

Oakland University Senate

19 March 2009

Minutes

Members present: Andersen, Berven (D), Berven (K), Bhargava, Brown, Condic, Doane, Eberly-Lewis, Frick, Graetz, Grossman, Hawley, Hightower, Howell, Ingram, Keane, Khattree, Kusow, Larrabee, Lemarbe, Lombardo, Machmut-Jhashi, Meehan, Moore, Moran, Moudgil, Nixon, Pelfrey, Penprase, Polis, Preisinger, Rammel, Russell, Sangeorzan, Shablin, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Townsend, Voelck, Wharton, Wiggins, Williams, Zo

Members absent: Debnath, Dvir, Eis, English, Giblin, Goslin, Law-Sullivan, Medaugh, Mili, Mittelstaedt, Mitton, Murphy, Tanniru, Thompson, Wood

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Items:

Security Update --Mr. Lucido

Macomb Update -- Ms. Otto

NCA Update -- Ms. Awbrey

Full-Year Registration -- Mr. Shablin

Report of ad hoc committee to review new program proposal process -- Ms. Piskulich

2. Roll Call. Approval of minutes of 2-12-09. Mr. Frick, Mr. Larrabee.

3. Motion to approve revised Constitution in the School of Business Administration. Second reading. Mr. Polis, Ms. Moore. Approved.

4. Motion to approve revised Constitution in the School of Education and Human Services. First reading. Ms. Bhargava, Ms. Andersen.

5. Motion from Graduate Council to approve change in temporary 'P' (Progress) grade policy in thesis, dissertation, and doctoral capstone projects. First reading. Mr. Meehan, Mr. Russell. Subsequently approved after 5a.

5.a Motion to waive the second reading of the motion from Graduate Council to approve change in temporary 'P' grade policy. Mr. Russell, Mr. Moran. Approved.

6. . Procedural motion to staff Senate standing committee. Ms. Williams, Ms. Moore. Approved

Calling the meeting to order at 3:20, Mr. Moudgil noted the packed agenda and mentioned that the secretary would be leaving during the meeting for another engagement. Ms. Howell agreed to continue the secretary's role upon Ms. Machmut-Jhashi's departure. Mr. Moudgil then invited Chief Lucido to update the Senate on security issues affecting campus. Mr. Lucido spoke about the emergency notification process used during the recent bomb threat. He noted that during an emergency a dispatcher does not have time to write out the text for a broadcast message, so canned messages, limited to 140 characters, are used. The notification message sent regarding the bomb threat was canned, and thus, according to Mr. Lucido, was too vague. Had there been time, information about the specific buildings involved would have been included. Mr. Lucido

observed that the police department has learned from this experience and that the practice will change in the future. Ms. Pelfrey voiced concern about the building evacuations, to which Mr. Lucido replied that the policy is to keep people 500 feet away from the danger area. He also suggested that emergency procedures be posted in classrooms. Ms. Pelfrey then inquired about the use of bullhorns as warning devices; Mr. Lucido remarked that a campus-wide speaker system is planned for implementation.

Ms. Berven asked about the poster of the suspicious person placed around Wilson Hall, and wondered whether the poster should indicate why he is a suspect. Mr. Lucido explained that the individual was of concern to the OUPD, and that a poster was meant to inform the community to be watchful. He apologized for any confusion it may have caused, and added that the police department continues to learn and refine its policies and procedures. Finally, Mr. Lucido alerted senators that an emergency operations exercise was to take place the following morning on the second floor of Hannah Hall, from 8:00 to 11:00, with the involvement of emergency vehicles and first-responders.

Mr. Moudgil thanked Mr. Lucido for the information and then invited Ms. Otto to give an update on the activities at Macomb. She gave an overview of the strategic importance of Macomb's location in terms of higher education, including its rank as third largest county in Michigan, home to 20% of the state's population. In addition, one-third of Oakland's current students are from Macomb. Because of these demographic factors, there has been a strong political call for the establishment of a four-year university in Macomb County. Ms. Otto noted the recommendations of Governor Granholm's commission on higher education: 1) major improvements in the current offerings at the University Center, and 2) the establishment at Macomb of a branch or satellite campus of an existing institution in the state. OU has been directly involved in Macomb for over twenty years through partnerships with the SEHS and the ISD, offering professional development and degree programs. Ms. Otto observed that there is a need for more on-site programs as well as graduate programs and certificate programs for educators.

