



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Ninth Meeting
Thursday, April 22, 1976
3:15 p.m.
156 North Foundation

MINUTES

Members Present; Senators Barren, Bertocci, DeMont, Fuller, Freeman, Genyea, Hetenyi, Heubel, Hitchingham, Hovanessian, Karasch, Keegan, Ketchum, Liboff, Matthews, McKay, McKinley, Moeller, O'Dowd, Russell, Schuldenberg, Schwartz, Shacklett, Shantz, Sponseller, Torch, Tower and Williamson

Members Absent: Senators Atlas, Barnard, Beardman, Burke, Chernob, Coffman, Doane, Evarts, Felton, Gardiner, Hamilton, Hammerle, Hampton, Johnson, Keelin, Klein, Moberg, Obear, Paslay, Pogany, Riley, Ruscio, Scherer, Schluckebier, Seeber, Strauss, Swanson, Swartz, Tucker, Voight and White

Mr. O'Dowd presided.

Mr. O'Dowd had no preliminary remarks: Mr. Matthews announced that Mr. Donald Fuller, President, University Congress would assume the Senate seat occupied by Mr. Gerald Alt this past semester.

Mr. McKay inquired about the status of the Constitution of the University *vis-a-vis* the Board of Trustees; he pointed out the issue was now almost a year old and was still without resolution. Mr. Matthews described the activities of the Steering Committee in this regard and agreed with Mr. McKay that a full report of the matter would be made by the Steering Committee to the Senate at the first meeting in Fall, 1976. Mr. Freeman wished to be assured that these remarks would be included in these minutes.

Mr. McKay then asked about the procedures which the Board of Trustees intended to use in the presidential review. Mr. O'Dowd disclaimed close knowledge of the subject, but was of the opinion that while the Board would conduct the review, it would no doubt consult widely in the University.

The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m.

Upon motion of Mr. Hetenyi, seconded by Mr. Heubel, the minutes of the meeting of April 15, 1976, were approved by voice vote as distributed. Attention was then directed to the formal agenda.

A. Old Business:

- * 1. Main Motion unamended (Mr. Moeller, Mr. Shacklett)

Second Reading; debatable, amendable and eligible for final vote.

Comments: Mr. Russell asked whether, should the motion carry, departments would be required to teach discontinued courses appearing in the old catalogs, should a student so demand; Mr. Tower replied negatively. Upon inquiry of Mr. Heubel as to when the new regulation would go into effect, Mr. Moeller replied it was the APC's intent for it to be effective immediately. Mr. Hetenyi, seconded by Mr. Torch offered a motion to amend the Main Motion such that the words after "STATED" would be stricken and the following words would be added:

IN THE CATALOG IN EFFECT AT THE TIME OF THE STUDENT'S
GRADUATION AT THE STUDENT'S CHOICE.

After considerable discussion, upon call of the question, the amendment was defeated by voice vote. Soon thereafter the Main Motion unamended was approved by voice vote as follows:

THAT THE GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY GIVEN STUDENT ARE
THOSE STATED IN THE UNIVERSITY CATALOG EXTANT AT THE TIME AT
WHICH THE STUDENT IS ADMITTED TO OAKLAND UNIVERSITY OR THOSE
STATED IN ANY SUBSEQUENT CATALOG ACCORDING TO THE STUDENT'S
CHOICE.

B. New Business:

- * 1. Motion from the Steering Committee, moved by Mr. Tower and seconded by Mr. Heubel to nominate members and chairpersons to the Senate Standing Committees as per the list included on the agenda. The Motion, being ruled by the Chair as procedural and so eligible for final action at this meeting, was approved unamended, by voice vote as follows;

MOVED THAT THE PERSONS NAMED ON THE LIST FOLLOWING BE
APPOINTED TO THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE.

- * 2. Motion from the Steering Committee, moved by Ms. Hitchingham and seconded by Mr. Shacklett to confirm presidential faculty nominees to the University Planning Committee as per the list included on the agenda. The Chair ruled the motion as procedural and so eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comments: Mr. McKay, noting that the faculty membership would be nominated and confirmed "for the biennial term of the Senate" (see informational item #3, agenda of April 15, 1976), inquired whether the term of these nominees would be for 1976-77 year only; Mr. O'Dowd replied affirmatively. Mr. McKay further inquired whether, should any or all of these nominees fall of confirmation, Mr. O'Dowd would submit alternatives; Mr. O'Dowd replied affirmatively.

