



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY  
**S E N A T E**

**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE**

Thursday, 17 October 1991  
Second Meeting

***MINUTES***

Senators Present: Abiko, Appleton, Bennett, Benson, Braunstein, Briggs- Bunting, Campbell, Cass, Chipman, Cramer, Dahlgren, DeCarlo, Downing, Eberwein, Eckart, Edgerton, Eisenhower, Fish, Frankie, Gamboa, Garcia, Gerulaitis, Goslin, Griggs, Grossman, Halsted, Hartzler, Heintz, Hormozi, Hough, Hovanesian, Kevern, Kleckner, McKay, Mittelstaedt, Otto, Peterson, Pierson, Pine, Reddy, Rush, Russell, Schultz, Shepherd, Stamps, Stano, Swartz, Wisz, Witt, Wood, Workman, Zenas.

Senators Absent: Cowlshaw, Hansen-Smith, Jackson, Kheir, Kim, Mabee, Olson, Porter, Stevens, Urice.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 26 September 1991 (Hough; Briggs-Bunting). Approved.
2. Election of a Steering Committee member (Senate Elections Committee).
3. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to fill vacancies on two standing committees (Otto; Hough). Approved.
4. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to present eight faculty names to the Board as candidates for the Presidential Search Committee (Otto; Hough). Approved.
5. Procedural motion to recess the Senate and go into open session for the purpose of nominating candidates and conducting an advisory election. Approved.
6. Procedural motion to advance to the Board names of eight candidates elected in an advisory vote of faculty members present (Otto; Garcia). Approved.

Mr. Kleckner called the Senate to order at 3:16 p.m., noting that the unusual room (the conclave having been moved from the Oakland Room to the East Crockery) and seating arrangement reflected unusual activity about to occur. Senators took seats in the usual formation, while the multitudes of additional faculty participants occupied several hundred additional chairs. He then summarized plans for conduct of the meeting to clarify how work on the separate task of identifying a slate of faculty members to present to the Board as candidates for the four faculty seats on the Presidential Search Committee was to be conducted separately from routine Senate business. In an attempt to make the selection process as open as possible despite severe time constraints, the Steering Committee invited all interested members of the faculty to enter names and vote in an advisory election. This activity would take place in an open session while the Senate recessed after transacting its regularly scheduled business. Once the election was conducted, the Senate would reconvene to confirm the slate identified in the advisory vote. When Mr. McKay inquired whether names only would be transmitted or whether the Steering Committee would provide additional information about elected finalists

to the Board, Mr. Hough replied that the Steering Committee had decided to offer to send a delegation to advise the Board. Ms. Otto added that the Steering Committee intended to send forward short biographical statements provided by the eight worthies to provide background on what expertise each would bring to the presidential search process.

Ms. Gerulaitis objected to the requirement that the Senate advance two names for each faculty seat on the committee, wondering why the Board wanted to select our representatives and asking whether senators wished to go along with the stipulated procedure. Mr. Kleckner thought that Trustee Googasian had explained this process at the September Senate meeting. He indicated that the Senate could do whatever it wished, but so could the Board. He would not speculate on what the Board would do if presented with only four names. Mr. McKay pointed out that these procedures came from the Ad Hoc Committee rather than the full body of trustees. When Mr. Stamps asked what would happen if the Senate sent forward four names as its first choices, accompanied by a list of four alternates, Mr. Kleckner said he did not know. Mr. Stamps then declared his intention to introduce such a recommendation at the appropriate point in the agenda. Ms. Gerulaitis announced that she would move to submit four names, period. Mr. Stamps indicated his support for that position. With such intimations of future activity, the Senate then turned its attention to ordinary business.

Mr. Kleckner noted that the minutes of 26 September had been distributed rather late and wondered whether senators felt prepared to discuss them. He would welcome a motion for approval but would also willingly defer consideration until November. When Mr. Hough, seconded by Ms. Briggs-Bunting moved approval, the Senate concurred without discussion.

