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PREFACE

It was in early November 1981 that twelve people were brought together to form the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities. They were charged to review Oakland University's programs, along with the mission of the institution, then to draw some conclusions and make recommendations concerning that mission and program priorities in relation to it. This was to be done in four months, with a report due on March 15, 1982.

The process which was developed and utilized was broad in scope and involved consultations with a wide variety of people. Full cooperation was gained from all sources--deans, directors, faculty, special committees, alumni, legislators and other officials, students, and community people. Most people viewed the Committee's activity as a necessary thing and as an opportunity to review where the University is so that the process of creating a real blueprint for the future could begin.

The Committee's work has now been completed, after many hours of reading, interviewing, discussing, analyzing, thinking, and arguing. Decisions have been reached. Recommendations have been made. They are presented in this report.

In spite of the fact that the Committee has worked under extreme time pressure, its members are confident that their efforts have been worthwhile. Because of time limitations, the report shows signs of being uneven. After all, it has had to be written by a committee. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the report will be the basis for a great amount of discussion in the Oakland University community, from which will come further decisions and actions which will truly determine the path the University will take in the years ahead.

Special thanks must go to
- Gloria Schatz for her outstanding service as Secretary to the Committee
- Sharon Wilhelm for her fine assistance to the Chair of the Committee
- Judy Clark and Doris Anable for their help in the typing of Committee documents.

For the Committee
George F. Feeman, Chair
March 15, 1982

Members of C.A.M.P.:

C. Akers  R. Christina  J. Green  S. Miller
N. Boulos  J. Dawson  K. Gregory  J. Stinson
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I. SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

For the convenience of the reader, the program recommendations of the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities are summarized in this section of the report. Full details are given in the body of the report, particularly Sections IV. through VII.

1. The Role and Mission of Oakland University, in brief:

For the complete statement of Oakland University's proposed Role and Mission with respect to academic programs, the reader should refer to Section IV. of the report.

Oakland University is a high quality public institution which is characterized in part by the following:

a. Its students are recruited state-wide in Michigan.
b. Its faculty are recruited on an international scale.
c. Its public outreach extends throughout southeast Michigan.
d. Its standards of admission, instruction, scholarship, and service are high. Access with quality is its hallmark.
e. Its undergraduate instructional programs are marked by a strong balance between the liberal arts/general education and professional emphases. Its master's level programs meet demonstrable needs. Its doctoral programs are unique and innovative.
f. Its goals are to provide its students with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes which are essential for successful living and active, concerned citizenship.

2. The Criteria which were utilized:

For the complete discussion on criteria utilized by the Committee, the reader should refer to Section V. of the report.

The criteria which were utilized by the Committee are:

a. Quality
b. Essentiality - centrality to the University's Mission
c. Environmental Match - the ability of a program or unit to match its capabilities to the needs of the University's service area.
d. Affordability

In applying these criteria, the Committee assigned, where applicable, one of four priority levels for resource allocation, as follows:

a. Increased Resource Allocation
b. Same Level of Resource Allocation
c. Reduced Level of Resource Allocation

d. Affordability

In this assignment, the Committee's intentions were toward the tightening of programs and better clarification of focus.
and purpose. In particular, with respect to departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Committee sought to strengthen, not weaken, the University's commitment to a foundation and integration of liberal arts for all educational programs.

d. Phasing out of the program or unit.

3. The Committee's Recommendations, in brief:

For full details on the Committee's findings and recommendations, the reader should refer to Sections VI. and VII. of the report.

By School, College, or organized unit, the Committee's recommendations are as follows:

a. College of Arts and Sciences:

(1) Increased levels of support should be provided to the Biological Sciences and to Rhetoric. In the latter case, the Journalism major should be phased out and Communications strengthened through offerings in speech and more activities in forensics.

(2) Chemistry, Linguistics, Mathematical Sciences, Physics, Political Science, and Environmental Health should be maintained at current levels. With respect to the Mathematical Sciences, strengthening can occur through joint arrangements with the School of Engineering as described in Section VI. With respect to Chemistry and the laboratory sciences, a significant effort should be made to seek funds for laboratory space and facilities.

(3) In accordance with the statement made in 2c. above, Area Studies, Art and Art History, English, History, Modern Languages, Philosophy, Psychology, and Sociology/Anthropology should receive reduced levels of resources. Staffing needs in Philosophy can be met through the partial reassignment of Foundations faculty from SHES. Degree programs in Area Studies should be phased out, and the program should be renamed in a more recognizable manner.

(4) Secondary Education programs, in which both SHES and Arts and Sciences are involved, and the Journalism major should be phased out. The Rhetoric, Communications, and Journalism Department should be renamed Rhetoric and Communications.

b. School of Human and Educational Services

(1) Increased support should be given to the Lowry Center, with the proviso that access should be improved.

(2) Reading, Guidance and Counseling, Early Childhood, Special Education, the Continuum Center, School Services, and the Instructional Materials Center should be maintained at current levels. Means should be found for
sharing the I.M.C. materials and facilities with other units such as Nursing and the Health Sciences to enhance their instructional programs.

(3) Reduced levels of resources should be given to Human Resource Development and Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership. Foundations faculty can be partially reassigned to assist the Philosophy Department in Arts and Sciences to strengthen its offerings.

(4) The Physical Education minor and certification program, the Office of Field Services, the Education Specialist program, and Secondary Education programs should be phased out.

(5) Exercise Physiology and the Cardiac Rehabilitation Laboratory should be made a part of the Health Sciences program (see e. below).

c. School of Engineering

The School of Engineering should receive increased resources for both its Engineering and its Computer and Information Sciences programs. As described in Section VI., through joint arrangements, Mathematical Sciences can also be helped to increase its resources as the Engineering resources are increased.

d. School of Economics and Management

The School of Economics and Management should receive increased resources for its undergraduate programs, but significant expansion of the evening MBA program should be discouraged. Details of this decision should be reviewed in Section VI.

e. Center for the Health Sciences and the School of Nursing

The Center for Health Sciences, as an administrative structure, should be phased out. In its place there should be created a School of Nursing and Health Sciences, with the current Dean of Nursing as chief officer. Within this framework, the present School of Nursing should receive its current level of resources. The Medical Technology program should receive increased resources, while the Physical Therapy program should continue at current levels, but with stronger admissions standards for FTIAC's, preferably at the same level as Nursing.

The Medical Review Program should be run as a Continuing Education credit offering. The Health Behavioral Sciences program should be run as a concentration within the College of Arts and Sciences.

The Industrial Health and Safety Program should be phased out, with possibly a concentration in that area developed as part of a future Labor Studies program.

The Exercise Physiology program and Cardiac Rehabilitation Laboratory should be part of the new School.
f. School of Performing Arts and Meadow Brook Functions

As an administrative structure, the School of Performing Arts should be phased out. The Department of Theatre Arts and Dance should be phased out with faculty who are retained becoming part of the Communications group in Arts and Sciences. The Department of Music should be returned to the College of Arts and Sciences and given reduced resources. General fund support for the Meadow Brook Art Gallery should be phased out.

Increased interaction between the Meadow Brook functions and academic activities should be encouraged and developed.

g. Kresge Library

All evidence indicates that the Kresge Library is in a sad state. The University's Number One priority for any fund-raising campaign should be in the direction of rebuilding its Library holdings and resources. This is mandatory if the University is to maintain its position as a high quality institution. Reduced resources and tightening of programs, as recommended in a variety of areas, might assist in freeing funds which could then be designated to Library development.

h. Institute of Biological Sciences

The Institute of Biological Sciences should be maintained at current levels of funding.

i. Graduate School

The Committee recommends that the Graduate School, as an administrative structure, be diminished in size and resources. It recommends that the Provost serve as Graduate Dean and that the Graduate Council become a standing committee of the University Senate. Graduate advising, admissions, and record keeping should be fully coordinated with the corresponding undergraduate services.

j. Continuing Education and General Studies

Both the Bachelor of General Studies (B.G.S.) and New Charter College should be phased out. The B.G.S./Community College relationship should be replaced by high quality structured alternatives within the organized schools, so as to strengthen the University's relationships with the community colleges. Extension sites should be evaluated and quality control should be maintained at them. There should not be a proliferation of sites.

Labor Education should be continued at current levels. Cable TV should be studied carefully and either done well with a strong commitment or not at all.
Continuing professional education should be decentralized, with strong School and College involvement and revenue sharing to provide incentives for the building of strong and attractive programs.

k. Special Programs

With or without federal support, special program efforts on behalf of the disadvantaged should be continued. Special efforts to attract Hispanic students should be made. Better coordination with academic units, higher standards, and better evaluation processes should accompany these efforts.

l. Academic Services

High quality programs cannot be maintained without strong support in academic service areas. A computerized student record system must have the highest priority. Admissions standards should be raised, particularly for transfer students.

High priority should be given in fund raising to obtain funds to increase the University's scholarship and financial aid capacity.

Strong coordination should be achieved in advising and placement of students. Cooperative education ventures should be encouraged and supported.

4. Conclusion:

Of the 52 programs or units to which priority levels were assigned, 8 would receive increased resources, 19 would stay at current levels, 12 would be reduced, 10 programs would be phased out, and 3 School or Center administrations would be eliminated, if the Committee's recommendations were accepted.

Three priority areas for major fund raising were identified. These are the Library, laboratory space and facilities, and funds for scholarships and financial aid.

In the remaining program areas, the Committee was unable to determine priority levels, because, at present, the Division of Academic Affairs does not have primary control over the activities or because the activities interface with activities in other divisions. An inter-divisional analysis will have to be made to provide appropriate recommendations in these cases.

