



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Sixth Meeting
March 13, 2003

Minutes.

Members present: Aubry, Bazaz, D. Berven, K. Berven, Coppin, Eberly, Eberwein, Etienne, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Hansen, Haskell, Hildebrand, Jarski, Kamil, Klemanski, Latcha, Long, Mabey, Mann, Moudgil, Mukherji, Olson, Osthaus, Papazian, Polis, Porter, Rozek, Russell, Schott=Baer, Schwartz, Sen, Sevilla, Sieloff, Smith, Vincent, Willoughby
Members absent: Alber, Bertocci, Clark, Didier, Frick, Gardner, Giblin, Haddad, Hansen, Henke, Khapoya, LeMarbe, Machmut-Jhasi, McNair, Metzler, Otto, Schmidt, Schweitzer, Sethi, Surrey, Tomina, Zingo

Summary of actions:

1. OU's Capital Campaign Update, Susan Goepp
2. Academic Calendar, 2004-2005, Steve Shablin
3. Cooley Law School update, Virinder Moudgil
4. Motion from the Steering Committee on mid-semester evaluations for students in 100-and 200-level courses. (Ms. Mukherji, Mr. Latcha) 1st reading
5. Motion from the Steering Committee to add two at-large members to the University Committee on Assessment. (Mr. Graves, Mr. Downing)Approved following approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Ms. Sieloff, Mr. Downing)
6. Resolution to create two faculty liaisons to the Board of Trustees (Mr. Russell, Mr. Schwartz) Approved following approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Mr. Latcha, Ms. Schott-Baer)

The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 3:14 p.m.

Capital Campaign Update:

Mr. Moudgil introduced Ms. Goepp, Vice President for University Relations. He explained that she had agreed to come and update the Senate on the Capital Campaign, adding that this is the first real organized campaign the university has had, that there have been previous attempts but not at this level.

Ms. Goepp defined the capital campaign as an organized intensive fundraising effort for clearly identified purposes and used a [Powerpoint presentation](#) to highlight the planning, the timeline and activities underway. After her presentation she opened the floor for questions. Mr. Polis asked for more information about the money already raised in the quiet part of the campaign. Ms. Goepp indicated that the \$11 million included gifts, bequests and pledges. In response to a question about the staff, she replied that there are 7 constituent officers and 2 APs. Mr. Russell

wondered about the telephone campaign and use of a telemarketing company; Ms. Goepp indicated that paid firms work better, that the development office works closely with them, provides scripts and monitors the calls. The telephone campaign brings in around 3800 donors, \$176,000 and costs around \$20,000. Mr. Russell asked if the case studies being prepared have had any faculty input, adding that faculty would be interested in seeing what donors are being told. Ms. Goepp responded that the deans are involved and she hoped they were consulting with faculty. Mr. Downing indicated that the deans are working on unit drafts which will eventually be shared with the faculty. Mr. Moudgil stated that one area being highlighted is student research and the idea that every students should have a chance to do research or have some other hands-on experience. Faculty should encourage their students to apply for research grants. Ms Hansen commented that more lead time is needed for the application process; she also asked if the capital campaign would focus at all on facilities and equipment. Ms. Goepp responded that only 25% is intended for facilities, the rest will be for endowments. In response to Ms. Hansen she added that endowment funds can be used for maintenance too. A query concerning how much money is needed for an endowed chair brought a response of around \$1.5 million; a lot depends on the unit. If there's a need for lab facilities and equipment it could be as much as \$3.5 million. Responding to a question by Mr. Polis concerning the size of the campaign, Ms. Goepp replied that we don't know yet, that the testing of the donor base hasn't been completed yet so we don't know how much they will be willing to give. She also stated that 99% of those pledging fulfill their pledges and that generally the same holds true of bequests. After thanking Ms. Goepp for her information, the Provost commented that in his 27 years at Oakland there has never been such an effort as we have now, that as a mature institution we are better situated to increase our base of support.

Academic Calendar again.

Mr. Shablin presented three draft [Academic Calendars](#) to the Senate and highlighted the features of each. Draft I mirrors the current OU model but runs into problems at the end of the semester. Draft II has classes beginning before Labor Day, provides an entire study day, and has commencement on Dec. 18th. Draft III is a model used in 1999, classes start after Labor Day, the study period is a weekend, and commencement would land on Dec. 19th.

