



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 9 April 1987  
Seventh Meeting

### *MINUTES*

Senators Present: Appleton, Barthel, Bingham, Blankenship, Blatt, Burke, Chipman, Coffey, Copenhaver, Diltz, Downing, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Frankie, Gerulaitis, Haskell, Herman, Hildebrand, Hough, Kiwicz, Ketchum, Khapoya, Kleckner, Moore, Pine, Reddy, Russell, Schimmelman, Stillman, Stinson, Taylor, Terry, Thomas, Tripp, Willoughby, Wilson, Witt.  
Senators Absent: Barnard, Bertocci, Cardimen, Champagne, Chatterjee, Clatworthy, Dahlgren, Desmond, Garcia, Hamilton, Hart-Gonzalez, Hartman, Heubel, Higgins, Hightower, Horwitz, Liboff, Lindell, Pettengill, Pillow, Righter, Rozek, Srodawa, Straughen, Swartz.

#### Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 12 March 1987 (Russell; Coffey). Approved.
2. Motion to increase credit requirements for M.A. in Counseling (Dahlgren; Pine). Approved.
3. Motion concerning Senate representation for the Eye Research Institute (Wilson; Witt). Approved.
4. Motion concerning 1-grade records (Chipman; Downing). First reading.
5. Motion to modify the membership of the Academic Standing and Honors Committee (Downing; Hough). First reading.
6. Procedural motion to fill a vacancy on the Academic Standing and Honors Committee (Hough; Willoughby). Approved.
7. Procedural motion to staff Senate committees, 1987-89 (Hildebrand; Tripp). Approved.

At 3:16 p.m., Mr. Kleckner announced that he was calling "this unruly group" to order. Decorous silence followed his announcement, allowing him to call for consideration of the minutes of 12 March. These, having been moved by Mr. Russell and seconded by Ms. Coffey, were approved without discussion. (Note: the Secretary apologizes to Mr. Copenhaver for misrepresenting him as absent on that occasion, which he claims to remember vividly.) Attention turned to the first item of old business: a motion from the Graduate Council concerning credit requirements for the M.A. degree in Counseling (Messrs. Dahlgren and Pine):

**MOVED** that credit requirements for the M.A. in Counseling program be increased from 36 to 48 semester hours.

Mr. Pine reminded his Senate colleagues that the proposed action responds to the advice given to the School of Human and Educational Services when this master's program was reviewed by the Graduate Council. Thus reassured that the program review system is working effectively,

the Senate approved the motion without dissent.

The other item of continuing business fared equally well. This was a motion from the Steering Committee to provide Senate representation for the faculty of the Eye Research Institute (Ms. Wilson; Mr. Witt):

**MOVED** that the Senate repeal its legislation of 6 December 1979 linking faculty of the Institute of Biological Sciences with those of the Center for Health Sciences for purposes of Senate voting and representation by establishing separate rights of representation for the Eye Research Institute. The Director of the Eye Research Institute shall be seated ex officio and voting. Faculty holding primary appointments in the Eye Research Institute shall be entitled to minimum representation of one elected seat and such additional seats as may be warranted by the Senate's apportionment procedures.

Ms. Wilson pointed out that the motion provides independent representation for the Eye Research Institute, separate from its old liaison with the Center that grew into the School of Health Sciences. The Senate gave its unanimous consent. Mr. Kleckner then announced that the Eye Research Institute, anticipating this happy outcome, had already elected its new Senator to join this body.

Next came the first item of new business: a motion from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee to establish a system for recording Incomplete grades (Messrs. Chipman and Downing):

**MOVED** that written records must accompany the assignment of an Incomplete grade for any undergraduate or graduate student, specifying the work that must be completed in order to remove the 1-grade and a schedule for completing that work. Sufficiently detailed information about course expectations must be provided to allow another faculty member to carry out terms of the agreement, if necessary. Copies are to be maintained by the Instructor, the student, and the instructor's department office; forms should be submitted to the department office along with any grade sheets recording 1-grades. Responsibility for requesting the Incomplete rests with the student; although faculty members may, at their discretion, initiate preparation of the 1-grade form in emergency situations when the student is unable to do so. This policy is to take effect with the fall 1987 semester.

Mr. Chipman, when called upon to explain the proposal, deferred to Ms. Eberwein, as it was the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction that initiated it. Ms. Eberwein expounded somewhat on the agenda commentary. She explained that the motion resulted from the new undergraduate grading system, which allows an Incomplete grade to be awarded for work left undone anytime after the final date for official withdrawal from a course at the end of the eighth week. Whereas, in olden times, an I could only involve one week's classwork and the final examination, it may now entail considerably more. Current policy allows the student to complete this work within the first eight weeks of the next semester in which she or he registers (so long as it is within a calendar year--after which the I for undergraduates reverts to a 0.0). UCUI developed this proposal in an attempt to protect an instructor's pedagogical control over the course so that the instructor, rather than the student, determines the sequence and pacing of assignments.

