

Oakland University Senate
April 16, 2009
Minutes

Members present: Andersen, Berven (D), Bhargava, Debnath, Dvir, Eberly-Lewis, Eis, English, Frick, Goslin, Graetz, Grossman, Hawley, Howell, Ingram, Khattree, Kusow, Law-Sullivan, Lemarbe, Lombardo, Machmut-Jhashi, Meehan, Mittelstaedt, Mitton, Moore, Moran, Moudgil, Nixon, Pelfrey, Penprase, Preisinger, Rammel, Russell, Sangeorzan, Shablin, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Thompson, Voelck

Members absent: Berven (K), Brown, Condic, Doane, Giblin, Hightower, Keane, Larrabee, Medaugh, Mili, Murphy, Polis, Tanniru, Townsend, Wharton, Wiggins, Williams, Wood, Zou

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Items:

Security Update--Mr. Lucido

Modifications to Graduate Programs—Ms. Rammel

RN-MSN Program

Transitional Doctor of Physical Therapy (tDPT) Degree

2. Roll Call. Approval of minutes of 3-19-09. Mr. Frick, Ms. Howell. Approved as amended with written corrections to be submitted electronically by Mr. Moran.
3. Motion to approve revised SEHS Constitution. Second reading postponed.
4. Motion to approve revised Library Constitution. First reading. Mr. Polis, Ms. Moore.
5. .Motion to approve new major program in Cinema Studies. First reading. Mr. Meehan, Mr. Nixon.
- 5a. .Motion to waive second reading of new program in Cinema Studies. Ms. Howell, Mr. Nixon. Approved.
- 5b. Motion to approve new major program in Cinema Studies. Approved.
6. Motion to approve establishment of undergraduate certificate programs. First reading. Mr. Polis, Ms. Pelfrey.
- 6a. Motion to waive second reading of UG certificate programs. Ms. Thompson-Adams, Ms. Moore. Approved.
- 6b. Motion to approve establishment of undergraduate certificate programs. Approved.
Motion to discontinue Senate Budget Review and Planning Review Committees
7. and create new Senate Planning and Budget Review Committee. First reading. Mr. Meehan, Mr. Nixon.
- 7a. Motion to recommit the motion to the Steering Committee. Mr. Russell, Mr. Mitton. Approved. 20 yes, 14 no.
- 7b. Motion to authorize a Senate meeting in May. Mr. Russell, Mr. Nixon. Approved

Summary of Actions:

8. Motion to endorse a resolution to support review of physical relocations of academic units, departments, or programs. First reading. Ms. Howell, Ms. Pelfrey.
- 8a. Motion to waive second reading of the resolution. Mr. Grossman, Ms. Howell.
Approved, with three no votes recorded.
- 8b. Motion to endorse the resolution to support review of physical relocations of units, departments, or programs. Approved, with three no votes recorded.
9. Procedural motion to staff Senate standing committee. Ms. Williams, Ms. Moore.
Approved.

Mr. Moudgil called the meeting to order at 3:15 and suggested that although this is traditionally the final Senate meeting of the academic year, senators and senate committee members may be needed to facilitate the work of the faculty and the university over the summer months. He then invited Mr. Lucido to speak to a campus security issue. Noting that years ago Mrs. Wilson had installed a security gate in the area of east campus, Mr. Lucido outlined plans over the spring to add an electronic gate at the triangle near Sunset Terrace. According to Mr. Lucido, this measure will enhance security at Meadow Brook Hall, the Incubator, and the golf courses. Protecting the valuable art work at MBH, a building that is on the national register of historic properties, and the sensitive research of OU faculty at the Incubator are key concerns. In addition, recent vandalism and theft on the golf course has further indicated that greater security is needed, particularly during the overnight hours. Mr. Lucido stated that he has requested the security gate for several years and has now obtained the necessary approvals. The installation will occur in the next few weeks, with gates closing off the area to vehicular traffic between 11:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. in the summer. Staff will have authorized access. Stealing objects from the facilities in this area of campus would require a vehicle. This effort is not a guarantee that such incidents will be entirely prevented, but it does move toward enhancing safety and security. Mr. Frick asked if multiple gates were planned; Mr. Lucido clarified that only one gate would be installed, and that it would be placed in the same location as Mrs. Wilson's gate. He added that it would look exactly like the fencing already in place and would not detract from the area aesthetically.