Disadvantages: Draft I runs too late in December; Draft III - Monday, Thursday and Friday classes will be short of meeting times due to Labor Day and Thanksgiving. Mr. Russell noted that every model contains a December commencement and wondered if any thought had been given to moving commencement to January. Mr. Shablin responded that an e-mail survey of students last year indicated they preferred December; Mr. Russell thought that a survey had also shown faculty preferring January. Mr. Schmidt asked if the survey included only the students who participated in graduation; Mr. Shablin answered that all who were eligible to graduate were included. Mr. Grossman asked if Student Congress had been consulted; Mr. Shablin responded that they would be. Ms .Eberwein liked both II and III since both allow a study day; however she expressed some concern about version II and the gap between the 1st and 2nd class meetings on Monday due to the Labor Day break. Mr. Downing indicated the deans preferred version III; although version II starts a week earlier you only pick up one night of classes. Mr. Polis suggested that the New Student Convocation could be eliminated and thus classes could begin Tuesday morning. Ms. Snyder spoke in favor of the convocation, noting that half of the students and their parents show up for it; also the later start of classes allows students time to get things done, buy books, take care of financial aid, drop/add classes. The Provost suggested that any further comments be emailed to Mr. Shablin (shablin@oakland.edu)

Cooley update:

As many have seen in the news, Cooley has been approved for a Satellite campus at Oakland and the Board of Trustees has asked for more information regarding Cooley's needs as a satellite. Ms. Schaefer is preparing a financial statement for the Board. The Provost reiterated the advantages to Oakland; in addition to the free tuition for OU faculty and staff, Cooley has agreed to pay Oakland 8% of their gross tuition or \$75,000 minimum for a satellite (compared to 8% of gross or \$25,000 for first year) He stated that as soon as the Board acts, Cooley will begin publicizing their program here; with more students enrolling, there will be more money for Oakland. Mr. Latcha pointed out that there is already a billboard about Cooley at Oakland at Telegraph and 10 mile; adding that he would anticipate more publicity once the satellite is approved, since students may be reluctant to enroll when only one year is offered. Mr. Polis asked about the rooms Cooley will be using; are they displacing some of our students? Mr. Moudgil replied that the rooms weren't being used, that this is an investment and that he remains in favor of this partnership as long as there is a direct benefit to Academic Affairs. If Cooley were ever to grow to a branch campus, the money and resources would have to come from Cooley; what they are using now would then come back to Oakland--he sees it as a win-win situation, and emphasized that no one has given anything away. Ms. Awbrey asked of there would be anything about Cooley's programs in OU's catalog; the Provost thought not, although in the case of collaborative programs, it might depend on which institution was grading the degree.

Campus Trails:

The Provost then read a message from Rusty Postlewaite, Association Vice President for Facilities Management, concerning [south campus trails](#) which have been laid out and marked for use.

Following the roll call, the [Minutes](#) of the February meeting were approved, (Moved Mr. Grossman, Seconded Ms. Papazian)

Grading in 100-200 level courses:

Ms. Mukherji, seconded by Mr. Latcha, then presented the following motion:

MOVED that instructors of 100- and 200-level courses give each registered student an indication of satisfactory or unsatisfactory mid-semester progress by means of the electronic grading system.

Mr. Clark, Director of the Academic Skills Center, was on hand to answer questions. He explained that the motivation for this stemmed from:

- 1) the hope that this would improve student retention by providing students with information about their performance earlier in the semester, thus giving them more time to get help and correct their behavior;
- 2) the financial consideration--every student OU loses means less money for the university;
- 3) we are already doing this for certain cohorts of students (e.g. student athletes) using a paper system--doing it electronically for everyone will reduce costs;
- 4) also every student who graduates from OU is a potential donor.

Mr. Berven asked if the designations S and U would be standardized, does it mean 1.0 or 2.0. Mr. Clark responded that 2.0 is passing. Ms. Hansen commented that she thought faculty were already supposed to provide feedback to students about their progress. Mr. Clark said that students may think they are doing fine and may not realize how much trouble they are in. Ms.