The list of specific and general recommendations, as well as suggestions for future study, is too long to be summarized here. The reader is referred to Sections IV., VII., and VIII. of the report.
II. THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISSION AND PRIORITIES

1. Charge to the Committee

As he established the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities on November 5, 1981, President Joseph E. Champagne charged it as follows:

WHEREAS Oakland University finds itself in a period of declining real revenues appropriated by the State of Michigan, and

WHEREAS students cannot realistically be expected, through increased tuition and fees, to offset in a major way declining and real revenues, and

WHEREAS it may reasonably be projected that this condition may persist for several additional years, and

WHEREAS the continued viability of Oakland University in its present configuration is called into serious question and is perhaps made impossible,

THEREFORE, a Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities is herewith established whose charge shall be to:

A. Consider the quality, scope, and enrollment trends of the academic programs of Oakland University;

B. Ascertain the Oakland University academic "targets of opportunity," such as activities that:
   1. Exhibit strong present or future student demand or
   2. Hold promise of substantial opportunity for community public service;

C. Identify those programs for which
   1. existing academic strength matches one or more targets of opportunity or
   2. that have achieved or are on the verge of achieving substantial critical acclaim for excellence and/or uniqueness, and which, therefore, even in a period of extremely restricted resources, should receive fiscal sustenance or, perhaps, new resources at the expense of other programs;

D. Specify those academic activities which need not necessarily hold program (or academic major) status but which are essential to the offering of a degree with any major; and

E. Present to the President on or before March 15, 1982, a report of its conclusions concerning the academic mission of the institution and concerning program priorities for the purpose of better allocating scarce and/or declining resources.
2. Composition of the Committee

The Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities was chosen to be broadly based within the academic community. Its nucleus was the Steering Committee of the University Senate, a group elected by University Senate vote. Additional faculty members were appointed in order to insure representation from all units offering degree programs. In addition, a student member with extensive experience in student government was selected, as was the Director of Alumni Relations, who brought the perspectives of both the alumni and the administrative-professional staff to the deliberations of the Committee. A representative of the President's Office was appointed to serve as a resource person and to assist in data gathering.

Thus the composition of the Committee was as follows:

George F. Feeman, Chairperson of the Committee, has been a member of the faculty since 1969. He is Professor of Mathematical Sciences and Acting Associate Provost. He served as Chairperson of the Department of Mathematical Sciences from 1971 to 1975 and from 1978 to 1981. He holds the B.S. from Muhlenberg and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Lehigh University.

Charles W. Akers is Professor of History with a Ph.D. from Boston University. He has been a member of the faculty for 15 years.

Nadia E. Boulos, Associate Professor of Nursing, joined the Oakland faculty in 1976. She holds a B.S.N. from the University of Alexandria, Egypt, the M.S.N. from Wayne State University and the Ph.D. from the University of Michigan.

Robert H. Bunger, Executive Assistant to the President and Director of Institutional Planning and Analysis, received the B.A. in Economics from Rice University and the J.D. from Wayne State University. He has been at Oakland for 12 years.

Robert J. Christina, Associate Professor of Education, joined the faculty 11 years ago. He holds a B.S. from Bloomsburg State College and the M.S. and Ph.D. from Syracuse University.

James E. Dawson, Associate Professor of Music, has been at Oakland for 8 years. He holds a B.M.E. and M.M. from Northwestern University and the A. Mus. D. from the University of Michigan.

James Green, Executive Assistant, University Congress, is a senior political science major in a pre-law program. In addition to his congressional duties he has been a member of the President's Ad Hoc Committee on the Organization of the Proposed Medical School and a member of the President's Committee on Recreation and Athletics.

Karl D. Gregory, Professor of Economics and Management, received the B.A. and M.A. from Wayne State University and the Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. He has been a member of the faculty for 13 years.
Richard E. Haskell, Professor of Engineering, is in his 15th year as a member of the Oakland faculty. Haskell received the B.E.E., M.E.E. and Ph.D. from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Steven R. Miller has been a member of the faculty for 19 years and is Associate Professor of Chemistry. He earned a B.S. degree from Case Institute of Technology and the Ph.D. from Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Joan B. Stinson is Director of Alumni Relations and a 1963 graduate of Oakland University with a B.A. in English, secondary education. She joined the administration in May, 1981. She served two terms as Vice President of the Alumni Association.

J. Lynne Williams, Assistant Professor and Director of the Medical Technology Program, has been at Oakland 3 years. She has a B.S. in Medical Technology from Michigan State University and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Physiology from Wayne State University.

3. Procedures Used by the Committee

The Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities used a multi-faceted approach to accomplish its task. The various aspects of it are summarized as follows:

A. Internal analysis of existing programs:

In this phase of the effort, the Committee was interested in learning how departments and units viewed their own programs with respect to quality, scope, and trends. The Committee worked exclusively through deans and directors, by asking them to determine program units and appropriate faculty to provide the Committee with the desired information. A questionnaire was designed by the Committee and distributed to deans and directors on December 9, 1981, with a requested return date of January 15, 1982. Each dean or director was asked to provide a summary report for his/her unit and to submit the summary report and all program reports on which it was based to the Committee. A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed with the report and is marked Appendix 1. A list of units and programs for which reports were received in response to the questions is provided in Appendix 2. Virtually all of these reports were received by the deadline.

Individual program analysis was supplemented by the examination of a variety of cross-disciplinary activities. These are activities which generally cross school or college lines and which have similarities in program design and utilization of resources. The purpose of the examination in each case was to clarify program purposes and needs, in relation to others of similar type, and to determine possible areas of coordination and better allocation of resources. The process used in this part of the analysis consisted of discussions with designated
area representatives followed by discussions with appropriate deans and directors, in joint sessions. A list of these activities is enclosed with the report and is marked Appendix 3.

Thus the components of the internal program analysis were as follows:

1. Questionnaire
2. Written responses for programs and units
3. Interviews with Deans and Directors on their own programs
4. Discussions with area representatives on cross-disciplinary activities
5. Discussions with Deans and Directors in joint sessions
6. Review by the Committee

The detailed schedule of interviews for the period January 25 - February 15, 1982 is contained in Appendix 4. It includes the names of approximately 80 persons who were involved in this phase of the Committee's work. A complete set of reports, interview and discussion summaries, and timetables is included in the supplementary file.

B. External analysis of existing programs:

While the internal analysis was being conducted, the Committee also obtained a view of the University and its academic programs from a variety of external sources. These included:

1. Alumni:

   A random selection of about 10% of the alumni group was surveyed by mail. A total of approximately 1800 questionnaires was sent out. The 360 responses constituted a return of 20%. A copy of the questionnaire which was used is enclosed and is marked Appendix 5.

2. University, Community, and Legislative Leaders:

   Thirty-eight people in leadership positions in the University, schools, community, and legislature were interviewed. They are listed in Appendix 6.

Through the alumni survey and the interviews, the Committee was assisted in gaining a broad perspective on the University and its programs, which in turn played a significant role in the development of a mission statement for the institution and general criteria for the determination of priority levels for programs and activities.
C. Special Reports:

For completeness in the total process, specialized reports were sought and received from task forces, offices, and committees. These include a report on public and community service based on responses to selected questions in the questionnaire, a report on affirmative action based on responses to one of the questions on the questionnaire, a summary of a community phone survey conducted by a marketing class in the School of Economics and Management, two reports from the University Senate Academic Policy and Planning Committee on general education policy and on procedures for the establishment of research institutes, two reports on faculty and professional development, and reports on the various academic services of admissions, placement, advising, cooperative education, registration, and records.

The first seven of the reports mentioned above are included as Appendices 7 through 13. They all have potential program value and provide generally useful information. The reports of the APPC have been submitted to the Chair of Senate Steering Committee for advice on proper legislative processing.

In addition, selected commonly available data from institutional sources were reviewed. These included various publications from the Office of Institutional Research, complete with their extensive caveats on the use of data. Two of these on cost analyses were especially for the use by the Committee. Other documents utilized were the Student Survey Analysis, annual reports of organizational units, brochures, for programs in Continuing Education and the Continuum Center, budgetary data and several internal memoranda describing programs.

The Committee is grateful to Carlo Coppola, Chair, and the members of the APPC, to Barbara Murphy and the members of the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity, to Jacqueline Scherer and the members of the Task Force on Public Service, to Professor Ravi Parameswaran and his class, to Brian Copenhaver, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, to Donald Miller, Associate Dean of SHES, and to David Beardslee of the Office of Institutional Research, for their assistance in the preparation of these reports.

D. Synthesis:

After a review of the vast amount of information collected in the internal and external analyses of programs together with the special reports, the Committee prepared a statement of the institution's academic mission, philosophy, and role. The Committee then engaged in a matching and evaluation process whose outcome consisted of decisions on programs and priorities and recommendations for future action. Thereafter,
it produced this document to assist in the University-wide effort that will culminate in generating an academic blueprint for the University during the years ahead. These decisions and recommendations are given in the closing sections of the report, following a discussion of the criteria which were utilized and the methods of application of these criteria.
III. OAKLAND UNIVERSITY AND ITS PROGRAMS

1. OAKLAND UNIVERSITY AND ITS SETTING*

Geographic Location

Oakland University is located in Oakland County in the northern tier of suburbs of the Detroit metropolitan area. The University is situated on 1,500 acres of land about five miles east of Pontiac, five miles west of Rochester, and 28 miles north of the Detroit central business district. Oakland County has one of the highest per capita incomes in the United States, and there is substantial industrial and commercial enterprise within commuting distance of the campus. The immediate area around the campus has undergone intense residential and commercial development during the past decade.

The campus itself is a wooded tract that once was the estate of Alfred and Matilda Wilson. There are 17 buildings on the main part of the campus, the estate buildings left from the Wilson farms, a music pavilion, and 18-hole golf course, and athletic and recreation fields.

Higher Education in Michigan

Oakland University is one of 13 public state colleges and universities in Michigan, each of them governed autonomously. Three of these institutions are large doctoral institutions. The University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Michigan State University in East Lansing, and Wayne State University in Detroit each enrolls more than 30,000 students, each has medical schools, and each has a comprehensive set of undergraduate and graduate programs.

The remaining 10 state colleges and universities are a diverse group of institutions, and their development parallels that of public state colleges and universities throughout the country.

Four of the schools—Western, Eastern, Northern, and Central Michigan Universities—had their beginnings as teacher training colleges and have evolved into regional state universities with enrollments of 8,000 to 20,000 students. Two other schools—Ferris State College and Michigan Technological University—have their roots in specialized programs, while the remaining institutions—Grand Valley, Saginaw Valley, Lake Superior, and Oakland—were formed as comprehensive state colleges in the postwar era. In addition to these 10 institutions, The University of Michigan has two relatively autonomous branch campuses in Dearborn and Flint that are comparable in size and scope with the other state colleges. This group of institutions has enrollments between 2,000 and 12,000 students.

*This section has been adapted from the Oakland University Planning Document of 1978.
Oakland is a distinctive institution in this group of 10 or 12 state colleges and universities. While it is one of the newer universities, its size and scope of programs is more reflective of the older regional institutions. The division between graduate and undergraduate student populations is also weighted much more heavily toward graduate education at Oakland than at any of the other state colleges and universities in this grouping.