Ms. Rammel presented the next informational item, which involved modifications to graduate programs in the Schools of Nursing and Health Sciences. The RN-MSN program is intended to provide BSN students, with a slight adjustment in the undergraduate curriculum, an option for early admission into the graduate program. It allows earlier commitment, prior to being enrolled as a graduate student. Mr. Moudgil asked for clarification regarding compromise to academic quality in making adjustments to the curriculum, to which Ms. Rammel assured him that there is no academic impact on either degree. Ms. Moore asked whether this indicates that Graduate Council has dealt with the issue of accelerated programs, for example, the five-year master's degree. Ms. Rammel observed that the RN-MSN program is not an accelerated program; rather, it is an early admission opportunity. Graduate Council, however, is working with the MPA program to design a five-year template that would satisfy both sides of the degree requirements. In this template, courses could be shared between the undergraduate and graduate levels. Financial aid is a key issue in moving forward with building such a plan to make it advantageous to students. She noted that Graduate Council is working to bring a plan forward, possibly in the fall.

The secretary then took the roll call. Mr. Moudgil then noticed that the second part of Ms. Rammel's informational item was overlooked. Ms. Rammel explained the clinical doctorate programs in Health Sciences and the need for a pathway for individuals with bachelors or masters degrees to transition into the clinical doctorate, allowing them to earn the degree based on prior completion of many of the requirements. She added that the direction the discipline is going on the national level is to phase out the master's program with the intention of moving from the bachelor's degree directly to the clinical doctorate. Mr. Krauss added that the transitional DPT is intended for those already licensed and practicing in the field, and that offering the degree will position OU to be competitive with other universities in the state. He emphasized that this is a national trend.

The [minutes](#) of the March meeting were then submitted for approval upon a motion from Mr. Frick. Mr. Moran objected to language in the final paragraph of the minutes, pointing out that the dissatisfaction with the office moves in the College that he spoke about at the last meeting was more than his own opinion, and that, in fact, there is documentation from the chairpersons of the affected departments voicing their objection to the plan. The secretary agreed to make amendments to the minutes but requested that Mr. Moran provide her with an electronic copy of the specific changes he referred to. Ms. Howell then seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended, and the Senate indicated approval.

Old Business

Mr. Moudgil noted that the second reading of the Constitution of the School of Education and Human Services is postponed, and will be brought back to the Senate's attention after changes are made to the document.

New Business

Moving to the first item of new business, Mr. Moudgil invited Ms. Bhargava to make a motion for approval of a [revised Library Constitution](#). Mr. Goslin provided a second.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the new Constitution of the Library.

Ms. Kraemer, from the Kresge Library, pointed out the salient revisions in the Constitution that more accurately reflect current practices. The most substantive change is found on page five, which involves the addition of a newly-formed Committee on Instruction in the Library. Another adjustment was made on page seven, a change from referendum to secret ballot. Mr. Moudgil added that the Constitution has been reviewed and approved by General Counsel. Mr. Grossman noticed a few typographical errors in the document that he would pass on to Ms. Kraemer after the meeting.

The next item of new business concerned approval of a new major program in [Cinema Studies](#).

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees approval of a Bachelor of Arts major in Cinema Studies.

After the motion was made by Mr. Meehan and duly seconded by Mr. Nixon, Ms. Eis and Mr. Edwards presented a description of the proposed program. Ms. Eis observed that Cinema Studies has had a long history at OU, with film courses introduced in the late 60s and early 70s. The interdisciplinary concentration began in 1989, and she pointed out that the concentration in Film Aesthetics and History will remain an option should the new major be approved. The courses in the concentration are currently generated from a variety of departments, and several new courses that involve film have been developed by other departments. Currently, two faculty teach film full-time: Kyle Edwards and Joshua Yumibe, both assistant professors in the Department of English. Ms. Eis remarked that enrollment patterns in film courses were studied carefully and that a student survey was undertaken in 2007 regarding a potential major. She mentioned that the state of Michigan has initiated an aggressive program of incentives to appeal to filmmakers to carry out production in the state. Three or four studios are now either established in Michigan or are considering it. Mr. Edwards then outlined the curriculum, which consists of 48 credits, and explained the required and elective courses for the major. A handout distributed to the Senators listed all the courses. Projected enrollment figures in the proposed budget show an estimated steady state of 35 students by the fifth year. Two tenure-track faculty hires are anticipated with the new major, one implemented in the second year, the other in the third. Mr. Edwards observed that there is much interest in building relationships with film studios and production companies coming to Michigan, and expressed hope that forging those links may assist in gaining additional resources and opportunities for students. Ultimately, he noted, the aim is to offer a Digital Film Production track in the future. While facilities are not available currently to pursue that direction, the potential of this track fits well with the emerging film industry in the state.