She remarked that discussions are now underway with deans and faculty to create new programs, and added that the undergraduate communications degree has been very successful. The Bachelor of Integrative Studies is anticipated to be successful as well. There are about 30,000 people living in Macomb County who have some college but no degree. The BIS may be an ideal degree for this population. There are also possibilities emerging with the School of Engineering that may allow displaced autoworkers to retrain for defense work (Macomb has about 400 companies involved in the defense sector). Ms. Otto observed that she is often asked about where those involved in Macomb programs live. About 58% are Macomb residents, with the remaining 42% drawn from Oakland, St. Clair, and Wayne counties. The M2O program, which allows for dual enrollment, has been operational and highly successful for three years. The program has won two state-wide innovation awards. According to Ms. Otto, this program is extremely student-friendly, particularly because courses no longer need to be taken sequentially between campuses. Recruiting estimates suggest that enrollment next fall may double. Currently, 400 students are enrolled, and Ms. Otto believes that reaching 700 students by next fall is not unreasonable. Next, Ms. Otto explained the staffing structure at Macomb, indicating that the goal is to align all processes at Macomb with the university, and further noted that sixty percent of all

courses are taught by full-time faculty, contrary to a popular perception that part-time instructors account for most classes taught.

The near-term goals and objectives include further developing the student-centered environment. Student groups have been established, for example, in communications and elementary education, whose missions involve community service. A university in Macomb would fulfill the need for services that impact community environments. Ms. Otto noted that plans are underway for expanding undergraduate offerings and modes of delivery, and for greater flexibility in making education accessible and affordable. Ms. Otto then spoke about meeting with community leaders in specific areas, including health care. Discussions with Henry Ford-Macomb and Mt. Clemens General, two major employers in the area, have centered on their needs in the higher education sector.

Ms. Otto noted that a key strategic activity at Macomb is to facilitate communication between the faculties at both sites to align curriculum and to assist students in successful transfer to OU. Connecting to community colleges, according to Ms. Otto, is vital in light of our current economic changes. More students are enrolling in community colleges to save money; the combined enrollment at OCC and MCC is currently 50,000. More than half are expected to transfer to four-year degrees. Articulation is extremely important to align the curricula appropriately in the transfer process.

Ms. Zou asked whether facilities at Macomb will be upgraded in terms of space and equipment. Ms. Otto indicated that upgrading facilities and computer labs is planned, and that equipment such as a document camera can be obtained for Macomb teaching. Ms. Townsend then asked about branding the institution. She described growing up in Macomb county, with friends who attended OU, and was curious about the effects on OU's image in being identified with Macomb. Ms. Otto responded that it would raise Macomb's image for OU to be the institution with which it identifies. Mr. Preisinger then offered to provide portable classroom solutions to our faculty at Macomb, and Ms. Otto expressed her gratitude for his assistance. Mr. Cipielewski noted that remote controls were also needed for Macomb classrooms. Ms. Otto reiterated that all these issues can be solved, and that her office will assist in any way. Mr. Larrabee noted that keys to classrooms and equipment cables are not provided to faculty at the University Center, which requires multiple trips to the maintenance office. Ms. Otto is aware of the issues and is working toward getting these UC regulations changed. She added that she is currently negotiating to obtain space dedicated to OU classes and faculty.

Mr. Meehan asked about page 324 of the NCA self-study report, which states that the hiring of faculty at Macomb is carried out by the deans, who, in turn, report to the provost. He wondered whether the departments do the hiring; Ms. Otto replied that it is the same hiring process as we have on campus, with departments making recommendations to the dean. Mr. Moudgil clarified that the ability to hire faculty resides within the departments, i.e. following the same process whether a faculty member is hired at Macomb or at OU. Mr. Meehan reasserted that the phrasing should be amended, and Ms. Otto agreed that she would work with Ms. Awbrey to do so. Ms. Mittelstaedt then inquired whether faculty would be specifically designated for Macomb and whether office space would be provided. She replied that it would be a department's decision whether faculty would be designated for the Macomb site. Mr. Moudgil noted that in the past

some faculty resisted going to Macomb, so it has remained an option for faculty and not a requirement. Ms. Townsend inquired about the office space and whether it is truly dedicated to faculty members or just a sort of visiting space. Ms. Otto said that space is dedicated and that faculty can leave their belongings and materials there. Ms. Townsend then asked about the geographical areas that have been explored in terms of recruitment, to which Ms. Otto explained that students in the thumb and St. Clair County are being actively recruited. Mr. Moran asked whether administration could move an entire department to Macomb; Ms. Otto said no.