In addition to the four-year colleges and universities, there are 29 public community college districts in the state. These schools range in size from 700 to 18,000, with Oakland, Macomb, and Wayne county colleges being the largest.

More than 400,000 students are enrolled in public institutions in the state, divided evenly between the two- and four-year schools. Michigan also has several excellent private institutions, ranging in size from the small liberal arts colleges to The University of Detroit with its several graduate programs. The State now provides direct grants to the private schools for each Michigan resident they enroll.

Within this state system of higher education, Oakland provides both undergraduate and graduate education. The undergraduate programs include most of the traditional liberal arts and sciences majors, education majors for preschool through secondary education, and professional programs in engineering, computer science, management, nursing, human resources development, and various health and applied sciences. At the master's level, Oakland offers programs in area studies, English, history, clinical psychology, mathematical sciences, management, engineering, music, biology, chemistry, physics, education, computer and information science, linguistics, public administration, and medical physics. At the doctoral level, Oakland sponsors a program in systems engineering and a program in reading education. A complete program inventory is given in the third portion of this section. Majors within the B.A. and B.S. degrees offered by the College of Arts and Sciences are treated as degree programs. Concentrations, while being important, are of less than major status and have not been listed. Thus things such as the Honors College in Arts and Sciences will not be found on the list.

The table indicates the responsible unit for each program and the year in which it was introduced.

2. OAKLAND UNIVERSITY HISTORY*

Origins

the state and projecting substantial growth in the second half of Noting that Oakland County was the second most populous county in

*This section has been adapted from the Oakland University Planning Documents of 1978. The narrative and statistics in it should be regarded as simply a chronicle of curricular and administrative development from 1957 to 1981. A full narrative and analytical history of Oakland University has yet to be written.
the century, the Oakland County Planning Commission decided in 1955 that an institution of higher education should be located in the County. Several community leaders suggested the idea for a new college to Matilda R. and Alfred G. Wilson, hoping that the Wilsons would donate part of their 1,500-acre Meadow Brook Farms in Avon Township to establish a new campus. The Meadow Brook estate was an ideal location for a new college, and the Wilsons had a long involvement in area civic and educational matters.

Meadow Brook Farms was established at the turn of the century by John Dodge, Mrs. Wilson's first husband and one of the Dodge brothers who had helped found the Ford Motor Company and whose Dodge Motor Company ultimately became a principal part of the Chrysler Corporation. Following Dodge's death, Matilda Dodge married Alfred G. Wilson. A participant in Republican Party activities, Mrs. Wilson served briefly as Lieutenant Governor of the State and was also a long-time member of the State Board of Agriculture, the Governing Board of the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, progenitor of Michigan State University. Through her role as a Board member, Mrs. Wilson developed a high regard for Michigan State President John A. Hannah.

The Planning Commission's suggestion convinced Mrs. Wilson that MSU would be interested in developing a new campus on Meadow Brook Farms, some 75 miles from the main campus in East Lansing. After satisfactory negotiations with President Hannah and MSU Vice President Durward B. Varner, the gift of the entire estate and $2,000,000 was announced publicly on January 3, 1957.

Construction on the first buildings started in 1958, and the first classes--noncredit continuing education--were offered in a converted chicken coop that same year. Concurrently, the MSU board made the fundamental decision that the new campus, known as Michigan State University-Oakland (MSUO), would not be regarded as a branch, but as an autonomous institution. The two institutions were governed by the MSU Board of Trustees. The new campus was to be headed by a chancellor who would report to the MSU President. D.B. Varner became the first Chancellor of MSUO in 1958.

General Development, 1957-1977

During late 1957 and 1958, several MSU faculty-staff planning committees were charged to establish the basic principles and developmental guidelines for the new institution. The committees made fundamental academic curricular decisions: professional programs at the highest level of intellectual quality should be established in business administration, education, and engineering; all programs should be suffused with the spirit and substance of the liberal arts, both as support to professional subjects and as general education; all instruction should be characterized by devotion to basic academic principles rather than to immediate job application; narrow professional specialization and traditional academic
departments should be avoided; continuing adult education should be closely associated with the credit-bearing curriculum, and extracurricular distractions (such as ROTC, fraternities and sororities, intercollegiate athletics) should not be encouraged. Along with many technical suggestions concerning the academic program—such as the exclusion of freshman English composition and subcollegiate mathematics as unsuitable to higher education, course credits, schedules, grading system, teaching loads, admissions, and initial academic organization—these fundamental ideas were submitted to the Meadow Brook Seminars to be shaped into a single curriculum.

Nationally prominent education leaders in the various fields participated in the five seminars—engineering, science, business administration, teacher preparation, liberal arts, and continuing education. While in substance the seminars only ratified decisions already made by the MSU committees, they served to strike the sophisticated academic tone and set the rigorous, intellectual style which many felt distinguished MSU/OU in its early years. They fostered a faculty ethos and motivated students to accept a mystique of uniqueness, which while expressing more an aspiration than a reality, provided a self-confident energy which sustained the institution for more than a decade. The formulations of the Meadow Brook Seminars resulted in the MSUO Curriculum of 1959, a mimeographed publication with provided the framework for institutional development for at least 10 years.

The initial group of 24 faculty was appointed in early 1959; about 570 students, all freshmen and entirely commuter, were admitted and registered in September 1959. During the next few years MSUO was entirely an undergraduate college, primarily preoccupied with the problem of inventing and unrolling each succeeding element of a four-year curriculum and secondarily concerned to create a campus ambience appropriate to its presumed collegiate style. During the first several years, the professional programs central to both the MSU and Meadow Brook Seminar planning were treated as concentrations or majors within a common liberal arts curriculum. The initial unitary structure gave way in 1961 to a three-division structure of humanities, social sciences, and mathematics and science. Supervision for the engineering science program came from the science division, while the social science division was responsible for the professional and administrative elements of the programs in elementary and secondary education and business administration. In 1963, conventional disciplinary departments in the liberal arts and sciences were authorized.

In the same year, just before the first commencement, the name MSUO was formally changed to Oakland University. The first graduates received baccalaureates in Spring 1963. A total of 146 undergraduate degrees were conferred: 137 Bachelor of Arts, and 9 Bachelor of Science (engineering science). Of the Bachelor of Arts degrees, 7 were in business administration; 40 in elementary education; 34 in 8 different secondary teaching concentrations; and the remainder were in 12 disciplinary liberal arts majors from art through sociology, programs
included in neither the original MSU committee plans, nor the Meadow Brook Seminar reports, nor the MSUO Curriculum of May 1959. The founding faculty—those appointed between 1959 and 1963—clearly had had profound impact on the shape of the institution.

Consistent with Meadow Brook Seminar recommendations, the disciplinary or professional majors which the first graduates presented for degrees had been formulated within a highly structured university-wide liberal arts matrix, which initially assigned half of the baccalaureate curriculum to prescribed general liberal education. Rather than the traditional upper and lower division of studies, general education extended through all four years of the standard curriculum and preempted more than half of a student's first and second years, and about a quarter of the third and fourth years. The subject areas included arts, humanities and languages (including a two-year language requirement), social sciences, area studies, and mathematical and natural sciences. Courses were especially designed for general education, either on an interdepartmental basis (area studies or Western institutions) or on a departmental basis (social psychology or science). This array of general education, known as the University Course Program, persisted from 1959 to 1970, although it was modified almost constantly toward enhanced student choice, greater departmental freedom, and less total curricular time devoted to general education.

By 1970, the original institutional consensus on general education had eroded considerably. Rapidly expanding enrollments, a much more diverse student population, and more complex structure had combined with the turbulence of the times and the restlessness of both students and faculty to make the characteristics of the MSUO Curriculum of May 1959 obsolescent. In addition, the 1960's saw emerging dominance of traditional departmental and professional concerns. In the early 1960's, the views of faculty who championed the original conception of a coherent, pervasive, deliberately designed general education as a necessary complement to professional studies had dominated. In the late 1960's and early 1970's, the attitudes of faculty committed to departmental and professional concerns, reinforced by an upsurge of student demand for career-related education, prevailed.

While considerable creative energy was still being devoted to general education in the late 1960's (freshman exploratories, senior colloquia, and the special general education "inner colleges" were products of this time), the formal, organization development of the University tilted the institution in a more conventional direction. The building of professional schools and disciplinary departments received primary administrative and budgetary emphasis and absorbed most of the intellectual energy of faculty. General education failed to secure a place within
the academic administrative and governance structure comparable to that of the disciplinary units. Thus by 1970 at least one important dictum of the original conception of MSUO/OU was seriously attenuated: that a common liberal education permeate all specialized and professional programs for all students, freshman through senior. Efforts to reformulate University-wide general education in terms appropriate to the 1970's failed. University general education ebbed and faculty and administrative attention focused elsewhere.

From early 1970 to about 1976, curricular attention was fixed almost exclusively on construction of professional career-oriented undergraduate programs and graduate studies and their necessary administrative-governance vehicles. By 1977, there were signs of a resurgence of interest in general education. In 1977 the Honors College (within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences) was established with emphasis on rigorous general education to complement a disciplinary major for "superior" classical students.

New Charter College (an amalgam of the old New College and Charter College, the "inner" colleges of the 1960's) regrouped in the mid-1970's to provide a special general education program for nontraditional students. Various other curricular initiatives bearing upon general education, especially within the College of Arts and Sciences, were also taken. Early in 1978, the University Senate, supported by the administration, directed its Academic Policy and Planning Committee to review the state of general education throughout all undergraduate degree programs and to make recommendations in this regard. A special report on that issue is provided as Appendix 1-7 of this document.

The years 1965-66 were critical in the development of Oakland University. They marked transition from conception of the institution as an undergraduate liberal arts college with three professional programs to the vision of a university in substance as well as in name. In 1963 the decision to change the name Michigan State University-Oakland (MSUO) to Oakland University (OU) had been accompanied by a campus debate centering not so much on whether the name should be changed, but whether the new name should include the title College or University. Acceptance of the latter was symbolic of future developments. On May 1, 1965, the MSU Board authorized dissolution of the divisional arrangement of 1961 and the institution was reorganized in a conventional university pattern: the College of Arts and Sciences, with nearly a full range of disciplinary departments and majors (including undergraduate elementary and secondary teacher education), the School of Education (with original emphasis on graduate study), and the School of Engineering all were authorized and implemented. At the same time the School of Economics and Management and the School of Performing Arts were authorized, but their implementation was delayed.
Coincident with these administrative-governance changes, Oakland University embarked on master's-level graduate studies in selected disciplines in 1965. These various developments seemed to preclude the possibility that Oakland should remain small.