Ms. Mittelstaedt asked what students may expect as a career upon graduation without the digital track. Ms. Eis replied that a variety of areas are possible, including working as a film archivist or curator, film critic, and film researcher. About fifty or sixty job titles are listed in government statistics in the area of film studies. Mr. Edwards added that students have found success in Los Angeles in the television industry, and have garnered production and corporate positions. Ms. Mittelstaedt complemented the proposers for the interdisciplinary strength of the major.

Mr. Moran wondered where the two new hires would reside since there is no Cinema department. Ms. Eis explained that they would be faculty in the Department of English, but if options for expansion presented themselves, film production hires could be housed in Art and Art History. Mr. Moudgil observed that faculty teaching biochemistry provide a similar example. Traditionally, faculty have been hired in both Biology and Chemistry since there is no separate department. Ms. Berven opined that the estimate of student enrollment at 12/20/35 is low, and wondered whether there is a set limit at those numbers. Ms. Eis said there were no limits but without new hires it would be difficult to handle more student numbers. Film courses are heavily enrolled, but the proposers, she noted, preferred to remain conservative regarding estimates. Ms. Berven observed that the numbers in the proposal are identical to those that had been projected in the Japanese proposal, and that she imagines the numbers in film to far exceed those in Japanese. Would there be some admission criteria for the major if numbers grew quickly? Ms. Eis noted that the Studio Art major generated about 180 majors when the proposal indicated a steady state of 90. While the idea is not to stop admissions to a program, the nature of the Film studies program does not pose the same facility issue as the production track. Because it is more interdisciplinary in scope, not all the courses will be handled in a single department. Mr.

Moudgil indicated that should the program produce more student enrollment, the need for additional faculty would be responded to.

Mr. Moran asked about appropriate facilities to show films and whether that is an issue. Mr. Edwards commented that ultimately a screening room could be created, but that space is always an issue on campus. He further noted that a key goal is to enhance cinema culture at the university, and that a film series could be offered in appropriately equipped classrooms. Ms. Eis noted that classrooms exist on campus with stadium seating and projection, and that they have worked closely with Mr. Preisinger to create appropriate spaces for film classes.

Ms. Howell moved to waive the second reading of the proposal; Mr. Nixon offered a second. Mr. Russell then asked whether the program could begin in the fall if approved. Ms. Eis explained that because many of the courses for the major already exist, a student would not need to take any added courses for a couple of semesters. Mr. Russell then asked Mr. Moudgil about the new positions requested for the major in 2011 and 2012. Mr. Moudgil replied that he hopes to be able to add the positions if student enrollment targets are met and if wider economic conditions allow it. Ms. Pelfrey wondered about Senate committee review and recommendations. Ms. Jhashi indicated that the information regarding Senate committees has been made available, and that reports from SPRC, SBRC, UCUI, and Assessment are positive. Mr. Krauss, the chair of SBRC, voiced his support for the proposed program. Ms. Kellett encouraged the proposers to look at the articulation agreements with community college since strong programs exist in those institutions. Ms. Eis agreed, and noted that the proposal includes a section on how transfer students can work through the major with credits from other institutions. In addition, she pointed out that there is a long-established group of film teachers in Detroit area high schools that has already been consulted. Mr. Meehan asked whether current faculty could cover the existing courses in the fall, as well as the seven courses newly- approved by COI. She agreed that all the courses could be covered.

The motion to waive the second reading was approved. The original motion was then voted upon and approved.

The third item of new business was moved by Mr. Meehan, and duly seconded by Ms. Pelfrey.

MOVED that Oakland University establish the right of academic units to create undergraduate certificate programs according to the definition and guidelines specified in the attachment: [“Approved Undergraduate Certificate Programs.”](#)

Ms. Awbrey then explained that a need exists for non-degree students to be able to take courses for a certificate. UCUI believes that this could act as an incentive to bring students into degree-granting programs, and that having a number of courses in the certificate program that are part of the degree program insures the quality of the certificates. She noted that several certificates are available at the graduate level, and that UCUI would like to act on a UG certificate from MTD currently on the table.