No old business remained, so attention turned next to the familiar task of replacing committee members. First came an election, conducted by Mr. Arnold and the Senate Elections Committee, to replace Mr. Stevens on the Steering Committee. Mr. Stevens, who had been elected in absentia at the September meeting, found himself too busy to serve. Had he been present at that session, he would have followed the example of other senators who had withdrawn their names from consideration. Mr. Arnold accepted nominations and conducted an election that resulted in Mr. Edgerton's installation. While those ballots were being counted, Ms. Otto, seconded by Mr. Hough, introduced a procedural motion to fill vacancies on two standing committees by electing Joyce Eckart to replace Sharon Muir on the General Education Committee (1991- 92) and Eleanor Lewellen Reynolds to replace Ronald Kevern on the Committee on Human Relations (1991-94). The Senate approved these recommendations without discussion.

Still waiting for news about the Steering Committee election, Mr. Kleckner introduced Messieurs Peterson and Wisz as new student senators and then turned over the floor to Mr. DeCarlo to provide information on current events and answer any questions. The Interim President reported that he had liberated \$20,000.00 from golf course profits to be used in a faculty development fund as a seedbed for special projects. Just as Mr. DeCarlo was about to discuss the governor's recent budget vetoes, Mr. Arnold returned with election news, and the Senate turned its attention back to the main business of the day.

Mr. Kleckner, hastening to another meeting, yielded the chair to Mr. Dahlgren for the purpose of electing faculty members to serve on the Presidential Search Committee, but not before reminding his colleagues to make sure any nominees had agreed in advance to serve. With the Senate still in regular session, Ms. Otto, again seconded by Mr. Hough, moved on behalf of the

Steering Committee that eight faculty names be presented by the Senate to the Board of Trustees. Ms. Gerulaitis immediately objected that it should be a faculty prerogative to choose our own representatives. Mr. Hough observed that the motion reflected discussion of this issue by the Steering Committee, which recognized Mr. Sims's invitation as a real and welcome opportunity for faculty members to participate directly in the presidential selection process for the first time in the university's history. He explained that the committee had proposed a slate of eight candidates, fully confident that any four of them would represent us admirably. Rather than trying to divide the slate according to separate constituencies, the Steering Committee endeavored to advance names of persons widely acquainted with the university as a whole and well qualified for committee service -- recognizing, however, that other names equally suitable could be added in the open session to follow. Ms. Gerulaitis still rejected the idea of letting anyone else make the final decision for the faculty. Mr. McKay viewed the matter differently, preferring to think that faculty members would select all eight, with the four who would actually be appointed to the Search Committee relying on the others for wise counsel. Yet Ms. Garcia saw nothing to ensure that the remaining four would serve as lieutenants to those selected. She took little comfort in the idea of a backup committee anyway, remembering that faculty backup committees in previous presidential searches had found themselves so far back as to disappear from sight.

Mr. McKay indicated his support for the Steering Committee motion, mentioning that the Senate could recommend that the four chosen rely on the others for advice. When Mr. Braunstein asked for Mr. DeCarlo's informed judgment about how the Senate should proceed on this matter, Mr. DeCarlo responded that the Board has the duty of selecting a president. It is trying to involve the faculty in that momentous process and has proposed a method for identifying potential members of the Search Committee. He advised doing what they asked and raised the possibility that, if the Senate were to advance only four names, the Board might send back for four more. He pointed out that the recommended process is a generally accepted one, both fair and appropriate. Queries also arose about the proposed slate: what constituencies did the eight represent; was there a way to assure that any particular group would be represented? Ms. Otto mentioned that the Search Committee would include representatives of other constituencies such as deans and administrative-professionals. Each of those groups would advance two names for each slot. When Ms. Briggs-Bunting mentioned that it would be helpful to know which constituencies might be represented by the dean appointed to the Search Committee, Mr. Dahlgren reported that Deans Pine and Stevens had been proposed by their colleagues. Following this discussion the chair called for a vote on the Steering Committee motion to send forward eight names, and the motion carried by voice vote with some dissents.

At this point, Mr. Dahlgren asked for a motion to recess the Senate in order to go into open session for nominations and an advisory vote. The suggestion met with general approval.