Mr. Russell questioned whether certain persons on the list were appropriately regarded as

faculty. Upon being pressed to clarify his meaning, Mr. Russell indicated he was thinking of Mr. Tower, who is Assistant Dean, School of Economics and Management; Ms. Krompart, who is Acting Assistant Dean of the Library was also mentioned in this connection. Mr. Hetenyi pointed out that both were clearly members of the faculty, Mr. Tower as Associate Professor of Economics and Ms. Krompart as Assistant Professor of the Library. Mr. Matthews explained that when the Steering Committee developed the slate of eighteen faculty names from which the President drew these six individuals for nomination, it included all members of the so called "AAUP" Committee on Priorities, which committee included Mr. Tower; Mr. Matthews opined that surely Mr. Russell would not want to argue that what was good for the AAUP, was not good for the University. Mr. McKay worried about the word "must" in the comments to the motion; Mr. Matthews agreed it was the wrong word and suggested "might appropriately be confirmed etc." in substitute. Mr. Shacklett called the question and the Main Motion unamended was approved by voice vote as follows:

MOVED THAT THE FACULTY NAMED ON THE FOLLOWING LIST BE
CONFIRMED AS MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Charles Akers --History (Arts and Sciences)
Peter Bertocci --Soc/Anthropology (Arts and Sciences)
Janet Krompart --Library
David Smith --Education
Paul Tomboulion --Chemistry (Arts and Sciences)
John Tower --Economics and Management

3. Report from the College of Arts and Sciences (Mr. Torch)

The Report comprising a forwarding memo from Dean Reuben Torch to the University Senate (dated April 22, 1976) and a Report on Alternatives to the Proposed Position Shift Layoffs (dated March 31, 1976) was distributed at the meeting and was recorded as received and part of the agenda of April 22, 1976, Item 3., (New Business).

Mr. Torch presented the Report, and his forwarding memo as the College's response to Senate legislation of February 26, 1976. The Report itself had been accepted by the Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences at its meeting of April 21, 1976 while the Resolution presented in the forwarding memo had been enacted at the same meeting.

Mr. Fuller arose to read a statement from him as President, University Congress as follows:

STATEMENT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

April 22, 1976

This report is an official document of the College of Arts and Sciences. It is being treated as the majority consensus of the membership of the College's Assembly.

THIS ASSUMPTION IS UNQUESTIONABLY FALSE

The Constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences is also an official document of the College. However, a particular section of that document has been totally ignored in arriving at the

decisions reached for the past eight years.

Article III Section i (3) provides for "Student Delegates, not to exceed ten percent of the entire membership of the Assembly..." Students have not been elected to these positions by the College for the past eight years.

Surely, there have been many issues decided within the College in the past where student votes could have affected the outcome of the decision. One example is the report before us today. The vote to adopt within the Assembly was 48 in favor, 29 opposed. A difference of 19. There are currently 22 vacant Assembly seats for student delegates. Clearly the outcome could have been affected by the student delegation.

As Congress President, I have requested authority to appoint students to those positions within the Assembly since the College has not made any effort to do so. My request has been denied. Granted, students are represented within the Senate, however, the College's report cannot be amended on the floor of the Senate, and an opportunity to amend it was not offered the Assembly.

Therefore, I would move to postpone consideration of the question at this time and to recommit the report to the College of Arts and Sciences until such time as the College elects a student delegation, or until such time as a substitute vehicle for choosing that delegation is established and that membership is consulted.

Signed
Donald R. Fuller
DRF/lar/Jb (COPY)

Mr. Fuller then moved (seconded by Mr. Shacklett) to recommit the Report to the College of Arts and Sciences, on the grounds that it had been approved by an unconstitutionally organized body, the Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences being deficient in membership due to the absence of Student representatives. Mr. Fuller stated he had offered to appoint students to the Assembly, but had been rebuffed by the Dean. Mr. McKay pointed out that the reason why students were not included in the Assembly was that several years ago, the Student delegation voluntarily withdrew; until this moment the students have never given notice they wished to return. Mr. McKay noted that the Assembly had formally deplored the absence of students, and was on record as standing ready to seat them once duly elected.

Mr. Matthews after reading the relevant Article III, 1(3) of the Constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences as amended December 12, 1968, associated himself with Mr. McKay. He pointed out that for Mr. Fuller to come forward "at two minutes to midnight" complaining that the Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences was improperly organized and offering to appoint a few students to what were elective seats was too arrogantly cute a trick for the Senate and the College to put up with. Mr. Torch expressed his agreement with Mr. Matthews, but wasted fewer words in so doing.

Mr. Russell speaking to the substance of the motion to recommit, wanted to know what effect the motion if approved would have on the "position shift layoffs?"

Mr. O'Dowd replied that such action would have no effect on the "position shift layoffs," but would shut off discussion of an important matter before the Senate.

Upon call of the question the motion to recommit unamended was defeated by voice vote.

Debate on the Report then became general. Messrs. Russell and McKay attacked the alleged 9:1 ratio in Nursing and questioned the need to reallocate nine positions to that unit, forcing the College of Arts and Sciences, and specifically the Department of Classics to foot the bill. Mr. O'Dowd pointed out that some considerable part of the bill was being paid by the suspension of the ADA diploma program which entailed five faculty "layoffs" and affected the jobs of other non-faculty employees as well. Mr. Matthews remarked that the question of ADA was one which seemed to interest certain Senators but little if at all even though the jobs of five dues paying faculty were at stake. Discussion quickly returned to Nursing and specifically to what ratio had been projected in the recommendation from the Academic Budget and Planning Committee on the basis of which the School of Nursing was originally approved by the Senate. In the absence of the Dean of the School of Nursing, the Senate finally recognized as inconclusive any discussion of ratios in the School of Nursing.