Mr. Grossman observed that the term “Affairs” needs to be omitted (correction made above), and Ms. Awbrey agreed. Ms. Pelfrey inquired whether tuition would be the same, and whether

students would be eligible for financial aid; Ms. Awbrey answered yes to both questions. Mr. Goslin wondered whether allowing only eight credits to be applied to an undergraduate degree could de-incentivize a non-degree student to pursue a degree. Ms. Awbrey noted that that issue had been discussed in UCUI. Mr. Goslin remarked that in his experience with graduate certificates it is beneficial to apply all credits earned for a certificate to a degree program, and that potential students find this an attractive aspect to considering OU. Mr. Grossman observed that the wording is such that Mr. Goslin's concerns are not an issue, as it states that all credits can be applied to a degree but only 8 credits can be applied in the other direction. Ms. Berven inquired whether an existing certificate in language translation would require a name change; Ms. Awbrey doubted that it would. Ms. Rammel stated that one concern is to make sure that certificates are aid-eligible and are reported to the Department of Education. Ms. Awbrey clarified for Ms. Berven that the certificates are intended for non-majors, and that the certificate in MLL is, in fact, for majors.

Mr. Moudgil observed that this was the first reading of the motion, and asked Ms. Awbrey whether approval is time-sensitive. She responded that Music, Theater, and Dance expressed urgency regarding a certificate they intend to offer, but that no one was present to inform the Senate on that matter. Mr. Moudgil began to articulate his support of the program when Mr. Moran interrupted with a point of order. Citing Robert's Rules, Mr. Moran noted that it is out of order for the Chair to offer his/her opinion on a matter under discussion. Mr. Moudgil replied that he understood. Mr. Goslin then expressed concern that students and employers are unaware of the distinction between a graduate certificate and a professional certification. He wondered whether another word could be substituted for "certificate" to avoid confusion. Ms. Awbrey observed that certificates are transcribed, and that employers will see it indicated in the record. Ms. Thompson-Adams voiced support for the use of certificates as a way to encourage students to return to school, and noted that she has three such certificates ready for implementation. The concept of certificates, she observed, is important for people in specialized areas within industry. She then moved to waive the second reading, with a second provided by Ms. Moore. Ms. Pelfrey asked about university oversight regarding certificate programs; Ms. Awbrey responded that UCUI is responsible. The Senate voted to approve the second reading of the motion, and then voted to approve the original motion.

The next item of new business involved the issue of merging to Senate standing committees. Mr. Meehan made the motion; Mr. Nixon provided a second.

MOVED that the Senate Budget Review Committee and the Senate Planning Review Committee be discontinued and replaced by the Senate Planning and Budget Review Committee as a standing committee of the Senate effective Fall 2009 with the following charge and membership:

Charge:

1. To work with the President, vice-presidents, deans, and directors to review university plans, goals, objectives, role and mission.
2. To advise the President and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding priorities for institutional and academic resource allocations.
3. To receive from the President reports on available resources and their allocation to the university divisions, and to advise the President regarding priorities for such allocations.

4. To receive from the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs reports on available resources and their allocation to the university's academic programs, and to advise the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding priorities for such allocations.
5. To make recommendations to the Senate on any changes affecting the academic organization of the university especially as to how these changes advance the university's mission and goals and affect the university's budget.
6. To report to the Senate after reviewing new programs (1) on their contribution to the overall mission and goals of the institution and (2) on the adequacy of the budget for the program and an assessment of the budget rationale. The review should answer the questions of whether the program furthers the university's mission and whether the program can be viable with the resources available.
7. To report to the Senate upon reviewing recommendations for the discontinuance or major reorganization of existing academic programs as may be proposed especially as these decisions affect the overall budget and mission and goals of the university.

Membership:

Eight faculty comprised of one faculty member from each School, the College, and the Library, and two at-large members appointed to staggered three-year terms by the Senate upon nomination of the Steering Committee, which shall designate one of these as chair; an administrative professional appointed by the AP Assembly for a three year term; the Director of Budget and Financial Planning; the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, the Senior Associate Provost for Undergraduate and Graduate Education (or designee), *ex officio* and non-voting.