#### RECORD OF OPEN SESSION BETWEEN SENATE MEETINGS

Mr. Dahlgren then invited Mr. Arnold to step forward to carry out the electoral process. Ms. Otto, speaking for the Steering Committee, pointed out that an attempt was being made to carry out a process that would allow maximum faculty input in time to make recommendations the next day to the Board. She entered into consideration a slate of eight well qualified and willing professors judged by the Steering Committee to meet not only the Board's criteria but its own. Specifically, the committee has sought out persons with substantial records of

university-wide committee service that qualifies them to represent the institution as a whole. The eight names proposed by the Steering Committee were Peter Bertocci, Daniel Braunstein, J. Curtis Chipman, George Gamboa, Vincent Khapoya, Sharon Muir, Joan Rosen, and Michael Sevilla. With the floor open to nominations, other names appeared on Mr. Arnold's chalkboard: Jack Barnard, Jane Briggs-Bunting, Robert Edgerton, Brian Goslin, Dorsey Hammond, Robbin Hough, Mary Otto, John Reddan, and Nalin Unakar. Those making nominations mentioned school affiliations, association with the university's research mission, and representation of newer faculty among the reasons for supporting particular candidacies. With seventeen names presented, Ms. Eckart moved that nominations be closed, and the group concurred. Mr. Arnold indicated that electors should vote for up to eight candidates.

Mr. Russell inquired who would be eligible to vote, trusting that suffrage would be restricted to faculty members. Ms. Otto replied that the Steering Committee, aware that the Board had asked the Senate for its recommendation, anticipated that all senators would vote in addition to any other faculty members present. Mr. Russell objected to allowing anyone to vote in the advisory election other than faculty members and pointed out that the memorandum setting forth plans for this meeting spoke only of faculty voters. Mr. McKay thought the faculty vote would serve as advice to the Senate. Mr. Edgerton read the memorandum to mean that faculty only would vote initially, with the Senate confirming their judgment later. On the basis of this discussion, Mr. Arnold ruled that the Elections Committee would take ballots only from faculty.

While ballots were being counted, Mr. Dahlgren invited Mr. DeCarlo to continue his remarks. Mr. DeCarlo returned, therefore, to the matter of last week's gubernatorial vetoes. Relatively speaking, he asserted, Oakland was not hit too badly. Every institution sustained vetoes, and some of our sister universities -- notably Central and Western -- lost over a million dollars. Oakland, by contrast, lost about \$250,000.00, mainly from the Labor Studies Center. Other vetoes included funding for the Japanese program, the visiting scholar portion of the King-Chavez-Parks program, and the Teaching Excellence Awards. He did not expect the legislature to override these vetoes successfully but said that Oakland people would keep on tactfully trying to restore funds. He thought we could weather these losses on the strength of prudent budgeting. The cuts were based purely on money, not partisanship this time, and he interpreted the message from Lansing to be that the state simply lacks the wherewithal to do all that it has tried to do. When he invited questions, Mr. Walia asked about funding for the Teaching Excellence Awards and Research Excellence Award, stressing the importance of recognizing both forms of professorial achievement.

Mr. Tepley then asked where we stand on the projected science building. Mr. DeCarlo saw no progress since the September meeting and conjectured that nothing would be accomplished until the legislature raises the bonding cap. It no longer appears that that milestone will be reached this month.

Mr. McKay asked what Mr. McGarry had meant at the latest Board meeting, when he spoke of the state's \$2.9 million negative appropriation for the summer term. Mr. DeCarlo explained that we were not paid for the three summer months. The state pledges to pay out our full budget over the fiscal year, but we have had to close books before funding gets restored. We cannot be positive that it ever will come, but at the moment this shortfall can be regarded as "just a bookkeeping deficit." He encouraged people not to worry about it.