The new structural arrangements, coming at a time of explosively expanding student demand for admission at all levels, in turn raised urgent questions concerning the University's direction and thrust of growth. The need for a new consensus among faculty on the one hand, and for a new official definition of role on the other, became apparent. The latter need, at least, was satisfied by the MSU Board.

After wide consultation on campus, Chancellor Varner presented to the Board in Spring 1966, three options or models of Oakland University in the future. The first model was that of a relatively small liberal arts college, limited in enrollment, selective in admissions, with perhaps a modest range of master's-level graduate studies. The second was that of a large rapidly expanding "regional" university, relatively unselective in admission, almost unlimited in enrollments, but with only master's-level graduate studies. The third model was:

"that of a rapidly growing institution destined to be a large and complex University with a 1975 enrollment of from 12,000 to 14,000. The curriculum would be expanded; degrees would be offered at the bachelor's level, moving rapidly to master's level work in most, if not all, departments; and plans initiated to offer the Ph.D. in certain areas in the five-or ten-year period ahead. Business administration, performing arts, special education, nursing education, public administration and possibly some professional programs would inevitably develop in the years ahead under this plan. Graduate assistants would be necessary to help manage the teaching responsibilities at the undergraduate level and for furthering the research activities of the senior faculty. The public and community activities of the University would be substantially expanded under this plan, with a great deal of involvement in research and community action related to the urban and suburban problems of metropolitan Detroit."

Upon recommendation of Chancellor Varner, endorsed by President Hannah, model three was adopted formally by the MSU Board on June 12, 1966, as the goal toward which Oakland should aim; this is the fundamental mandate under which Oakland University has functioned since that date. Opinions may differ on the proportion of its successes and failures, but until this mandate is changed, Oakland University is still charged to develop as a large, comprehensive, and complex public university serving the State as a whole as well as its immediate environs. This means a university with several student bodies: classical and nontraditional; resident and commuter; day and evening; a range of programs: baccalaureates through doctorates, liberal arts and professional; with emphasis on
teaching and scholarship, yet committed to service related
to the urban and suburban problems of the northern metropolitan
Detroit area.

Progress toward substantiation of its university status between
1965 and 1972 slowed because much of the University energy was
absorbed in the rapid expansion of student enrollment and the
consequent growth in faculty and administrative staff.
Nonetheless, major developments supported the direction that
the University had taken in 1965. Meadow Brook Music Festival
(1964) and Meadow Brook Theatre (1967)—both spectacular
examples of community service—were initiated, and both brought
with them some complementary curricular development. The
Meadow Brook School of Music was formed in 1965, and in 1967
the School of Performing Arts was activated with establishment
of the Academy of Dramatic Art. Both of the latter have since
closed.

In 1967, the Institute of Biological Sciences, a major scientific
research agency, was established; in the same year, the Urban
Affairs Center was formed with the purpose of relating the University
to the racial and socio-economic problems of its immediate
environs. That year the University also made its first
systematic attempts to assume an obligation to educate students
from disadvantaged backgrounds, but efforts to expand educational
opportunity for adult students were thwarted when the University
Senate defeated a plan to develop a predominantly evening
School of General Studies. Finally, in 1969 the School of
Economics and Management, one of the programs authorized in 1965
by the MSU Board, was organized.

The development of graduate study also moved forward during this
period. The University moved into master's-level instruction in
1965, and preparation for doctoral programs was underway. A
doctorate in engineering was authorized in 1969 (but not implemented
until 1971), and in the same year the Graduate Council, governing
body for graduate study, was formalized. But plans to begin an
interdisciplinary doctorate in natural sciences were frustrated by
various external obstacles and internal departmental intransigencies.

Accreditation of the academic programs by the North Central
Association also occurred during the 1965-72 period. Oakland was
awarded independent undergraduate accreditation in 1966, and in
1971 North Central granted full accreditation at the master's level
and preliminary accreditation at the doctoral level.

In 1970, by Act. #35, Public Acts of 1970, Oakland University was
established as an independent public university, under the authority
of its own Appointed Board of Trustees; the 13-year formal association
with Michigan State University ended. Almost simultaneously,
Chancellor Varner resigned to assume duties elsewhere. Donald D. O'Dowd
was named Chancellor and later became President. The thrust of develop­
ment evident since at least 1965 continued under the new governing
Board and the new President, but the academic climate had changed.
Faculty unionization accompanied by a 10-day strike in Fall 1971
enveloped the campus with increased uncertainties; precipitous drops in teacher education enrollments threatened the stability of major areas of arts and sciences and graduate study, and declines in engineering enrollments followed. Legislative appropriations were not as generous as they had been during the 1960's, both because of a generally tight state budget and because changing State priorities had shifted larger proportions of state resources in other directions. Marked demographic and socio-economic changes in the study body, long in almost underground development, surfaced in 1971-72. Massive shifts occurred in students' curricular orientation that demanded applied, immediate career-related, and professional programs—creating grace problems of internal resource reallocation. A more rapid and urgent development of model three (large, complex institution) than had existed since 1966 seemed called for, now in circumstances as unfavorable as those of the 1960's had been favorable.

Between 1971 and 1977, articulation of the University's formal academic structure and corresponding programs accelerated. On March 18, 1971, the first credit physical education courses were authorized. In 1972, the Departments of Communication Arts (in the College of Arts and Sciences and containing Journalism, Theatre Arts, and Speech programs) and Learning Skills (at first located directly under the Provost) were approved and new evening and off-campus programs designed to attract adult students were launched. In 1973, students were admitted to degree programs in Computer and Information Science (in the School of Engineering) and Human Resources Development (in the School of Education). A Center for Community and Human Development was also charged to develop "outreach" courses in community service. In the same year curricular responsibility for elementary education shifted from the College of Arts and Sciences to the School of Education, and the program received full baccalaureate status. In 1974 the School of Nursing was established and authorized to offer the B.S.N. degree. In 1975 the Center for General and Career Studies was created to house the B.G.S. degree program and 2 + 2 programs for community college associate degree holders, along with the evening, off-campus programs, the Department of Learning Skills, and New Charter College. In 1976 the Center for Health Sciences was authorized to offer health professional degree programs such as Medical Technology and various medical- and health-related activities. Graduate studies in various fields expanded rapidly from 1970 on, with addition of sixteen master's programs and a doctorate in reading education.

These curricular developments, along with various administrative steps, fended off a potential collapse in student enrollments. Reliable estimates indicate that without the new programs the University would have suffered a decline of more than one-third of its fiscal year equated student (FYEs) count during 1970-80; instead, enrollments have exhibited over this period sustained, moderate growth. Since 1972, more than 40 credit-bearing programs have been established. At the same time, Studio Art, Classics, and the Academy of Dramatic Art were suspended.
A change of leadership of the University occurred in March 1981 with the installation of Joseph E. Champagne as President, following the departure of Donald O'Dowd and the Interim Presidency of George T. Matthews. A large amount of reorganization of the University took place in Spring and Summer of 1981, affecting curricular developments in certain ways, including the closing of the Centers for General and Career Studies and Community and Human Development and the placement of the Learning Skills group within the College of Arts and Sciences. The latter then merged with Communication Arts and Journalism, following a name change of its own, to become known as the Department of Rhetoric, Communications, and Journalism.

In the meantime Frederick W. Obear left Oakland to become Chancellor of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, and, following a search, Keith R. Kleckner was appointed Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost in December of 1981. The conjunction of the forces of new leadership and desire for review and reorganization with declining resources and weak economic status of the State of Michigan have prompted the review undertaken by the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities in November 1981.
### Inventory of Degree Programs (and Majors Within Degree Programs) Offered at Oakland University, 1981-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree and Major</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. BACHELOR OF ARTS (B.A.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Majors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art (History)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Languages &amp; Civilizations</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Amer. Languages &amp; Civilizations</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Languages &amp; Civilizations</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Major</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Teaching Majors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and Major</td>
<td>Year Started</td>
<td>Responsible Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.S.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-professional Majors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teaching Majors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degrees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Physics</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Infor. Sciences</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Develop.</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Physics</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration &amp; Policy</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Engineering</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NURSING (B.S.N.)</strong></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>NRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. BACHELOR OF GENERAL STUDIES (B.G.S.)</strong></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>CGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. BACHELOR OF MUSIC (B.MUS.)</strong></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. BACHELOR OF FINE ARTS (B.F.A.)</strong></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. MASTER OF ARTS (M.A.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Studies</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance &amp; Counseling</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and Major</td>
<td>Year Started</td>
<td>Responsible Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M.A.T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>SHES &amp; A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>SHES &amp; A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. MASTER OF SCIENCE (M.S.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Statistics</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Engineering</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Infor. Science</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Physics</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (M.B.A.)</strong></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. MASTER OF MUSIC (M.MUS.)</strong></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (M.P.A.)</strong></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. EDUCATION SPECIALIST (ED.S.)</strong></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PH.D.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>EGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>SHES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CAMP

#### PROGRAM REVIEW TABLE

**Program Name** _____________________________

**School** _____________________________

**Dean or Chairperson** _____________________________

#### 1. QUALITY

**a. Program/Curriculum**
- (1) Instruction
- (2) General Education/Specialization Balance
- (3) Advising
- (4) Planning/Evaluation

**b. Faculty in Program**
- (1) Teaching
- (2) Service
- (3) Scholarship
- (4) Equal Opportunity
- (5) BUFM/FTE Ratio

**c. Student**
- (1) Admission Requirements for Program
- (2) Retention/Graduation Rate in Program
- (3) Equal Opportunity
- (4) Current Student Program Image
- (5) Alumni Program Image

**d. Community Image of Program**
- (1) University AP
- (2) Non-University People

**e. Program Support**
- (1) Library
- (2) Facilities
- (3) Equipment
- (4) CT/AP Staffing

**Other?** _____________________________

#### 2. ESSENTIALITY

**a. Centrality to University Mission**

**b. Present Student Demand**

**c. Projected Student Demand**

**d. Internal Service**

**e. External Service**

**f. Ability to Compete with Other Universities**

**g. Other?** _____________________________

#### 3. SERVICE AREA IN RELATION TO PROGRAM (ENVIRONMENTAL MATCH)

**a. Past and Current Record of Service**

**b. Identification of Needs/Opportunities**

**c. Quality of Projected Plans**

**d. Feasibility of Plans**

**e. Leadership Availability**

**f. Potential**

**g. Other?** _____________________________
4. COST EFFECTIVENESS (AFFORDABILITY)

a. Ratio of ____ to FTE (full-time equivalent faculty):
   (1) Salary
   (2) Supplies and Services Cost
   (3) Equipment Cost
   (4) Number of Majors
   (5) Number of FYES

b. Ratio of ____ to BUFM (Bargaining Unit Faculty Member-Full Time):
   (1) Salary Cost
   (2) Supplies and Services Cost
   (3) Equipment Cost
   (4) Number of Majors
   (5) Number of FYES

c. Cost per:
   (1) FYES
   (2) Credit Hour
   (3) Major
   (4) Graduate

d. External Funding
   (1) Current and Past
   (2) Projected

e. Qualitative Program Benefits to University/Community

f. Other? __________________________

5. General Recommendations and Comments:

6. Priority Category

a. Worthy of Additional Resources
b. Same Level of Resource Allocation
   c. Reduced Level of Resource Allocation
   d. Phase Out the Program

Evaluator: __________________________ Date: __________________________
As a state supported institution of higher education, Oakland University has a three-fold mission. It offers instructional programs of high quality that lead to degrees at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels and programs in continuing education; it advances knowledge through research and scholarship; and it renders significant public service.