Mr. Goslin began the discussion by noting that the punctuation in the final line of membership should clarify who is *ex officio* and non-voting. He then expressed his approval of the proposed merged

committee based on his experience as a past chair of the SPRC. Mr. Russell voiced his opposition to the proposed merger, noting that in his experience as past chair of the SPRC the committee found it had all it could do without adding issues relating to budget. He stated that more oversight by faculty is desirable, not less, and therefore urged the continued separation of the committees. Mr. Nixon offered an endorsement of the motion, recalling his experience on the planning review committee and finding the committee stymied on budget issues. For the sake of greater efficiency, he expressed support for the merger. Mr. Grossman noted that in OU's past this did exist as a single committee and wondered why they were separated. After a protracted silence, Mr. Russell speculated that he thought the issue involved getting people with the appropriate expertise on the committees, and suggested that perhaps a larger problem lies in staffing the senate committees. He opined that relying on volunteers, who may or may not fill the committee rosters adequately, is not the ideal way of staffing the committees. Mr. Meehan reminded everyone that the motion grew out of the recommendations of the ad hoc committee charged with examining the process of review of new program proposals. The work of the two committees does overlap to some degree, he commented, and further noted that the impact is not on governance but on streamlining the process to help faculty move proposals. Mr. Moran observed that as a past chair of the SBRC, during the last NCA review, he found the accreditation visitors startled to learn that the university provides scant information regarding budget issues to the committee, and further, believes Mr. Russell is right that faculty has less

input and is provided with less information. Streamlining things for a bad purpose, according to Mr. Moran, is not a good idea; he does not support the motion.

Mr. Dvir advocated for more representation from CAS in the proposed committee membership. Mr. Grossman wondered whether the School of Medicine is counted in the roster. It was not included. Mr. Russell supported Mr. Dvir's comments, then moved to table the motion. Mr. Grossman explained that a motion to table is not to postpone, but to kill. Mr. Russell then withdrew the motion, and offered a new motion to recommit the motion to the Steering Committee to reconsider the composition of the membership. Mr. Mitton provided a second.

Mr. Meehan said that he hoped that people are willing to serve when the call for volunteers is put forward. He also expressed concern about the information available to the budget committee. Mr. Moran claimed that the SBRC does not see real university budget figures, so the mandate of the committee is not fulfilled most of the time. Mr. Meehan wondered if that is reason enough to hold up the attempt to streamline the process for faculty to move proposals, although he agrees in principle with that particular issue. Mr. Russell stated that his original opposition to the main motion was the overload that those committees experience. He stated that when he served on the SBRC the provost at that time swamped the committee with information, and it was too much to process. Perhaps that has changed, Mr. Russell suggested, and the work of the committee is no longer that extensive. Mr. Mitton said that he had no issue with having one committee, but did voice support for getting real budget information so that decisions are made appropriately. Ms. Moore explained that the bulk of the work of the committees currently entails the review of new program proposals, where the budgets are explicitly outlined. Mr. Moran reminded the Senate that the contextualization of a new program, such as Cinema Studies, is fully part of the language of the charge of the SBRC. Without knowledge of how the program fits in the grand scheme of things, one is shooting in the dark. No one actually knows what the university budget actually looks like, so the committees are hamstrung by a lack of adequate information. The situation has changed in the last ten to fifteen years, according to Mr. Moran, and thus the SBRC is unable to render a useful contribution. That problem will worsen if the SBRC is submerged within another committee.

Mr. Kusow sought clarification regarding whether there is there too much work for the committee or whether a revised membership that represents different disciplines is needed. In addition, he wondered how governance is affected with a merged committee, if at all. Mr. Russell explained that CAS has roughly half the faculty of the university yet has only one member on the proposed committee. Moreover, CAS has several major divisions that are just as distinct as those within the professional schools. Mr. Russell believes that CAS ought to have four people on the committee to represent the various constituencies. Mr. Moudgil asserted that if the issue is the committee's composition, then it should return to the Steering committee.

Note: Because of the unexpected length of this Senate meeting, the audio tape ran short and failed to record the discussion below. Any errors or omissions are unintended and are the result of the limitations of the secretary's memory.

Mr. Dvir reiterated his desire to reconsider the committee's composition, and Mr. Russell repeated his belief that the work required by one committee would be too consuming. Mr.

