is interpreted to mean no increases either. Oakland University's turn comes tomorrow to testify before the Senate Budget Committee. He anticipated questions about how our tuition rates will be affected by continuation of this year's allocation without any improvement. Legislators are also likely to ask about how institutions expect to deal with the absence of plans to approve new capital construction projects. The answer is, of course, "not well." We must find better ways to utilize existing space. Although the provost described the Senate committee as "basically a friendly group," he doubted they would be able to offer much hope.

Interim President DeCarlo provided further perspective on Lansing developments. He doubted that the next day's meeting with the Senate committee would be extensive, and he regretted that the House had altogether canceled such hearings for universities. Pointing out that the Senate is struggling to find new sources of income (such as an increased tobacco tax) that could be partially earmarked for higher education, he said he would support such a measure. He had talked with the governor that day and inquired about rumors of executive orders rescinding this year's appropriated funds. A mounting state deficit raises that possibility despite the governor's reluctance to hit education. He reported that Governor Engler feels fairly confident we can get through this year as planned, but there is little hope for additional revenue for the

next two years. A projected cut in property taxes will hit particularly severely two years hence. Mr. DeCarlo thought Oakland would do all right, if we move promptly to position ourselves for hard times. "We'll survive." So far as capital outlay is concerned, Mr. DeCarlo described the situation for the science building as very critical, especially if the legislature requires institutions to match state allocations for building. He would strongly protest such a proposal. He also foresaw disaster in a projected requirement that universities pay bonding interest costs. This arrangement would prevent building on all but a few Michigan campuses. Virtually no building at state expense is likely over the next few years. To provide perspective on our situation, Mr. Kleckner mentioned Mr. Urice's recent accreditation visit to a university in New York that has taped off areas of the campus to protect people from physical injury resulting from ill-maintained physical facilities and that is implementing drastic program and faculty cuts. Members of the accreditation team who hailed from other eastern states regarded their colleagues on the New York campus as comparatively lucky! He then reported that Oakland administrators will be bringing in an outside consulting firm to review space use and recommend optimal use of our present facilities while we wait and wait for the new science building.

Concluding the meeting, Mr. Hough said that he had been struck with the fact that the way in which the Board conducted the presidential search had gone very much as the Senate proposed. He then introduced a resolution of thanks that had been drafted by this body's secretary:

RESOLVED that the Oakland University Senate thanks the Board of Trustees for the open and inclusive way in which it conducted the presidential search process and commends the members of the presidential search committee for their generous service to this community.

The chair saw no reason why such a resolution should not be subject to immediate vote, and the Senate approved it unanimously. On that happy note, Mr. Kleckner welcomed Mr. Fish's call for adjournment at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:
Jane E. Eberwein
Secretary to the University Senate

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E
Home Page