**Instruction**

Oakland University provides rigorous educational programs. A strong core of liberal arts is the basis on which undergraduates develop the skills, knowledge, and attitudes essential for successful living and active, concerned citizenship. A variety of majors and specialized curricula prepare students for post-baccalaureate education, professional schools, or careers directly after graduation.

Offerings in continuing education provide Michigan residents with high quality course work for professional development and personal enrichment.

The University offers master's programs that meet demonstrable needs of Michigan residents and that maintain a superior quality. Doctoral programs are offered which are innovative and serve needs that are not adequately met elsewhere in the state.

In admitting both traditional and non-traditional students, the University seeks Michigan residents who can profit from its offerings, and it welcomes qualified applicants from other states and countries. A special effort is made to locate and admit disadvantaged students with strong potential for academic success and to provide the support conducive to the realization of that potential. The faculty and staff cooperate with nearby community colleges to ensure that their students who seek to transfer to Oakland University are well prepared for work at a senior college. In recruiting and admitting students, the desirable size of each program is considered. Enrollments are not permitted to exceed a number consistent with the high quality of instruction.

Oakland University offers, and will continue to offer, only those programs for which adequate resources, well prepared faculty, and qualified students are available.

**Research and Scholarship**

Oakland University assumes an obligation to advance knowledge through the research and scholarship of its faculty and students. This activity reinforces the instructional mission. Wherever possible, students are involved in research projects, and the results of research and scholarship are integrated into related courses of instruction. Within its means, the University provides internal financial support for research and scholarship and vigorously pursues external sources of support. Research institutes, financed primarily by outside grants, make an important contribution to this mission.
Public Service

Oakland University serves its constituents through public service that is consistent with its educational mission. It cooperates with businesses, governmental units, and other organizations on research, technical development, and problem-solving enterprises. It attempts to maintain the necessary degree of flexibility to be able to respond with innovative instruction, research, and other service to the rapidly changing needs of the area. It offers exposition, analysis, and criticism of significant public issues. Its facilities are made available for the activities of community groups whose purposes are compatible with the mission of the University. Cultural enrichment is provided for the community through the Meadow Brook enterprises, other campus events, and off-campus presentations by faculty and students. Above all, the University aims to provide a model of socially responsible decision making and ethical institutional behavior, within a multi-racial and multi-ethnic environment.
V. CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

1. The Criteria

The Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities deliberated intensively on the appropriate criteria to be used for review of programs and the determination of priority levels for resource allocation. The general criteria fell into two types, quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative criteria include size and cost data, enrollment trends, number of graduates, alternative funding capability, and utilization. Qualitative criteria include the quality of instruction, quality of the faculty, centrality to the mission of the institution, program uniqueness, program potential, and such items. In a relative sense, quantitative data are fairly easy to collect, but are difficult to interpret because of the way things impact on and affect each other. Qualitative measures are difficult to obtain in the first place. For them, one must rely on the judgments of those persons directly connected to or related with a program, for they are most knowledgeable about their own areas and criteria of quality vary from program to program.

In its development of a role and mission statement, the Committee has staked out a position for Oakland University in the context of higher education in the State of Michigan. The following major themes are present in the statement:

a. Maintenance of high standards and quality.

b. Strong balance in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service, where the latter represents the extension of the intellectual and professional capabilities of the institution to the surrounding geographic area and elsewhere.

c. Within the instructional program, the existence of a strong liberal arts core to avoid strict career preparation and narrow specialization and to insure exposure to the arts and the social and physical sciences, and to guarantee the development of communication skills.

d. Access with quality to the community at large through reasonably selective admissions, special efforts and support on behalf of the disadvantaged, and strong continuing professional education programs, a commitment to public service and research benefiting others, and a continuation of cultural offerings.

Through these major themes and other accompanying themes in the role and mission statement, guidelines are provided concerning the function of Oakland University and its relation to society. It is crucial that the development and application of criteria be consistent with these guidelines.

Finally, the Committee, strongly desired to adhere as closely as possible to the structure of the operating units and programs, to develop criteria which were predominantly qualitative and most appropriate to the situation, and to maintain the highest possible degree of integrity and fairness. A review of the procedures used by the Committee shows that the first of these desires was realized. Others will have to judge the third. With respect to the second, the Committee settled on the following four criteria:
Criterion 1: Quality

In order to assess the quality of a program, the Committee used information on curriculum and instruction, balance between general education and specialization, planning, staffing levels, image, support levels, admissions, retention, and related items.

Criterion 2: Essentiality

In order to assess the degree to which a program is essential, the Committee relied heavily on the role and mission statement. Closeness and centrality to the mission played a key role. Other issues considered in this determination include present and projected student demand, service potential, and program uniqueness within the State.

Criterion 3: Environmental Match

By environmental match is meant the ability of a program or unit to match its capabilities in instruction and scholarship to the needs of the University's service area. Here past and current records of service were examined, along with the quality of projected plans, their feasibility and potential for success.

Criterion 4: Affordability

While the first three criteria are largely qualitative, the fourth one, affordability, is clearly quantitative. The key issues are whether or not the University can afford to implement a particular program, or, in some cases, whether the University can afford not to implement a program. The determinations here rest on costs, credits, student enrollments, funding capability and utilization, and opportunities.

2. Application of the Criteria

Having settled on the criteria, the Committee deliberated on how these were to be applied and with the possible outcomes. First, it was clear that all information which was gathered on a particular program or unit was to be utilized. This information came from written reports, alumni responses, and interviews with a wide variety of people both internal and external to the University, as listed in the appendices. In addition, selected information was obtained from reports by the Office of Institutional Research, organizational annual reports, budget documents, and other sources.

Second, a program review table was developed for use by Committee members. A copy of it is enclosed with this section. Essentially, each person on the Committee reviewed each program to the best of his or her ability. Section VI of this report contains composite summaries of these reviews.
Third, the Committee agreed on four priority categories as being consistent with the charge to the Committee. These are:

a. Worthy of Additional Resources
b. Same Level of Resource Allocation
c. Reduced Level of Resource Allocation
d. Phasing Out of the Program

In general, the priority category "Reduced Level" was assigned when the Committee's review indicated that a program or unit needed to be tightened for greater clarity of focus and purpose with resulting improvement in quality.

Fourth, based on the individual program reviews together with associated respective priority levels and also on an extensive review of cross-disciplinary activities, the Committee prepared a set of general recommendations on academic affairs. These recommendations identify additional budgeting priorities and relate to areas of cooperation, between areas, to possible schemes for reorganization for the purpose of better allocation of resources and development of opportunities for growth and increased revenues, and to a variety of follow-up activities.

Altogether, the set of reviews and recommendations, in conjunction with the role and mission statement, constitute an important step toward the formulation of an academic blueprint for Oakland University in the years ahead.
VI. REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Based on the Role and Mission Statement and the stated Criteria, the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities reviewed the academic programs of the University, as listed in Section II-3 and the appendices. Summaries of the reviews, with recommendations and suggested priority levels, are given here. General recommendations are provided in the next section of the report.

1. COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES:

Introduction: The Committee has recommended that several departments of Arts and Sciences receive reduced allocations of resources. In so doing, the Committee seeks to strengthen--not weaken--the University's commitment to a foundation of liberal arts for all its educational programs. Some larger departments offer more courses than are necessary for their majors and master's candidates. As a result they are often forced to support advanced work by teaching large sections of general education courses with little or no writing or critical discussion required. Funds that could go into library acquisitions are used to pay the salaries of instructors offering seemingly superfluous advanced courses. In the Committee's judgment, these departments could strengthen their place in the University by reducing the number of upper division courses offered, adjusting their personnel requirements to the realities of Oakland University in the 1980's, and giving more attention to the quality of their general education courses. The Committee urges each department in the College to take as its main goal the revitalization of liberal education on this campus.

a. AREA STUDIES

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: The Area Studies Program emphasizes interdisciplinary study of five areas of the world and offers a master's degree and a bachelor's degree (the latter established only this year). Student comments about the teaching program are good, but problem areas have been identified by faculty in the program:

a) The number of appropriately-qualified faculty available to the program has declined. Since the program has no appointment authority, it is dependent upon other departments for staffing, departments which have not always been significantly concerned with Area Studies needs when making hiring decisions.

b) Library holdings are not good.

c) Clerical support is inadequate in amount.

The Master's program graduates one or two persons per year. The new undergraduate major has one student this year. Enrollment in the Area Studies rubric has been roughly constant over the past five years.
In sum, the once energetic thrust of this program has very much diminished, although its general education offerings remain central to Oakland's institutional mission.

Recommendations:

1. Resources for this program should be reduced.

2. This reduction should have effect primarily in advanced work. In particular, both degree programs should be dropped, but an array of general education offerings should be maintained, with a focus on fewer areas.

3. Consideration of a Center for International Studies should be continued, with the understanding that funding should come from sources other than the general fund. The Committee recognizes that such a Center could be a locus for significant continuing professional education to persons of this region. The Committee did not review such a Center in detail because no firm proposal was available.