The motion also protects the student, however, by providing sufficient information about course expectations that another faculty member could carry out the original instructor's intentions should that person be unavailable. Evidence of professorial mortality spurs this development, although happier reasons for a faculty member's disappearance seem more probable--research leaves, retirements, and such. A written record of the 1-grade and specifications for its completion is to be shared by the student (who initiates this process by requesting the I and furnishing the form), the instructor, and the instructor's department. The faculty member is, of course, free to refuse an Incomplete. A space exists on the form to indicate whether the request is accepted or denied. After developing this system, UCUI invited the Graduate Council to consider adopting it also--even though I grades for graduate students remain on the books indefinitely. The Graduate Council responded enthusiastically; so the matter was then referred to the APPC, which deliberates on academic policies that pertain to both graduate and undergraduate students.

Mr. Willoughby asked whether the record would stop at the department office or advance to the Registrar's office. Ms. Eberwein declared that it would go no farther than the department or school--whichever unit is closer to the faculty member who assigned the grade. Mr. Burke later recurred to this point, suspecting a quality of wimpiness in a policy whose implementation depends on the cooperation of the department. He expressed trust in departments, however. Mr. Chipman acknowledged that no explicit system of monitoring was intended but thought that the Registrar could ascertain whether a form had been filed in the department office before assigning the grade. Ms. Eberwein indicated that UCUI had considered advancing a copy of the form this one additional step but had decided against it. Grades must be recorded and sent out under tight deadlines that would preclude the Registrar from double-checking all these forms at the actual time of grading. This information is of relatively little use to his office; whereas it may well prove important at the departmental level, when colleagues are called upon to complete an instructor's work. UCUI chose not to develop another level of bureaucracy. Mr. Willoughby preferred that the record be submitted directly to the chair or dean. Since it would be the chair's duty to see that the unit's duties were fulfilled, he thought that the chair should be in a position to make sure that all information appeared clearly enough on the form and in sufficient detail to be generally useful. Ms. Gerulaitis thought that the student's self-interest should assure that. The information must be comprehensible to that person also--by all odds the most interested party in the affair. Mr. Barthel thought departments could handle the burden, each in its own way. Self-interest should motivate them. Ms. Gerulaitis expressed confidence in a good secretary.

Ms. Bingham wondered about the forms themselves: would they be in triplicate, and where would they be available? Ms. Eberwein assured her that multiple copies would come attached for easy completion and that copies would be available in department offices, advising offices, and the Registrar office. She displayed a draft version of the form, which will soon be perfected.

Several questions arose about changing grades. Mr. Eberwein wondered whether the instructor could still petition the Dean to extend the period for completing an incomplete. Yes. Mr. Stillman asked what would happen if a student were unable to request the I at the appropriate time. Could an instructor give an Incomplete the following week? Ms. Eberwein pointed out that grades must be awarded on a tight schedule. If an instructor had no indication from the student or the student's family that an emergency made an Incomplete necessary, he/she would have to submit a numerical grade. Later, if satisfied that an I would be appropriate, the instructor would have to petition to change the numerical grade to an I. She thought that such

circumstances would seldom occur. Usually, students or their parents find ways to get in touch with the professor when a student is injured or hospitalized or called out of state at examination time.

Mr. Appleton anticipated some declining GPAs as a result of this policy given that many faculty members would be deterred from awarding 1-grades because of the increased paper-work. He could live with this situation, however, and expressed support for the motion. But, while the subject was under discussion in a public forum, he wished to pose several questions so that the answers would appear on the official record. The first of these questions had to do with repeating courses. Could a student repeat a course as a means of fulfilling the terms of an Incomplete? Ms. Eberwein said decidedly not. UCUI had discussed this matter and had no intention of changing existing policy. If a student needs to repeat the course, he/she should register for it again, pay tuition as usual, and file a repeat card. When the course is completed, the second grade (often higher than the original) replaces the first on the transcript. Mr. Appleton pursued the point by inquiring whether the practice might be acceptable if the idea of repeating the course, tuition-free, on the basis of an I were initiated by instructor. No. He then asked whether the policy being proposed to the Senate would make it acceptable for the instructor to require a student to retake some specific part of the course such as a laboratory exercise or a special class project. Ms. Eberwein said that would be acceptable and might even be necessary, given the impossibility of reproducing certain circumstances in a faculty office. She pointed out that this arrangement might well entail filing a petition to extend the period of the Incomplete, given that the assignments missed probably took place in the final seven weeks of the course even though the I must normally be made up in the first eight weeks of the next semester in which the student registers.