Mr. Liboff then questioned the need for positions in the School of Education. Mr. Hetenyi expressed deep unhappiness that the School of Education was not allotted even more positions. Mr. Hetenyi stated that last year Education operated its programs at a range of 24 to 35:1, all well above the contractually established ratio; Education in effect was contributing mightily to the support of several overstaffed departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. Mr. McKay argued for keeping down admissions in Education and so ironing out the understaffing over a few years. To some this seemed a good idea, since the bottom has (allegedly) dropped out of the education market anyway. Mr. Hetenyi pointed out that the market had not dropped out of graduate study in education (the primary role of the School) and that the programs in HRD, housed in the School but not "education," were flourishing. Mr. Hetenyi argued that even with the new positions generated by the "position shift layoff," Education would be grossly understaffed.

Mr. Freeman wondered how the University could justify nine new positions in Nursing and the new positions in Education, when Classics must be suspended. He requested the following be read into the minutes:

Layoffs are a reflection of priorities. A decision to issue layoff notices which would result in the suspension of a program in Classics is thus in effect a value Judgment that Classics is less worthy of support than all those programs which are not affected by layoffs.

If the Dean of Arts and Sciences suspends Classics by means of layoffs, he is saying that Classics is the least important component of his area of authority. I think that such a decision would be a poor one. If the Provost concurs with such a layoff he has shown by action his belief that Classics is the least important instructional component in the University. Such a decision is unacceptable to me.

If the President concurs, he is saying that Classics is less worthy of support than all other components in the \$20 million budget of the University. I find such a decision unthinkable.

Mr. Torch expressed sympathy for Mr. Freeman's distress, but felt called upon to deny that the suspension of majors in Classics was the Dean's decision solely; it was also the faculty's decision through action of the Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences which action was the subject of the Report being here debated. Mr. Hetenyi pointed out that it was also the decision of thousands of students who over the years chose not to study Classics, but other subjects.

Debate then broadened to a general consideration of curricular problems in the College of Arts and Sciences. The effect of faculty initiated curricular changes of a few years ago, and the effect of the inability of the College to form a coherent sense of general, liberal education were noted and lamented. The tardiness of the College even to launch an Honors Program was noted and exhortations to rethink and reformulate the curriculum were heard on all sides.

:Mr. Freeman then moved that the University Senate reject the Report of the College of Arts and Sciences (seconded by Mr. Williamson).

Upon suggestion of Mr. Hetenyi the absence of a quorum was noted at 5:45 p.m. Without objection this the last meeting of the University Senate for the academic year 1975-76, was adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

Office of the Provost/J
4/27/76

*Motions passed at this meeting.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE SENATE

The University Congress has challenged the legislation approved by the Senate on April 15, regarding grading and has called for a Conference Committee. The Steering Committee at its meeting on April 30, will appoint Senate members to such Committee.

Correction of Minutes dated April 22, 1976

ATTACHMENT TO SEPTEMBER 16, 1976 SENATE AGENDA

Consideration of the minutes of the meeting of April 22, 1976. Mr. Joel Russell, with the concurrence of the Steering Committee wishes to offer the following in correction of the minutes:

"Upon reading the minutes for the April 22 Senate meeting, I wish to suggest several corrections. The final paragraph on page two contains significant errors in transcription so as to completely alter the sense of my comments. The question I addressed the Chair was, "Did the President foresee any possible conflict of interests in appointing as faculty representative to the University Planning Committee faculty members who also hold administrative appointments?" Only the President knows how he plans to operate the Planning Committee. With some modes of operation such as open voting it is conceivable that persons with joint appointments might feel unnecessary pressures. Under other modes of operation with secret

voting or no votes but only consensus opinions such possible conflicts of interest might be less significant. After a long pause you will recall that it was the President who identified John Tower as such an appointee. I did indicate that Ms. Krompart also appeared to be in this category. I trust you recall, although I don't feel the minutes need show, that I prefaced my original question with a statement that the question was in no way to imply any criticism for the individuals for whom I have the utmost respect and in whose judgements I have complete confidence.

Mr. Shacklett was the Senator who suggested that the question could be simply settled by determining whether the Senate considered Mr. Tower and Ms. Krompart to be faculty members. At that point from the back row I had the vivid impression that Mr. Heubel rather than Mr. Hetenyi informed Mr. Shacklett that no one was questioning their faculty status. Finally the paragraph on page five concerning the shift of positions to the School of Nursing appears to miss the point of the questions raised.

The pertinent questions were:

1. Is it required, necessary, or desirable that all courses in the School of Nursing being taught with an effective 9:1 ratio or should only clinical courses have this ratio? (McKay)
2. Is it necessary to shift nine full-time positions from other schools to Nursing in 1977-78 when the data presented to the Senate shows only seven positions will be needed in 1978-79? (Russell)
3. Why has the ratio been established at 9:1 when all discussion (n the Senate when the nursing program was approved spoke of a 10:1 ratio? (Liboff)

I believe it would be far better for the minutes to reflect the actual questions raised than to make a general statement that the 9:1 ratio was attacked."

(COPY)

/mio

Taken from a memorandum written by Mr. Joel Russell to George Matthews.

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page