4. Whether or not there exists a Center for International Studies, Area Studies should change its name since the term "Area Studies" no longer has any meaning.

b. ART AND ART HISTORY

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: While the Committee commends the Department for its many efforts on behalf of students, it feels that there has been an uneven record of scholarship and that the program is far too broad in scope to maintain high quality and to serve the College and the University at a consistently high level. Evidence for this lies in the numerous offerings in the program.

Virtually by definition a program in Art and Art History is essential to the mission of the University. The Committee applauds the efforts of the Department to save costs and maintain a reasonable student/faculty ratio. Some program tightening will add to the quality of the effort.

Recommendations:

1. The allocations for Art and Art History should be reduced.

2. The Studio Art component should be re-evaluated with a thought to improvement and balance or elimination.

3. The Department should redefine its mission with fewer course offerings.
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4. The Department should begin to study and implement interdisciplinary work within the College.

5. The Department might possibly function better in association with Music in a Department of Fine Arts. Exploration of this might be a long range effort.

c. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

**Suggested Priority Level:** Limited Increase in Level of Resources

**Summary:** The Department of Biological Sciences is recognized as producing high-quality research. Improvements are needed in the area of laboratory instruction. This Department provides basic instruction for Oakland's many pre-professional, health-science, and nursing students, as well as a few traditional biology majors. It also teaches a very successful general education course for non-science majors. The Department's contribution to public service is notable through the faculty's participation in professional associations and other research-oriented activities.

**Recommendations:**

1. General fund support should be increased in a limited fashion with the addition of one or two laboratory support staff positions needed to bring the undergraduate laboratory instruction up to a satisfactory performance level.

2. As in Chemistry, laboratory space for Biological Sciences is a severe limitation on the Department's effectiveness, and this should have high priority in future capital resource allocations.

3. Opportunities which exist for the Department in the areas of Biotechnology and Cellular Aging should be pursued.

d. CHEMISTRY/BIOCHEMISTRY

**Suggested Priority Level:** Same Level of Resources

**Summary:** The programs in Chemistry and Biochemistry are generally perceived to be of high quality, by faculty and non-faculty alike. The Department faculty show broad expertise and involvement in teaching, scholarship, and service. The standards of the program are carefully guarded and monitored by the American Chemical Society. Since the Biochemistry program came into existence in 1980, it has found increasing favor with students and currently enrolls about one-third of the Department's majors. The Department makes a heavy contribution to other schools and units. Its opportunities lie in Engineering Chemistry, plastics, and energy technology, all of which involve increased cooperation with the School of Engineering.
While the Committee has recommended the same level of resources, it is fully cognizant of the drastic shortage of laboratory space and facilities which the Department is experiencing. The situation is so bad that some courses which should have lab components are being taught without them. Student dissatisfaction with the laboratory facilities was noted in the Student Survey. No mere increase of resources will solve this problem. Capital funds are needed, perhaps even a new building, at least an addition to Hannah Hall. Requests for funds for increased laboratory space should be high on the priority lists in any large University fund-raising campaign.

**Recommendations:**

1. Resource allocation should be maintained at current levels.

2. Greater cooperation on program development should be obtained with the School of Engineering to enable the University to take advantage of opportunities in Engineering Chemistry, polymers, and energy technology.

3. A fund-raising campaign should be conducted to obtain support for increased space for Chemistry and the other laboratory sciences.

e. ENGLISH

**Suggested Priority Level:** Reduced Level of Resources

**Summary:** English is an essential component of any University's total academic effort. At Oakland, the Department plays primarily a service role, since more than 50 percent of its work is with non-majors. Several Department faculty have outstanding records of scholarship. The Department, by its own choice, is a partial one. "It excludes Learning Skills which now carries the title of "Rhetoric" and forms a separate department, although many English faculty teach Rhetoric courses. The Department's service role is quite diverse and involves many academic units. The Department is heavily tenured and currently seems to lack a real focus. A new required course for the School of Economics and Management, ENG 382, further clouds this focus, at the same time that its potential for adding heavily to the Department's load seems to be great. The Committee questions the need for the splintering which exists relative to the teaching of English language among English, Rhetoric, and Linguistics, to say nothing of the Reading group in SHES. A strong Language Center can easily be envisioned with the coordination of all of these forces.

**Recommendations:**

1. General fund support for English should be reduced.
2. Program tightening should be accomplished, along with clarification of focus and purpose.

3. Territorial problems with Rhetoric should be carefully worked out and coordination of English language instruction should be achieved.

4. Exploration should be made into the formation of an English Language Center involving English, Rhetoric, Linguistics, and Reading.

f. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: This relatively new program, with its three options in occupational health, toxic substance management, and resource management, is designed to educate students for a public service role. As such, it is important to the mission of the University. The overall quality of the program is high, and student interest in it, while not large, is increasing. Since the program requires no full-time faculty, it is run at very low cost. It should continue to be conducted in this fashion and to bring the University visibility in this area.

Recommendations:

1. Allocation of resources should be maintained at current levels.

2. This program should be given greater publicity.

g. HISTORY

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: History is at the very core of a liberal education and thus is central to the mission of the University. The quality of the Department's instruction is generally high. The core faculty are experienced and strong and have made significant scholarly contributions. The Department's service record is strong. The Department has been recognized for its efforts in advising students on career opportunities. Both the B.A. and the M.A. are offered with the latter being a 36-credit program, five courses of which are offered at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Enrollment of majors has declined at both undergraduate and graduate levels in recent years. Library holdings in History, as for many other areas, are very inadequate. It appears that the M.A. program is dying and that the Department is continuing to add new courses in the face of these developments. Thus this is a time for tightening and reassessment.
Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be reduced.

2. The number of strictly upper division courses offered by the Department should be reduced.

3. Resources for majors and graduate-level programs should be shifted to general education and service courses.

4. Greater attention should be paid to writing skills and critical thinking in the general education courses which are offered.

h. LINGUISTICS

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The Department of Linguistics is a small department with four full-time faculty and some part-time support. It is, however, a very cost-effective department. This is achieved by having its faculty teach two general education courses that attract significant numbers of students. While the number of undergraduate majors has decreased in recent years, this decline has been offset by a significant increase in graduate enrollment. In spite of having heavy teaching loads, the faculty in the Department have maintained a significant level of scholarly activity.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be continued at current levels.

2. The proposed program in the teaching of English as a second language should be studied carefully to determine the additional support costs that would be required by a significant increase in the foreign student population. However, the Department should continue to provide appropriate and necessary services to foreign students and faculty.

3. The demonstrated need for an additional faculty member in the area of second-language testing might be met by an appropriate position shift within the University. Otherwise it should not be supported.

4. Exploration should be made into the formation of an English Language Center involving English, Rhetoric, Linguistics, and Reading.

i. MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The Mathematical Sciences are recognized as being central to any University, as they provide an important core element of many
of the technological and applied science programs. The Department of Mathematical Sciences at Oakland is recognized as having a high quality program in terms of its academic scholarship. The Department plays a large service role for other units in the University, especially Engineering, Human and Educational Services, Nursing, and Economics and Management. Its community and public service contributions include inservice training of teachers, programs to combat math anxiety and math avoidance, student science training programs for high school students, and math camps in the summer, all of which are commendable. Although the Department has suffered a decline in majors over the past ten years, its service function to other units has increased, and it has, in fact, demonstrated a consistently increasing credit delivery over the past ten years to the point where the latter exceeds 10% of the University's total credit delivery.

Recommendations:

1. Increased resources for the Department are needed but probably can be avoided by the sharing of joint appointments with the School of Engineering in the areas of applied mathematics and computer science. In addition, Special Instructors could be hired for the remedial and precalculus courses, thereby reducing the need for part-time people. (Details of such a scheme are given in a comment with the summary on the programs of the School of Engineering.) Any tenured-track new positions which may be opened up should be filled with people in the applied mathematics area.

2. Overzealous grading practices are recognized as a problem and should be examined by the Department. This may be a contributing factor to the inability of the Department to attract and retain majors. Greater attempts should be made to bring students up to the standards of the Department.

3. The practice of using Math as a "filter" to screen students for other programs (notably Engineering and Economics and Management) should be reduced.

4. The Department should reduce the number of upper-level course offerings and increase the number of sections at the 100 and 200 level, to decrease class sizes and improve the opportunities for the students to learn.

j. MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: In recent years the student demand for foreign languages has been declining. This phenomenon has had a direct effect on Oakland's Department of Modern Languages and Literatures. This fully tenured Department does a high degree of its teaching in upper level low enrollment courses, thus making the program
one of the most expensive in the College of Arts and Sciences. The belief that a foreign language should be required of all students is evidently held by some of the faculty, but the idea is not realistically feasible at this time. The faculty in the program are of high quality. A large proportion of the Department's few majors do get jobs quite easily. But the program is of high cost and has low student demand. Nonetheless, it is essential to the University.

In the absence of a definite proposal, the Committee did not review the much-discussed Center for International Studies. With or without that framework, the Department of Modern Languages has opportunities it could pursue. These include minors and corequisite programs, consulting opportunities, and translation services. To clarify its focus and to take advantage of these opportunities, the Department must first do some tightening of its existing efforts.

Recommendations:

1. The level of general fund support to the program should be reduced.

2. The number of languages being taught should be reduced, with concentration on those which are most feasible. At the same time, alternative ways of teaching these languages should be explored.

3. The Department should work closely with the professional schools in an attempt to develop suitable foreign language requirements in their curricula.

4. A study should be made of the possibility of permitting students who place in LS 101 to substitute a foreign language.

5. Exploration should be made into the differing ways in which a foreign language alternative to ALS 176 and Area Studies can be presented positively in the distribution requirements in the catalog.

k. PHILOSOPHY

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: The number of majors in the undergraduate degree program in Philosophy, the Department of Philosophy's only major, has declined by two-thirds over the past five years to a current level of 14 headcount, 6 FTE. Total credits delivered in the PHIL rubric have remained approximately constant over this period (at an annual FYES delivery level of about 135). The current regular faculty of four are engaged in substantial scholarship. Public service activity is not of special note.
The Philosophy Department has had six authorized faculty positions for quite a number of years. Two of these have been filled temporarily for the 1981-82 year with part-time and visiting persons.

In SHES, the demand for sections in the philosophical foundations of education has paralleled the dramatic decline in undergraduate education majors over the past decade. The philosophers in the Foundations area have developed teaching competencies in other subject areas within SHES, but are still under-utilized in their specialities.

Recommendations:

1. General fund resources to the program should be reduced. Temporary faculty should not be replaced on the expiration of their appointments.