Mr. Moudgil then invited Ms. Awbrey to give an update on the North Central Accreditation study and visit. Ms. Awbrey provided an overview of the process, and noted that her powerpoint presentation is available on the NCA website. She explained that the accreditation team will be visiting OU between April 6-8, and gave a short history of past accreditation visits, noting the major changes since the last major NCA review ten years ago. A few major topics touched upon included the growth of the university, the strategic plans, the capital campaign, the first-year initiative, technology and e-learning, a reorganized research office, community partnerships, and the new School of Medicine. Ms. Awbrey also pointed out that Oakland's straightforward mission -- teaching, research, and student development -- has remained unchanged since 1983 contrary to other institutions that modify their missions regularly. OU's strategic plan targets certain aspects of the mission, but does not change its core. She then reviewed the recommendations of the NCA in 1999: creation of a land use and facilities master plan; provision of resources to match growth in graduate education; increased communication between OU faculty and administration; strengthened coordination of study abroad and international programs; pursuit of greater diversity; articulation of general education goals; improvement in the process of assessment; and clarification in our literature regarding numbers of adjunct faculty. The review in 1999 was largely descriptive of the university; the 2009 review is evidence-based with five major criteria (with many sub-criteria in each heading): mission and integrity, preparation for the future; student learning and effective teaching; acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge; and engagement in service. Ms. Awbrey noted that the self-study took approximately two years with the help of many people across campus. She expressed special thanks to associate coordinator Millie Merz and also to Dawn Pickard, both instrumental in the writing of the self-study report.

Ms. Awbrey then summarized the major challenges facing the institution. The first, to maintain student access in a time of economic downturn, has been addressed by on-line programs and efforts at Macomb. In addition, a transfer center is being planned to assist students in making a smooth transition to OU. She noted that affordability measures have been put into place in the form of scholarships, tuition differentials, and payment plans. Student engagement and retention is a work in progress, according to Ms. Awbrey; efforts such as the first-year initiative are meant to address this, but we have room to improve. Enhancing academic standing and quality is evidenced by the medical school and by reinvigorating graduate programs. Another challenge is to maintain the quality of research, which includes partnerships to keep the flow of research dollars. She noted the provost's strong focus on undergraduate and graduate research. The full, 377-page, NCA report was sent to deans, chairs, and program directors. There is a briefer institutional snapshot available on the website that is a useful source of information about Oakland University. Ms. Awbrey also reminded members of the Senate to encourage faculty and students to attend the open meetings scheduled with the NCA visitors.

Mr. Moudgil commented that the accreditation process is of utmost importance to the university. On behalf of Oakland University he thanked Ms. Awbrey for her leadership and two-year dedication to the process. Senators gave Ms. Awbrey a well-earned round of applause.

Mr. Russell wanted to explore the issue of increased communication between faculty and administration. He commented on the presentation slide that referenced communications motivated by the Board, the president and the provost, and noted the absence of faculty-initiated communications. Ms. Awbrey said that none emerged in the subcommittees, but that she would be more than happy to add them to the report. He said that the AAUP made a suggestion, but did not receive a response. Ms. Berven asked for suggestions to get students to the open meeting. Ms. Awbrey said that ads are being placed in the Oakland Post and on the web. A presentation is also planned for student congress.

Mr. Shablin presented the next informational item regarding full-year registration. Beginning March 16, 2010 students will be able to register for three semesters: summer 2010, fall 2010, and winter 2011. Those institutions in the state with full-year registration have noted that students appreciate the ability to commit to a full year's academic schedule. He also noted that retention rates have improved. A transition plan was implemented this year, with the ability to register for summer and fall 2009. Enrollment is looking strong. A tentative winter 2010 schedule is also available for students. A task force comprised of faculty and administrators has been established and is meeting monthly to deal with the implementation of full-year registration.