Krauss, current chair of SBRC, then stated that his committee has met with Planning on occasion, and that in principle he supports the idea of streamlining the process with the purposed of increased efficiency. Ms. Piskulic reminded the Senate that the recommendations were made at the committee level, and that the ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the issues consisted of members from both SBRC and SPRC. A vote was then taken to recommit the motion to the Steering Committee to consider the composition of the committee. 20-14 in favor. Yes: Berven (D), Dvir, Eberly-Lewis, Grossman, Hawley, Khattree, Law-Sullivan, Lombardo, Meehan, Mittelstaedt, Mitton, Moore, Moran, Nixon, Pelfrey, Penprase, Rammel, Russell, Spagnuolo, Sudol
No: Andersen, Bhargava, Debnath, Eis, Goslin, Graetz, Howell, Kusow, Lemarbe, Presinger, Sangeorzan, Shablin, Thompson, Voelck
Abstention: English, Frick, Ingram

A motion was then made by Mr. Russell to authorize the Senate to hold an additional meeting in May. With a second by Ms. Howell, the Senate unanimously approved.

The provost then turned to the next item of new business, a resolution to support review of the physical relocations of academic units, departments, or programs.

MOVED that the Senate endorse a resolution to support review of the physical relocations of academic units, departments, or programs.

After a motion to approve was made by Ms. Howell and duly seconded by Ms. Pelfrey, Mr. Moran began discussion by noting that five departments are affected by the current plans in the College to move faculty offices. He remarked that there are significant budgetary and pedagogical effects resulting from moving 100 hundred faculty to new offices. He then pointed out that not consulting with faculty is a refutation of the concept of shared governance and shows a lack of respect for one's colleagues. In addition, he commented on what he characterized as inappropriate furniture ordered for the department of History (likening it to that one may find in "a shady time-share in Boca Raton").

Mr. Grossman suggested that the Senate proceed to a second reading of the motion, to which Ms. Howell voiced her support. Ms. Moore then expressed her view that people were reacting emotionally, and that it is perhaps not such an earth-shattering issue of where your office is. The Senate then voted to approve a motion to waive the second reading, with 3 negative votes counted (Ms. Moore, Mr. Shablin, Mr. Preisinger).

Ms. Howell said that she would like to know the larger picture intended by the College in making the moves, and that for some of the faculty in her department, a total of three moves will be necessary before it is all over, and noted the level of disruption inherent in being asked to move three times. Mr. Moran noted the pedagogical implications, such as the separation of the foreign language labs from the faculty offices and classrooms, and the separation of Art History faculty from Studio Art faculty, who will eventually be in different buildings. Ms. Andersen observed that Writing and Rhetoric faculty are now separated from their classrooms and thus unavailable to students. Ms. Berven indicated that Modern Languages and Literature faculty are

divided in three ways, not two, because faculty will be separated throughout three floors of the building. She noted that this breaks up a department that thrives on being a unit.

Mr. Dvir asked whether an administrator could speak to the issue of the moves. Ms. Moore remarked that should the motion go forward, that it will not be necessary to deal with what has already been done. She further noted that no one actually owns space on campus, and that only the president has jurisdiction over the utilization of space. Mr. Moudgil stated that the administration works to benefit faculty and staff, and that as provost he is respectful of that. He then asked Ms. Moore if she could address the question of what is currently in process. She noted that the furniture has been ordered and that the moves are proceeding on schedule. Ms. Howell then raised an issue regarding the furniture contracts already signed and wondered whether they would be reviewed. Mr. Moudgil reminded the Senate that its role is advisory, to which Mr. Moran responded that the provost, relative to his role on the senate, should not engage in debate on the issue.

Mr. Grossman called the motion, and the Senate voted to approve the motion to endorse the resolution. Three negative votes were recorded: Ms. Moore, Mr. Shablin, Mr. Preisinger.

The final item of new business was a procedural motion to staff Senate standing committees.

MOVED that the persons listed below be appointed to Senate standing committees and that the persons so designated be appointed as chair.

Procedural motion: debatable, amendable, and eligible for final vote.