Hansen suggested that better advising might help but also commented that she thought that telling them they are passing or failing should suffice. Mr. Grossman asked how this would be implemented and if spring and summer were to be included. Mr. Clark answered that spring/summer would not be included and that there is a mid semester grade screen in Banner that can be used for this feedback. Vice President Awbrey would continue to sent notices to faculty about the need to inform students and students could go to their Banner accounts to view their standing (S or U) in each class. Ms. Papazian stated that we want to help students succeed and this is worth a try to see if it will make a difference; the expectations would be set out at the first class meeting so students would be aware of what they will need to do to earn an S at midterm. Mr. Haskell asked if the default could be set to S for each class so all an instructor would need to do is change it to a U. Mr. Shablin responded setting a default would require that Banner be modified and the President has mandated no modifications. Mr. Polis suggested leaving the field blank if work is satisfactory and filling in the U if not. Mr. Long wanted to know what happens if a student gets a U? Or doesn't look it up to see what rating they did get. Mr. Clark indicated that his office is working with the Registrar to develop a way of identifying those students but right now the only students that are monitored are those in special cohorts, such as the student athletes, where keeping track of grades and progress in courses ties in to eligibility. Ms. Eberly noted that many students who do poorly in the early part of a term assume that they can make it up later and wondered how effective this notification would really be. Mr. Sevilla was concerned about the students having to monitor themselves and though some sort of notification would be preferable; perhaps an e-mail could be sent. Mr. Berven recalled that when the policy was first proposed midterms came after the withdrawal period. Mr. Clark stated that even when they do badly at first, students assume they will do better--sending a clear message that their work is unsatisfactory and incorporating some sort of intervention early in the term should help them truly succeed. Ms. Eberwein commented that the current forms that have to be filled out for the cohorts are much more cumbersome than this proposal; she added that some students believe a 1.0 is satisfactory, also that some students do okay on the first test but aren't prepared for the increased demands of the second part of the semester. Mr. Clark thought it would be a good idea to put a disclaimer on the S statements saying that this is no guarantee that you will succeed in the course. Noting that this will take a great deal of faculty cooperation, Mr. Grossman asked how much cooperation are you getting for the special cohorts. Around 30% replied Mr. Clark. The Provost then read the [comments](#) from the Academic Standing and Honors committee into the record. In conclusion Mr. Clark remarked that they have checked with other institutions and some much larger than OU are doing this very sort of thing.

Assessment Committee expansion:

A motion from the Steering Committee to add two at-large members to the University Committee on Assessment for the next three years was moved by Mr. Graves, seconded by Mr. Downing. Ms. Papazian noted that the University Committee on Assessment has a particularly heavy workload and it would be helpful if the work could be spread over more people.

Ms. Sieloff, seconded by Mr. Downing moved to waive the second reading. That motion was approved unanimously as was then the main motion:

MOVED that two at-large faculty members be added to the University Committee on Assessment for a term of three years.

Steering Committee sponsored discussion on Provost position.

The Provost excused himself and left the meeting and Mr. Graves assumed the mantle of chair, explaining that the Steering Committee wanted to talk about the provost position. Mr. Downing asked if Deans should leave too and Mr. Graves said no. Mr. Graves explained that two years ago Mr. Moudgil was appointed as Provost for a three year interim term. As we approach the end of the second year of the three years, the Steering Committee wants to discuss with the campus community the options relating to this position and gather feedback about how to proceed.

The following is a summary of the comments, questions and replies:

- Are there options if positions are frozen? Yes, a search is an option since positions can be unfrozen if needed.
- There have been two interim positions, the Provost and the Vice Provost for Grants and Contracts--how long should interim positions continue?
- Very satisfied with the work the Provost has done, in favor of moving forward to having him appointed as regular provost.
- Time frame? If a national search were to be initiated it would need to occur sometime in the next academic year.
- One aspect is how well the Provost works with the President; thinks the current Provost is doing a fine job at that.
- Has the president indicated what he wants? President is interested in getting feedback from the community about what to do next.
- What are the best ways of getting feedback? Going through the chairs? E-mail?
- If you ask for people's comments you need to provide a structure or some guidelines; perhaps take the current job description and add a scale.
- Would like to see some sort of review of the Provost's performance before making a recommendation to reappoint, need to get feedback on his performance so far.
- We always gain by doing an external search, strongly recommend keeping the search option open.
- Possibilities are: 1) external search; 2) internal search; 3) no search/reappoint
- If we are to assess the Provost's performance, guidelines would be appreciated.
- Get the information from deans and department heads would suffice; no need to survey faculty.

Mr. Graves summarized the discussion as falling into two categories: 1) need to get information on how Provost is doing and 2) need to get feedback concerning people's disposition to conducting a search. The Steering Committee will ponder this input and will return to the Senate with some proposals.

Faculty Liaisons to Board of Trustees

Mr. Russell, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, presented the following Resolution, noting that it was motivated by the last Board meeting during which the chair of the Board appealed to all groups of the university to work together in this tight budget situation. Mr. Russell suggested that the Board consider how the Michigan State University Board operates. The court ruling that was cited by OU's legal office was handled differently by MSU; in fact, MSU's Board went on record supporting open meetings, even though the legal counsel said they didn't have to; the MSU Board also has five faculty liaison positions. Mr. Russell thought it might be a model worth looking at. After the meeting Mr. Baskin, chair of the OU Board of Trustees, suggested that the Senate send its request for liaisons directly to the Board. The Resolution directs that our representative present this to the Board and also asks the Provost to forward this to the President. Mr. Russell commented that we have a better chance of getting this approved this

year that in prior years.