Mr. Larrabee asked how the full-year registration would impact new course development. Mr. Shablin indicated that new courses would be added and available to students as soon as possible. Ms. Lewis inquired about the opposite situation, in which a faculty member may be going on sabbatical; she wondered whether courses would need to be cancelled upon approval of a sabbatical request. Mr. Moudgil said that sabbaticals are not approved if there are no alternatives to teaching the courses in question. Sabbaticals should not jeopardize department offerings or student learning, and department chairs need to be cognizant of planning ahead. Mr. Moran expressed concern about this issue as many faculty are dedicated to discrete subjects. For example, Mr. Moran teaches English history and no other faculty member has his expertise. Mr. Moudgil explained that many sabbaticals have been approved for such faculty, but planning ahead is vital. Ms. Pelfrey asked whether detailed information would be available for students, such as time of class and building/room, to which Mr. Shablin said that it would. Mr. Russell then inquired about the position of the professional advisers group relative to the new scheduling. According to Mr. Shablin, advisers are part of the task force membership and that they are fully on board. Ms. Williams observed that departments with 50% or more classes taught by adjunct or part-time instructors may have difficulties with scheduling that far ahead. Mr. Moudgil advised that listing a course without a specific instructor should allow flexibility.

Mr. Moudgil then moved to the final informational item: a [report](#) from the ad hoc committee to review the new program proposal process. Ms. Piskulich, chair of the committee, first thanked her colleagues on the committee, and then summarized their recommendations. Their goal was to seek ways to streamline the process. Committee charges were reviewed to eliminate overlap and the merging of the Senate Budget Review and Senate Planning Review Committees was also

considered. The report is divided into issues that can be considered separately. Mr. Moudgil asked senators to review the report and bring issues to the next meeting.

Mr. Moudgil updated the Senate on the two dean searches currently underway. The advisory committee involved in the search for the dean in the School of Education and Human Services has completed video interviews, with visits to campus by four candidates being arranged. In the School of Engineering and Computer Science, the advisory search committee, chaired by Dr. Sayed Nassar, is currently reviewing and screening applications. A consultant has been hired to assist in both searches. Mr. Moudgil stated that his intention is to have both deans in place by fall semester.

Ms. Howell proceeded with the roll call. Mr. Frick moved to approve the [minutes](#) from the February meeting, Mr. Larrabee provided the second, and the senate voted to approve.

Old Business

Mr. Moudgil then turned to the item of old business, moved by Mr. Polis at the previous meeting.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the new [Constitution of the School of Business Administration](#).

Mr. Tracy was present to answer questions, but hearing none, the Senate voted unanimously to approve the new school constitution.

New Business

Ms. Bhargava made the motion on the first item of new business, with a second from Ms. Andersen:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the new [Constitution of the School of Education and Human Services](#). Mr. Moudgil then invited Mr. Cipielewski to outline the revisions. Mr. Cipielewski noted that the intention of the SEHS committee charged with reviewing the Constitution was to bring the document in line with current practices in the School, and brings up to date a document written in 1989. He noted that some errors exist in this version of the document that include lower case/capitalizations, missing strikeouts, and the like, and Mr. Cipielewski advised that he would provide an errata sheet by Monday. Substantive changes include the addition of new departments -- the Departments of Educational Leadership and Teacher Development and Educational Studies -- and a change in the membership of the School's Assembly. Everyone within SEHS is included in the Assembly, yet the academic purview of the faculty has been maintained by the creation of two voting mechanisms -- one representing faculty (tenure-track and job security), and the other representing APs. Only faculty may vote on academic issues. Another substantive change involved the establishment of a new committee, the Teacher Preparation Governance Council.