Academic Computing Committee

Ji-Eun Lee (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2008-2010 Chair

Ram Orzach (School of Business Administration) -- 2008-2010

Yang Xia (CAS- Physics) -- 2008-2010

Darrin Hanna (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2009-2011

Meghan Harris (School of Nursing) -- 2009-2011

Andrea Kozak (CAS--Psychology) -- 2009-2011

Julia Rodriguez (Kresge Library) -- 2009-2011

Susan Evans (CAS—Art and Art History) – 2009-2011

Academic Conduct Committee

Sumit Dinda (School of Health Sciences) -- 2008-2010

Frederick Hoffman (School of Business Administration -- 2008-2010

Eric LaRock (CAS--Philosophy) -- 2008-2010

Lunjin Lu (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2008-2010

Cynthia Miree-Coppin (School of Business Administration) -- 2008-2010

Brian Taber (School of Education & Human Services) -- 2008-2010

Elysa White (CAS--Philosophy) -- 2008-2010

Anne Becker (CAS -- Communication & Journalism) -- 2009-2011

Meghan Harris (School of Nursing) -- 2009-2011

Beth Kraemer (Kresge Library) -- 2009-2011

Mike Latcha (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2009-2011 Chair
Mark Navin (CAS -- Philosophy) -- 2009-2011
James Quinn (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2009-2011
Barb Penprase (School of Nursing) -- 2009-2011
Rachel Smydra (CAS -- English) -- 2009-2011

Academic Standing and Honors Committee

Youngjoo Kim (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2008-2010 Chair
Mohammad-Reza Siadat (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2008-2010
Xia Wang (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2008-2010
Rebecca Gaydos (CAS -- Linguistics) -- 2009-2011
Dan Ring (Kresge Library) -- 2009-2011

Assessment Committee

Eileen Johnson (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2007-2010 (at-large)
Ghassan Saed (CAS -- Chemistry) -- 2007-2010
Aaron Bird (School of Health Sciences) -- 2008-2011
Fran Meuser (CAS -- Modern Languages) -- 2008-2011
Carrie Motyka (School of Nursing) -- 2008-2011 Chair
Beth Kraemer (Kresge Library) -- 2009-2011
Austin Murphy (School of Business Administration) -- 2009-2011
Pat Piskulich (CAS -- Political Science) -- 2009-2011
Senkar Sengupta (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2009-2011

Athletics Committee

Ken Mitton (Eye Research Institute) -- 2007-2010
Erica Ruegg (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2008-2011
Sheldon Gordon (CAS -- Biological Sciences) -- 2009-2012
Chris Stiller (School of Health Sciences) -- 2009-2012

***Budget Review Committee**

Continuing members:
Shravan Chintala (Eye Research Institute) -- 2007-2010
Gwendolyn McMillon (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2007-2010
Balaji Rajagopalan (School of Business Administration) -- 2008-2011
Anne Mitchell (School of Nursing) -- 2008-2011

Campus Development and Environment Committee

Fay Hansen (CAS--Biological Sciences) -- 2008-2010
Richard Stamps (CAS--Sociology & Anthropology) -- 2008-2010
Mark Isken (School of Business Administration) -- 2009-2011
Michael Long (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2009-2011
Sharon Mills-Wisnecki (School of Nursing) -- 2009-2011

General Education Committee

Marshall Kitchens (CAS -- Writing and Rhetoric) --2008-2010 Chair

Stacey Hahn (CAS -- Modern Languages & Literatures) -- 2008-2010
Deb McGinnis (CAS -- Psychology) -- 2008-2010
Wanda Gibson-Scipio (School of Nursing) -- 2008-2010
Anandi Sahu (School of Business Administration) -- 2008-2010
Henry Aigbedo (School of Business Administration) -- 2009-2011
Tim Larrabee (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2009-2011
Lorenzo Smith (School of Engineering and Computer Sciences) -- 2009-2011
Lynne Williams (School of Health Sciences) -- 2009-2011

Honorary Degree Committee

Mike Polis (School of Engineering & Computer Science) -- 2007-2010
Tom Lauer (School of Business Administration) -- 2008-2010
Aldona Pobutsky (CAS -- Modern Languages & Literatures) -- 2008-2011
Mary Zeppelin (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2008-2011
Rasul Chaudhry (CAS -- Biological Sciences) -- 2009-2012
Kanako Taku (CAS -- Psychology) -- 2009-2012