2. The Department should meet some of its teaching needs through use of educational philosophy faculty from SHES, developing cooperative arrangements as necessary. Evidence was presented to the Committee that some transfer of effort could be immediately effected. A more extensive use of SHES faculty might involve some retraining activity.

1. PHYSICS

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: Physics is an indispensable program for undergraduate instruction in Engineering, Health Sciences, Nursing, and the other basic sciences. The Department provides important courses for general education students, particularly in the area of energy. The instruction and research carried out by Physics faculty are generally of high quality, and the breadth of course offerings at the undergraduate level is very valuable to the University. The work of the Department in the areas of Medical Physics is particularly important both as research and for the contact it provides with outside agencies.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be maintained at current levels.

2. The Department of Physics should be encouraged to increase its efforts to obtain outside funding for the additional staff position needed to start the Medical Physics Ph.D. program, according to the conditions of the Senate legislation that established this program.

3. The Deans of Arts and Sciences and Engineering should be encouraged to decide in which School to include an "Engineering
Physics Concentration/Option." It is assumed that there is a significant number of students who would come to Oakland for such a program.

4. The Deans of Arts and Sciences and Engineering should set up a mechanism whereby duplication of course offerings by Physics and Engineering can be reduced. This might include some cooperative curriculum planning, combining and cross-listing certain courses, and Physics faculty teaching part-time in Engineering. In addition, greater cooperation between Physics and Mathematical Sciences faculty in program development should be sought.

m. POLITICAL SCIENCE

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Funding

Summary: The program offers a B.A. in Political Science and a B.S. and Master in Public Administration. The quality of teaching is regarded by alumni as high with some prestigious placement of graduates. Faculty scholarship is good, but public service is not extensive. Advising is notably good. Student demand has declined 23% over the last ten years, compared to a 45% decline for other social sciences. 25% of total credit delivery is to Political Science majors. Those majors take the majority of remaining credits in other departments in Arts and Sciences, thus providing significant stability in the College. Cost is roughly average for the College. The record of attracting external funding is poor and needs to be improved.

Plans to install computer facilities with outside funding are to be encouraged. Opportunities for cooperation with SHES and SEM for a Ph.D. in Administration with appropriate tracks should be explored. Redesign of the Public Administration program to achieve economy of personnel should obviate the need for an additional tenure track position.

Recommendations:
1. General fund support should be maintained at current levels.
2. The position for the M.P.A. program should not be filled.
3. The Ph.D. in Administration should be explored with SEM and SHES.
4. External funding should be sought more vigorously.

n. PSYCHOLOGY

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: The quality of the programs in Psychology is generally good, but faculty commitment to scholarship is uneven. There were
alumni and other comments indicating there is an image problem caused by the view that some undergraduate courses are too easy. Although all programs continue to attract and retain students, there is some evidence of less student demand than in the past. There is evidence of a strong commitment to and encouragement of undergraduate research. The essentiality of Psychology to Oakland University's mission could be enhanced by greater attention and commitment to university service and outreach by all faculty. Although Psychology provides considerable support to other academic programs, a more effective use of resources could be made by focusing efforts on providing high quality undergraduate service courses.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be reduced below current levels.

2. The Department is encouraged to increase its commitment to the University's service and outreach while reducing its commitment to private practice.

3. The Department is encouraged to seek better balance in its faculty scholarship, teaching, and service efforts.

4. The Department should continue its active undergraduate student involvement in research.

5. The Department should shift resources from major and graduate courses to high quality undergraduate service courses.

o. RHETORIC, COMMUNICATIONS, JOURNALISM

Suggested Priority Level:

Rhetoric: Increased Resources Limited to the Writing Program
Communications: Same Level of Resources
Journalism: Phase out the Program

Summary: The improvement of student writing skills should be one of the University's highest priorities for the 1980's. Writing is the responsibility of all faculty, but the Department of Rhetoric has been created to provide the basic courses needed at various levels. It is vital that a few more specialized faculty, specifically trained for and committed to the teaching of writing, be added. But the Learning Skills courses will also require the services of an increased number of faculty from other units. These must be organized into a structured program that insures a reasonable uniformity of content and intensity in remedial and beginning courses.

Hardly less essential is the need for undergraduates to have at least some minimal training in oral communication. One or more courses should be available in the general education curricula of the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools.
The resources required to meet the essential needs in written and oral communication should not be dissipated in trying to mount a Journalism program of a quality comparable with existing programs in other state universities. There are few attractive openings for graduates in Journalism, and throughout the profession there exist serious doubts that technical training is the best education for a career in this field.

**Recommendations:**

1. Any new faculty added to the Rhetoric section of the Department should be trained for and devoted to the improvement of writing.

2. A mechanism should be developed by which participating faculty from other units may be permanently incorporated into the structured Rhetoric curriculum while remaining affiliated with their home departments.

3. With the addition of faculty transferred from the School of Performing Arts, the Department should develop a general education program in oral communication.

4. The Department should expand its extracurricular program in debate and forensics.

5. The major in Journalism should be phased out. No more Journalism courses than necessary for a minor should be offered. The word "Journalism" should be eliminated from the name of the department.

6. A study should be made of the possibility of permitting students who place in LS 101 to substitute a foreign language.

**Secondary Education**

**Suggested Priority Level:** Phase out the Program.

**Summary:** The Secondary Education Program has never been accredited by NCATE. The philosophical differences between the College of Arts and Sciences and SHES on how the program should be administered have hampered program development. The existence of a Program Coordinator for the past several years has not solved the problem. The Coordinator's report includes program goals which are very unrealistic at this time. In the two areas where jobs exist, mathematics and science, there are currently no students enrolled in the program. For the past several years there have been only a few students in this program in these two areas. Special overload arrangements for courses and supervision have had to be made for them. Given the fact that the involved departments are burdened with increased demands and have available fewer resources, the integrity and quality of this program have been difficult to maintain. School
contacts will no doubt be affected by the phasing out of this program, but for the most part these are relationships of long standing which can be maintained through alternate types of activities involving the interested departments and the schools.

**Recommendations:**

1. The Secondary Education Program should be phased out.

2. The involved departments should develop new activities to strengthen University-school relations.

q. **SOCIOLOGY-ANTHROPOLOGY**

**Suggested Priority Level:** Reduced Level of Resources

**Summary:** The quality of teaching in the program is good as evidenced by placement of students in graduate schools and internships and by alumni assessment, although alumni opinion has declined from excellent to good in recent years. The scholarship and public service records of certain faculty are notable. The program offers a B.A. and M.A. at a cost higher than the Arts and Sciences average. Student demand has declined sharply over the past eight to ten years, due to the existence of alternate programs such as HRD and reduced career opportunities for graduates.

Additional expenditure for an Institute in Archeology is not prudent at this time. The proposed Institute in Survey Research is in competition with similar efforts in SEM; cooperation is to be encouraged, since this represents a potential opportunity for significant public service. The proposed Bachelor's in Social Work would require the addition of one new faculty person; given the declining career opportunities in the field, the program is not justified.

**Recommendations:**

1. General fund support should be reduced.

2. Cross-disciplinary activities with SEM and HRD should be encouraged to make more efficient use of faculty time and to serve better the interests of students preparing for "helping" professions.

3. An Institute in Archeology and a Bachelor's in Social Work should not be supported at this time.
2. SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

a. CONTINUUM CENTER

**Suggested Priority Level:** Same Level of Resources

**Summary:** The Center is a service unit which is located organizationally in the School of Human and Educational Services. Evidence of quality in the Center lies in its uniqueness and its exceptional service to the community. The majority of similar centers have people in them who were trained in Oakland's Center. The Center has received several awards and honors for the work it has done. It provides a valuable and rewarding learning experience for the Oakland University community.

**Recommendation:**

General fund support should be maintained at current levels.

b. CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND LEADERSHIP

**Suggested Priority Level:** Reduced Level of Resources

**Summary:** Persistent concern with respect to Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership has been expressed relative to the unfavorable market conditions for graduates and the large number of unemployed teachers. For the past several years, the program's enrollment at both the undergraduate and graduate levels has declined. Recent trends and population projections indicate a possible reversal of the current trends by the mid-80's. Currently there is potential for positive development if the present ongoing efforts of self evaluation and planned change continue. However, alumni and others indicate that the reputation of C., I., and L. suffers because some undergraduate courses are viewed as being too easy. The quality of the program is perceived in variable fashion. Since personnel projections are uncertain and elementary school enrollments continue to decline, the C., I., and L. program should be kept to a minimum while its quality is improved.

**Recommendations:**

1. General fund support should be reduced.
2. The size of the program should be reduced to a minimum.
3. Program quality and internal admission standards should be improved.
4. Students should be fully informed of limited job opportunities for graduates.
5. The consistency and quality of faculty supervision of students in their teaching experiences, building on effective evaluation criteria, should be improved.

c. EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The Early Childhood program is of high quality. In both 1976 and 1980, NCATE reviews have cited it for special recognition. Its faculty have published consistently and have received external grant support. While its primary thrust is in an MAT program, both a minor and a concentration exist within HRD degree offerings. The program carries a high student/faculty ratio and is operated at low cost. Recent Legislation requires certification in this area for specialized teaching. The service role played by those involved in this program makes the program a valuable one for the University. New and innovative program developments help to maintain its uniqueness in the State of Michigan.

Recommendations:

Allocations for this program should remain the same. This will mean the replacement of one faculty position which will be vacated in August, 1982. Almost 40% of the teaching in this area is done by part-time faculty. Support should remain at this level.

d. EDUCATION SPECIALIST

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the Program

Summary: The Education Specialist program is a relatively new program in the University. The quality of the program, particularly the computer concentration (40 percent of enrolled students), was considered deficient. The curriculum, course content and materials were not appropriately designed for a graduate level program. A more rigorous program is needed. In addition, SHES does not have a critical mass of regular faculty to support the program. This necessitated using outside part-time faculty and faculty from other units of the University who do not have sufficient commitment to the program.

There is an affordability concern. The computer program causes further drain on the already inadequate on-campus computing facilities. The lack of these facililtes has caused some weaknesses in the program and has resulted in student withdrawal.

While the purpose of improving computer literacy of leaders in the public schools is commendable, the Specialist Program may mislead. Some students may expect to become specialists or experts in computers. The image of the University suffers if individual expectations are not met.
Another major component of the Specialist Program is in the area of educational administration. These students would be served better by a doctoral program in administration constructed jointly by SHES, Arts and Sciences and SEM. Other students could find suitable programs here or at other institutions.