Mr. Grossman commented on the number of editorial issues that need attention, including the wrong name for CAP. He asked for clarification regarding Section 1.3.4., which seems to suggest that the consent of the Assembly is required before the dean can do much of anything. Mr. Cipielewski replied that that language remains unchanged from the old document and reflects the understanding of the committee that the dean is empowered to assign leadership to the appropriate faculty to determine the curriculum. The executive committee would consider anything related to new programs and bring them forward to the assembly. Mr. Grossman then inquired about Section 1.5.4, noting that requiring consultation with the provost or president along with several others to get rid of a chair seems unworkable. Again, that language remains in place from the previous document, according to Mr. Cipielewski, and was meant to address the precipitous removal of a chair. To Mr. Grossman's observation that students have been removed from the governance process, Mr. Cipielewski agreed, explaining that students had never been part of the School's Assembly in recent memory (at least in the past fifteen years), and that because of the great number of programs offered (55) it is difficult to assign fair representation at undergraduate and graduate levels. Mr. Grossman opined that the lack of student representation in the Assembly flies in the face of shared governance at OU and urged Mr. Cipielewski to reconsider the issue. He also wondered whether it was practical require 40% attendance of everyone in the School to reach a quorum. Mr. Cipielewski cited that this language has not posed a problem in the past; Mr. Grossman suggested it be removed. Mr. Grossman wanted clarification that the three-year terms on CAP are staggered and also wondered how representation from the public school administration is obtained. Mr. Cipielewski noted that representation is through the superintendents' group and rotated between Oakland and Macomb counties. Mr. Cipielewski remarked that the document would be corrected for the second reading next month.

The next item of new business was moved by Mr. Meehan, and seconded by Mr. Russell.

MOVED that the temporary 'P' grade be discontinued for graduate students enrolled in a dissertation, doctoral capstone project or thesis research course, and instead assign real-time, permanent grade as described below:

SP -- satisfactory progress made toward completion of the thesis/dissertation/project
The 'SP' grade is included in credit hours attempted and earned (pass) semester hours, but not calculated into grade point average.

NP -- unsatisfactory progress made toward completion of thesis/dissertation/project
The NP grade is included in credit hours attempted, but not included in credit hours earned or calculated into grade point average.

Ms. Awbrey observed that the policy change has been framed with the goal that students do not lose their financial aid. Credits earned as temporary 'P' grades do not count as earned credit, which causes problems for students with financial aid. Mr. Russell expressed complete support for the policy and made a motion to waive the second reading. Duly seconded by Mr. Moran, the senate voted in favor to waive the second reading. With the issue still under discussion, Ms. Wiggins asked whether grades are changed when the student finishes the degree; Ms. Awbrey said that grades do not change. Ms. Wiggins then inquired whether courses in her department that are eligible for a 'P' grade but are not thesis/research/dissertation credits fall under this

policy. Ms. Awbrey stated that they would not, but those types of courses could be brought to the Graduate Council for consideration. Mr. Moudgil called for a vote on the motion, and it was approved.

The final item was a procedural motion from the Steering committee to staff a Senate Standing committee.

Moved by Ms. Williams, with a second from Ms. Moore, the motion passed.

MOVED that the person listed below be appointed to the following committee:

University Assessment Committee (SECS)
Senkar Sengupta -- Winter 2009 (replacing Keyu Li)

Good and Welfare

Mr. Moran distributed a [resolution](#) for the Senate's consideration. Mr. Grossman suggested that it might be more appropriate for the Senate Steering Committee to review the issue before it comes forward to the Senate as a whole. Mr. Moran read the content of the resolution and then expressed his opinion that neither the Department of History nor the Department of Modern Languages wants to move their offices to a new location. He complained that the projected office space assigned to History faculty is smaller and thus not conducive to holding the number of books that faculty currently keep on their shelves. In addition, he speculated that a plan exists to separate art history from studio art in the future. According to Mr. Moran, he has "uncovered" the costs of these moves, which he estimates to be roughly \$3500 to \$4000 per faculty member. (*Audio tape of Senate meeting ended here - length of meeting exceeded tape's capacity*) Mr. Moran suggested that given the expenses involved and his belief that this is an issue pertinent to shared governance, he would like further consideration of the resolution. The matter will be reviewed by the Steering Committee.

Mr. Russell raised a question about the 2010 timeline for the School of Medicine; Mr. Moudgil spoke briefly about the budget in the context of the legislative process. The meeting was adjourned (time of adjournment not recorded).

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