Library Committee

Laura Pittiglio (School of Nursing) -- 2008-2010 Chair
John Finke (CAS -- Department of Chemistry) -- 2008-2010
Barbara Oakley (School of Engineering & Computer Science) -- 2008-2010
Vagner Whitehead (CAS -- Department of Art & Art History) -- 2008-2010
Sara Maher (School of Health Sciences) -- 2008-2010
Mariela Gunn (Library) -- 2008-2010
Kristine Condic (Library) -- 2008-2010
Bill Cramer (Kresge Library) -- 2009-2011
Caroline Jumel (CAS -- Modern Languages) -- 2009-2011
Mary Lewis (CAS -- Psychology) -- 2009-2011
Shawn Lombardo (Kresge Library) -- 2009-2011
Karl Majeske (School of Business Administration) -- 2009-2011

***Planning Review Committee**

Continuing members: Gautam Singh (School of Engineering & Computer Science) -- 2007-2010
Mukesh Bhargava (School of Business Administration) -- 2007-2010
Frances Jackson (School of Nursing) -- 2008-2011
George Stoffan (CAS -- Music, Theatre & Dance) -- 2008-2011

Research Committee

Tom Pedroni (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2008-2010
Xiangqun Zeng (CAS -- Department of Chemistry) -- 2008-2010
Abdi Kusow (CAS -- Sociology/Anthropology) -- 2008-2010
Carol Liu (School of Business Administration) -- 2008-2010
Sumit Dinda (School of Health Sciences) -- 2009-2011
Barbara Harrison (School of Nursing) -- 2009-2011
Ravi Khattree (CAS -- Mathematics) -- 2009-2011
Hongwei Qu (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2009-2011

Student Academic Support Committee

Joel Russell (CAS -- Department of Chemistry) -- 2007-2010 Chair

Buck Dillon (School of Business Administration) -- 2007-2010

Suha Kridli (School of Nursing) -- 2008-2011

Derek Hastings (CAS -- Department of History) -- 2008-2011

Julie Ricks-Doneen (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2009-2012

Teaching and Learning Committee

Debatosh Debnath (School of Engineering and Computer Science) -- 2008-2010

Jennifer Law-Sullivan (CAS -- Modern Languages and Literatures) -- 2008-2010 Chair

Sunwoo Shin (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2008-2010

Fred Hoffman (School of Business Administration) -- 2009-2011

Lisa Levinson (CAS -- Linguistics) -- 2009-2011

Fritz McDonald (CAS -- Philosophy) -- 2009-2011

University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction

Kieran Mathieson (School of Business Administration) -- 2007-2010

Darlene Schott-Baer (School of Nursing) -- 2007-2010

David Dulio (College of Arts & Sciences / Political Science) -- 2008-2010

Michael Mitchell (Music, Theatre & Dance) -- 2008-2011

Jia Li (School of Engineering & Computer Science) -- 2008-2011

Jim Nugent (College of Arts & Sciences / Writing & Rhetoric) -- 2008-2011

Nancy Brown (School of Education and Human Services) -- 2009-2012

Millie Merz (Kresge Library) -- 2009-2012

Wanda Reygaert (School of Health Sciences) -- 2009-2012

*Upon a merger of the Budget Review and Planning Review Committees, current members of both committees will be offered to continue their respective terms on the newly constituted committee. The Steering committee will fill any remaining vacancies with the customary call for volunteers.

Good and Welfare

Mr. Grossman raised two issues. The first involved an upcoming change to the way faculty web pages are presented; he wondered whether there has been faculty input into this. The second had to do with the reapportionment of Senate seats. Noting that the reapportionment has heretofore been done on an *ad hoc* basis, without a specific method employed, he suggested that a method be adopted, for example, the Huntington-Hill method, for the sake of consistency.

Ms. Andersen presented information on an initiative to support student success that she plans to move forward during the next academic year. An Early Alert system was implemented by Charles Clark last year, but with his departure from the university, the project was abandoned. Ms. Andersen invited those with an interest in improving student retention to join her in reviving efforts to establish early alert for struggling students. She noted that trying to reach students at mid-term is already too late, and that often students on academic probation may ignore messages

from OU staff, but may be more responsive to faculty. She plans to give an update on the project in the fall.

Upon Ms. Howell's motion to adjourn at 5:35, Senators breathed a collective sigh of relief at the end of a very long afternoon.

Respectfully submitted,
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi
Secretary to the University Senate

Posted 9/22/2009