Resolution to Create Two Faculty Liaisons to the Board of Trustees

Whereas, the Chair of the Board of Trustees at the March 6, 2003 working session of the Board appealed to all constituencies of Oakland University to work together to assist the university in achieving its primary mission during a period of declining state funding for higher education, and

Whereas, the advancement of the university's mission under both good and poor fiscal conditions will be promoted by the unrestricted and uncensored flow of accurate information and ideas between the core constituencies (students, faculty, administration, and board) that promotes their mutual understanding and produces informed decisions, and

Whereas, this exchange of ideas and information can be most effective if there are established direct communication channels between each of the four core constituencies and between the core constituencies and support staff

(administrative professional, clerical/technical and maintenance/skill trades), and Whereas, formal direct communication exists between the board and administration via the Board Office and President's Office, between the board and students via the student liaisons to the Board of Trustees, between the administration and faculty via the Provost's Office and University Senate, between the administration and students via the Vice President for Student Affairs Office and the Student Congress, and between the faculty and students via the University Senate and Student Congress, and

Whereas, formal supervisory chains of daily communication are in place between the core constituencies and the support staff to maximize the effectiveness of the staff, and

Whereas, communications between the core constituencies and other groups essential to the achievement of the university's central mission (governmental bodies and agencies, community organizations and agencies, professional associations, consultants, and employee labor organizations) are made routinely on an as-needed basis,

Therefore be it Resolved, that the Oakland University Senate requests the Board of Trustees to create two faculty liaison positions with similar rights and responsibilities to the current student liaisons in order to provide a direct communication channel between the board and faculty, and

Be it further Resolved, that such faculty liaisons be full-time Oakland University tenured faculty members selected via the normal appointment processes of the University Senate, and

Be it further Resolved, that the University Senate directs Professors McNair and Schmidt to transmit this resolution to the Board of Trustees at its April 2003 meeting, and

Be it further Resolved, that the University Senate requests the Provost to forward this resolution immediately to the President and urge him to support and endorse the resolution when it comes before the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Sevilla asked how do we get this on the Board's agenda; Mr. Downing noted that generally all motions have to go through the university's General Counsel. Mr. Russell thought if this were presented to the Board's chair, the chair would then get it on the agenda. Mr. Grossman wondered about the previous Senate resolutions on this subject. Mr. Russell responded that

the first one (Feb. 19, 1999) seems to been forgotten, it was never taken to the Board; the second (Dec.6, 2001) went to the Board last year but the chair last year felt that communication was just fine and that no changes were needed. Mr. Russell commented that the new chair is interested in building bridges, and indicated he would support direct contact with faculty; adding that the Senate is only asking for representation similar to what the students now have. This is the only direct link missing between the four main constituencies.

A motion to waive the second reading was made by Mr. Latcha, seconded by Ms. Schott Baer and unanimously approved.

Discussion continued with Mr. Polis wondering if this is the best way to present this request; would it be better to have it go through the Provost and President rather than directly to the Board. Mr. Russell indicated that our representatives to the Board could present this to the Board, that he hoped the President would endorse this, adding that realistically this won't be on the April Board agenda which has already been posted. Ms. Schott-Baer commented that we are going through proper channels since the last part of the resolution charges the Provost to forward this to the President. Mr. Bervin added that the Provost should be informed that this was a request of Mr. Baskin; Mr. Downing indicated he would make sure the Provost was aware of this.

The resolution was then approved unanimously.

Upon proper motion duly seconded the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

4/8/03

Mid-Semester Evaluation

Comments from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee.

The Academic Standing and Honors Committee (ASH) is charged to ?review, propose, and implement university policies concerning academic probation, dismissal, and readmission.? In order to reduce the number of cases of probation and dismissal and improve the university?s retention rate, the committee has reviewed various proposals to strengthen the existing policy that requires instructors of 100- and 200-level courses to give some form of evaluation to every student prior to the end of the withdrawal period. The current proposal is the least complicated and intrusive of the options. It expands the current policy by requiring instructors to indicate for each student either ?satisfactory? or ?unsatisfactory? (?S? or ?U?) in the electronic grading system.

The committee believes that the small additional effort by instructors to submit such mid-semester reports will be fairly balanced by improved prospects of success by some students for

whom the current system has not been effective. The committee views the S/ U indications as messages, not as grades or student records. Accordingly, there should be no formal connection between the S/U mid-semester message and the ultimate grade calculation. The policy leaves the definition of satisfactory and unsatisfactory as the prerogative of the instructor in each course. The committee will recommend that a reminder about this policy be sent to faculty members prior to the beginning of each semester with the suggestion that the instructor provide in the course syllabus a definition of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance at the specified point in the semester together with suggested remedies for those students who get an ?unsatisfactory? message.

The committee recognizes that even this additional effort may not be effective for every student. Nevertheless, the effort may be justified in other cases where early intervention based on formalized S/U messages is expected to help some students get on a steady academic track.

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