Mr. Appleton also asked whether a student is entitled to withhold work required to make up an Incomplete until that magic eighth week. Can a professor require that the work be turned in sooner? Ms. Eberwein acknowledged that a case involving just that question had precipitated this discussion in UCUI. The committee finds nothing in current policy to protect a professor from receiving an onslaught of work in the eighth week. The new policy would address this issue, however, and protect the instructor's right to maintain pedagogical control of the course. The record form for the I grade requires the student to sign an agreement to complete the work as specified by the instructor. Thus, a faculty member may require that work be accomplished step by step--just as is done in the usual course syllabus.

With discussion of the 1-grade motion deferred until its second reading, the Senate then prepared itself to discuss the next item of new business: a motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee concerning its membership specifications. The absence of Mr. Righter, however, and the non-appearance of any other member of the sponsoring committee prompted Mr. Kleckner to defer discussion of this matter until other business had been completed on the assumption that Ms. Chapman-Moore would eventually appear to speak for her committee.

The next agenda item was a procedural motion from the Steering Committee to fill a vacancy on the Academic Standing and Honors Committee. Upon a motion by Mr. Hough, seconded by Mr. Willoughby, the group elected Augustin Fosu to replace Alice Gorlin through the Spring-Summer of 1988. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that this is a hard-working committee with especially demanding duties in the aftermath of winter, spring, and summer grading periods so that a vacancy through this summer would not be tolerable. Having resolved that problem, the Senate proceeded to consider the second procedural motion from the Steering Committee: the

annual roster of nominees to its standing committees. Ms. Hildebrand, seconded by Ms. Tripp, placed in nomination all names but one from the agenda. The exception was that of Professor Muir., who finds herself unable to serve on UCUI. The Steering Committee will submit another nomination for the SHES seat at the final Senate meeting. No discussion followed this announcement, and the slate of candidates was unanimously approved:

**a. Academic and Career Advising Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987.

Eleftherios Botsas

Mary Eddy

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)

Alice Horning (Chair)

Jerry Marsh

Howard Splete

**b. Academic Computing Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year (1987-89) effective fall 1987

James Dow

Donald Hildum

Syed Mahmud

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-1988)

David Doane

Anna Dugan

Jack Nachman

**c. Academic Conduct Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987

Harvey Burdick

C. L. Ko (Alternate)

Steve Miller

Subbaiah Perla

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)

Rita Gallagher

Mildred Merz

Anne Tripp (Chair)

**d. Academic Policy and Planning Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987

Joan Rosen

Robby Stewart

Carol Zenas

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)

Sharon Bostick  
George Coon  
Ronald Tracy (Chair)  
Christian Wagner

**e. Academic Standing and Honors Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-88) effective fall 1987  
Norman Kloosterman (Chair)  
Kristine Salomon

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)  
Augustin Fosu  
Bruce Mann

**f. Admissions and Financial Aid Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987  
Frances Jackson  
William Jones  
Ralph Mobley

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)  
Asish Nag (Chair)  
Sarma Vishnubhotla

**g. Campus Development and Environment Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987  
David Housel  
Diane Wilson

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)  
David Meyer  
Janice Schimmelman (Chair)  
Brent Steel

**h. General Education Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987  
Bonnie Abiko  
Pamela Hilbers  
Robert Stern

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)  
Penny Cass  
Renate Gerulaitis (Chair)  
Jerrold Grossman

**i. Research Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987

Gary Moore  
 Ronald Sudol  
 Nalin Unakar  
 Steve Wright

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)

Kevin Murphy  
 Dean Purcell  
 Michael Sevilla (Chair)  
 Carol Swift

**j. Teaching and Learning Committee**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987

William Fish  
 Sherman Folland  
 Subramaniam Ganesan

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)

Leo Gerulaitis (Chair)  
 Barbara Hamilton  
 Mary Krammin

**k. University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction**

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1987-89) effective fall 1987

Harold Hotelling: School of Business Administration  
 Kathleen Emrich: School of Nursing  
 (School of Human and Educational Services nominee to be announced at the next Senate meeting)

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1987-88)

David Downing: College of Arts and Sciences  
 Linda Hildebrand: Library  
 Joseph Hovanesian: School of Engineering and Computer Science  
 Osa Jackson: School of Health Sciences

With other business completed, attention turned again to the motion that had been deferred (moved, Mr. Downing; seconded, Mr. Hough):

**MOVED** that membership of the Academic Standing and Honors Committee be expanded by the addition of the Coordinator of the Academic Skills Center (or designee) as a non-voting, *ex officio* member.