When Mr. Gamboa then asked whether there had been any movement on selling property for Squirrel Road expansion, Mr. DeCarlo reported that Oakland University objected strongly to the most recent plans because they lack a greenbelt and would create problems with respect to snow removal and parking. We are holding out for a more expensive plan that would preserve some of the road's bucolic atmosphere. He noted that outsiders often consider university property as belonging to everyone but said that Oakland people would resist that kind of thinking. With no further questions raised, the Interim President promised to keep the Senate posted on developments. He appreciated the community's cooperation and urged people not to fret at this point about the deficit situation.

While the Elections Committee continued to count ballots, Mr. Dahlgren introduced the Good and Welfare portion of the familiar Senate agenda, asking if there were anything to be offered for the good of the order. Mr. Heintz took advantage of this opportunity to report that the University Student Congress envisages resurrecting Oakland Undiapered in some form and hopes for faculty cooperation and involvement. He anticipated a booklet that would be more informative than evaluative, allowing students to see syllabi for courses and learn how instructors meant to conduct them.

Mr. Dahlgren then asked the Steering Committee what it had to report in response to Mr. Stamps's September inquiry about a Faculty Club. Ms. Otto said that there had been inadequate time to go beyond a preliminary discussion. She hoped to have more information available at the next meeting of the Senate. It turned out that the Steering Committee also had no program prepared to amuse those waiting for election returns. She suggested that people use the free time to network.

With some people beginning to leave, the question arose as to whether there was any reason for no-senators to remain. Mr. Downing pointed out that the number of candidates greatly increased the likelihood of ties and Mr. Dahlgren encouraged those who could do so to stay for any run-off votes.

Mr. Liboff took advantage of the waiting interval to raise concerns about faculty governance and Senate structure. This day's events reminded him that the university has no forum available for faculty members to advance their thinking apart from other members of the Oakland community. He urged substitution of a faculty senate system of governance rather than the general university model that has traditionally prevailed here. Ms. Benson supported his suggestion, observing how difficult it seems for newer faculty members to circulate and test out their ideas. As a new senator, she had requested and studied the Senate constitution but remained puzzled about how the system works. She agreed with Mr. Liboff's point that Oakland has long needed an exclusively faculty deliberative body. Mr. Brieger, intending no reflection on the present Senate, agreed that such a forum would be useful. Yet governance processes move so sluggishly that he recognized it would be asking a great deal of the current Senate to dissolve itself and develop new structures.

Mr. McKay, presenting himself as "new" to the Senate after a ten- year interval between terms, inquired how many senators are not faculty members -- assuming that academic administrators all hold professorial rank. The secretary responded "very few": three students, two APs elected by their Assembly, three presidential appointees, and the Interim President. "We already have an overwhelmingly faculty body". Mr. Hough, declaring himself sympathetic to the objections raised, wondered what those complaining wanted the Senate to do that it is

not now doing, what questions another governance structure could address more effectively. He described the University Senate as already a faculty body with ties to other campus groups and indicated that he would welcome specific suggestions. Mr. Appleton commented that a faculty senate might have different powers and functions than a university one. He warned that a new constitution would call for thoroughgoing Board review that could entail rethinking of existing Senate prerogatives. Noting that the University Student Congress has faculty representatives, he pointed out that governance is not a one-way matter; there are gains to be found in collaboration. Mr. Liboff recalled a Board meeting recently at which trustees asserted their belief that we already have a faculty senate. It struck him that academic issues often get subordinated in Senate deliberations to financial and administrative concerns. By substituting a specifically faculty governance body that would concentrate on academic concerns, he thought it possible to lose some clout while maintaining a soul.

On this note, Mr. Arnold reappeared with election results. He preferred to follow the Senate's custom of not reporting specific tallies but assured people that there were no ties for the first eight positions. Those elected were Professors Barnard, Bertocci, Briggs-Bunting, Chipman, Edgerton, Gamboa, Khapoya, and Sevilla. Mr. Dahlgren then thanked the Elections Committee for its heroic service and ruled the Senate back in session.

#### RECONVENED SENATE MEETING

Ms. Otto, seconded by Ms. Garcia, then introduced a procedural motion for the Senate to advance these eight names to the Board. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote. Mr. Dahlgren then welcomed Mr. Hough's call for adjournment at 4:56 p.m.

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

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