Mr. Kleckner called attention to the note on the agenda, which indicated that the Steering Committee suggested consideration of the Director of the Academic Skills Center (or designee) as a substitute for the Coordinator. The designee might, of course, be the Coordinator. Ms. Eberwein then clarified the Steering Committee's intent. That body has been concerned about

the comparatively small faculty representation on this committee, given its responsibility for acting upon petitions from students dismissed for academic failure. Although sympathetic to the committee's desire to add a member with close ties to the Dismissal Option Program, which receives successful petitioners, the Steering Committee wished to increase faculty membership and therefore suggested doing so by adding one person to the committee: the faculty member who directs the Academic Skills Center. That person, currently, is Professor Robert Donald. He could, of course, name the non-faculty Coordinator as his designee. Since getting out the agenda, however, Ms. Eberwein had discussed this matter with Ms. Chapman-Moore and discovered that members of the Academic Standing and Honors Committee had already considered this alternative in their own deliberations and preferred to specify the Coordinator than the Director as the new member. They felt strongly the importance of including a person with close, direct knowledge of students actually in the DOP program. If the Steering Committee wishes to add another faculty seat, therefore, the Academic Standing and Honors Committee would prefer to deal with that matter separately--after approving this motion in its original form.

Mr. Chipman, recalling that standards for remaining in the DOP program were meant to operate almost automatically so that a student remained at Oakland or was dismissed on the basis of the next semester's grades without further committee action, wondered whether changes had occurred in operating that program. Mr. Kleckner knew of none. With nobody present to answer Mr. Chipman, the Senate was beginning to consider tabling the motion or considering it to have enjoyed its first reading--albeit a truncated one--when Ms. Chapman-Moore arrived and was immediately confronted with questions. She responded to Mr. Chipman's query about why direct contact with particular DOP students was important to the committee with an explanation of current procedure. Students in the DOP program get reviewed. Most stay or go on the basis of grades, but there are exceptional cases in which a student is progressing well even though not yet achieving quite a 2.0. The committee thinks the Coordinator of the Academic Skills Center should be able to ask special attention from the committee on behalf of such a person. Ms. Tripp, having just filled out some of the forms delivered by DOP students to their instructors, wondered what sort of good things a student might be doing to justify continued existence here if still unable to achieve a 2.0 average. Ms. Chapman-Moore pointed to the tutoring system that is now being introduced. A student might be making considerable use of this resource and might be scheduling timely, serious consultations with faculty. The system now requires the student to see an academic adviser as well. She indicated that the committee wants the flexibility to respond favorably to a student's effort and said that her colleagues were prepared to review special cases.

Mr. Chipman thought it would be more useful to see how effectively a student responds after being put on probation rather than actually dismissed. Ms. Chapman--Moore said that the Academic Standing and Honors Committee is looking into that matter but pointed out that the only thing done currently to inform probationary students of their perilous status is a notation of "probation" placed upon their semester grade sheets. Mr. Kleckner concurred, noting that some persons confuse probation with approbation. Mr. Russell noted that some academic units--his own included--have their own probationary policies that are not as yet reflected on the University's grade sheets. A student may be informed that she is in good academic standing when she is actually on probation so far as her major is concerned. Ms. Chapman-Moore drew the discussion to a close by reaffirming that her colleagues think it very important to have someone regularly working with the DOP program as a member of their committee. The matter will be considered again at the next meeting.



No private motions were introduced for the good of the order. Mr. Kleckner proceeded, therefore, to comment on the information items listed on the agenda. He pointed out that the final Senate meeting of the year has been rescheduled for a new date to avoid conflicting with final examinations. It will be held Monday morning, the 27th of April, at 9:30 a.m. in the Gold Room.

He then presented encouraging news about the library budget. The Joint Capital Outlay Committee of the Legislature has released the funds necessary for the architects, Rossetti and Associates, to complete their final drawings and prepare bid documents. All is downhill from here, but he cautioned that the hill is a long one. He hoped that University officers would be out with shovels around Thanksgiving and anticipated that the expanded and renovated Kresge Library would be fully open for business in September 1989. Logistical complications are to be expected, however, during the construction process and especially while the existing library area is remodeled. Hope for prompt action on the Science Building project has also been aroused in Lansing.

On that cheering note, Mr. Kleckner declared himself ready to consider adjournment. Mr. Willoughby responded with the expected motion and the Senate Concluded its duties at 4:10 p.m.

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

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

*Home Page*