There was also concern that a Specialist Degree in Education is not an appropriate degree for Oakland University. Although there are more than sufficient students to support a Specialist Degree program Oakland needs to focus on quality Master's and Doctoral degree programs.

Recommendations:

1. The Education Specialist program should be phased out.

2. The involved faculty should be utilized to strengthen other programs in SHES and Arts and Sciences and to eliminate the part-time needs of the unit.

3. A doctoral program in Administration should be developed jointly by SHES, Arts and Sciences, and SEM.

e. OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the Office of Field Services

Summary: The Office of Field Services was established to coordinate the placement of SHES students in field sites for internship experiences. Initially, these placements were largely involved with teacher education. More recently, placements in social agencies, courts, and other internship sites in support of HRD and graduate programs have predominated. SHES faculty have indicated willingness to assume the responsibility of this office.

Recommendation:

The Office of Field Services should be closed and the field placement function assigned to faculty in the areas involved or, where appropriate, incorporated into the function of the Placement Office.

f. FOUNDATIONS

Summary: The Foundations area in SHES does not administer any programs. Its faculty teach in nine programs and contribute to general education efforts. As such, their major role is to provide service to other programs, which they have done well.

Recommendation:

Foundations faculty should develop cooperative arrangements with the Philosophy Department in Arts and Sciences to assist the latter in implementing its programs.
g. GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The master's degree program in Guidance and Counseling has served well the needs of many citizens who seek professional training in this field at the graduate level. Such training more properly belongs in a post-baccalaureate than in an undergraduate program. Although it is likely that the need for guidance counselors in the schools will continue to decline slightly, there may be increased opportunities for positions in social and governmental agencies and in private institutions. Oakland University can continue to expand its leadership in this field by strengthening the program in the next few years.

Recommendations:

1. The use of part-time teachers should be reduced.

2. The supervision ratio should be lowered by reducing the teaching of Guidance and Counseling faculty in the undergraduate Human Resource Development program and by incorporating into the curriculum more of the graduate courses given by the Department of Psychology.

3. Some of the effort now given to overload teaching and spring and summer teaching for extra pay should be transferred to scholarship and public service.

h. HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: There are currently about 400 students majoring in HRD, and about 100 students obtain Bachelor's degrees in HRD each year. There is some concern about several aspects of this program:

a) Perceived difficulty in placing graduates in appropriate positions and the high probability that the demand for the skills of these graduates may decrease in the near future.

b) The admission to the program of many students whose preparation and general college performance may be below desired standards.

c) The large number of options which are available in this program detract from its quality.

d) The limiting nature and highly specialized character of the training result in low program image.

On the other hand, HRD faculty are acknowledged to be highly competent in their fields, especially when the shared Guidance
and Counseling faculty are considered. The sharing of faculty strengthens both programs and should be continued. The presence of strong leadership in the School for this program indicates a good outlook for it. An excellent opportunity for Oakland's involvement in the public service field can be seen in the goals put forward for the Employee Training and Development program proposed jointly by HRD and the School of Economics and Management.

Recommendations:

1. The level of general fund support for HRD should be reduced.

2. The HRD faculty should be encouraged to focus the thrust of the program more clearly, reducing the number of concentrations to a much smaller number.

3. The quality of students entering and graduating from this program should be improved, and the enforcement of a GPA admissions requirement for transfer students that is higher than that presently in effect should be instituted.

4. Instruction should be made more cost-effective by requiring more full-time faculty to teach evening and spring/summer courses in-load.

i. INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTER

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The quality and scope of the Instructional Materials Center have improved dramatically since it was incorporated into SHES and given a full-time Director. It has been cited as a valuable resource by graduates of that academic unit and offers significant contributions in the area of community service to area school districts. Although it is recognized that a physical merger with the Library is not desirable, certainly a cross listing of materials would be desirable.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be maintained at current levels.

2. Greater interaction with units outside of SHES should be encouraged.

3. Coordination of purchasing/usage/maintenance of computer hardware and software among academic units should be encouraged.

j. LOWRY CENTER

Suggested Priority Level: Limited Increase in Resources
Summary: The Lowry Center provides significant service to the University and the local community, both as a child care facility and as a practicum and research site. Its existence within an institution of higher education is unique in this State and sets forth a positive image of Oakland University.

Center costs are met with tuition fees and are not supported by the general fund. The fee structure, however, denies access to the facility by lower-income families. Subsidies provided through external funding or a sliding tuition scale might increase accessibility for those groups. The facility is not open during exam periods, again denying access to certain groups when the need might be greatest. External funding could be sought to continue operations during those times.

Need exists for repairs to the water and sewage systems to bring them up to standard.

Recommendations:

1. Funds to repair substandard sanitary facilities should be provided.

2. Accessibility for low-income clients through a sliding tuition scale or a subsidy based on need should be increased.

3. Accessibility during exam periods should be increased.

k. PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the minor and the certification program.

Summary: In 1975 an ad hoc study committee on Physical Education recommended that all physical education courses be the responsibility of a new department within the School of Education to be called the "Department of Movement Science Education." It was also recommended that no undergraduate major program in Physical Education be established but that Master's level degree and certification programs in Movement Science Education be encouraged. A Movement Science program has never been implemented but a minor in Physical Education and a continuing certification in Health/Physical Education were established in 1977. Both of these programs have few students and little demand at the present time.

The Physical Education Department also offers skills classes in various activities such as swimming, golf, and tennis. These courses can be more cost-effectively taught by an Athletic Department or part-time staff.

Personal fitness classes are offered in conjunction with the Exercise Physiology Laboratory in the Athletics Department. These
courses stress nutrition and good health practices. In addition, classes in exercise physiology and kinesiology are taught for Physical Therapy students. These courses are more appropriately taught in the same academic unit as Physical Therapy.

Recommendations:

1. All physical education activities within the School of Human and Educational Services should be phased out.

2. The minor and continuing certification in physical education should be dropped.

3. All skills classes should be taught through the Athletic Department and administered through an appropriate Student Affairs office.

4. All health-related classes including exercise physiology, kinesiology, and personal fitness classes should be taught within a new School of Nursing and Health Sciences. The Cardiac Rehabilitation Laboratory should also become part of that new School.

1. READING

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The quality of this program, considering all measures used, is generally excellent. It has been sensitive to the needs of its students and other units, careful in development of its courses and programs, and successful in its professional accomplishments. Alumni views of this area suggest that it is the best in the School. Its work recently culminated in the implementation of a rigorous, high quality, very selective Ph.D. program. The Reading Clinic activities on behalf of community children experiencing reading/learning difficulties are very much in line with the University's service mission. The program is low cost and has a high student/faculty ratio. Faculty efforts to contain cost by teaching spring/summer courses on an in-load basis, and the shift of M.A.T. positions into the Ph.D. program are highly commendable. Scholarship efforts and external funding have occurred consistently at a high level. Interaction with other units in the School has been valued and appropriate. Future prospects for the Reading area appear only to be positive. The faculty are very strong and experienced.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be maintained.

2. Cooperative efforts with Linguistics should be continued.

3. The Reading area, Linguistics, English and Rhetoric faculty should explore the development of an English Language Center.
4. Services of the Reading Clinic should be made available to a greater extent for the use of students.

5. The possibility of increasing charges for Clinical testing services should be explored.

m. SCHOOL SERVICES

**Suggested Priority Level:** Same Level of Resources

**Summary:** School Services performs well a significant instructional and public service by providing courses, institutes, special lectures, and other offerings—all at the graduate level—at public school sites selected for the convenience of those served. The use of computers and other equipment at the public school sites relieves the demand for those items on campus. A money-maker, the program also attracts school system personnel to take courses on campus and enroll in programs. The success of the operation results from its cost-effectiveness and the commitment of its faculty. SHES is rightfully proud of this program.

**Recommendations:**

Site use should be better coordinated with the Extension Programs. The screening of instructors could be improved in the interest of enhancing the quality of the offerings.

n. SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Suggested Priority Level:** Same Level of Resources

**Summary:** The quality of this program, considering all measures used, is from good to excellent. Over a thirteen year period, it has developed and matured, with modifications made to maintain standards dictated by outside councils and agencies and to meet needs of students and other units. Its work on behalf of handicapped and retarded persons is central to the mission of the University. Its summer practicum for Oakland County children and its summer program for the Children's Orthogenic Center are commendable. The program is low cost and has a high student/faculty ratio. Its external funding and scholarly efforts have been at good levels. Its interaction with other units in SHES has been very good. The core faculty are very strong and experienced.

**Recommendations:**

1. Funding at current levels should be maintained. Special education needs can be met through position shifts within SHES.

2. Caution should be used in the removal of the one-year admissions requirement, since it serves as a screening device to maintain quality control.
3. Careful monitoring of use of part-time faculty should be continued.

4. Development of training programs for businesses is encouraged.

5. Greater interaction with units outside SHEES in science areas might be explored.
3. SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

a. COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Suggested Priority Level: Increased Resources

Summary: This program is essential to the University. At present CIS is so understaffed and underfunded that despite heroic efforts it falls short of providing a basic program of computer literacy for undergraduates and is severely handicapped in offering advanced work for majors and master's candidates. The present staff can provide the leadership necessary for the University to enter fully the computer age if given adequate resources. The recently conducted Student Survey indicated dissatisfaction with the level of academic computer services much greater than the national ACT norms.

Recommendations:

1. A technician and additional faculty should be added as qualified candidates become available.

2. A line item should be included in each year's budget for computer equipment and maintenance.

3. Cooperation among all units of the University that use computer facilities should be encouraged.

4. Work should be done toward the goal of computer literacy for all undergraduates.

5. Consideration of a Ph.D. program in Computer Science should be postponed until present program needs are fully met.

6. Attempts to recruit more qualified minority students for the CIS major should be intensified.

b. ENGINEERING

Suggested Priority Level: Increased Level of Resources

Summary: The momentum in Engineering is high. Student demand for engineering programs is sufficiently strong that an internal mechanism to limit enrollment is being effected, while admissions standards have also been raised. All programs have been accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). Engineering has a strong research record. Its ability to generate additional external funds appears to be limited primarily by the severity of teaching loads. The School of Engineering's service potential to Michigan, as the State seeks to rejuvenate its industrial base, is also high. The formation of the Center for Robotics represents an early step to put the School and, hence, the University, into a significant partnership with the local
private sector. The faculty have important contact with local industrial concerns. The market for graduates at all levels is superb; in fact, there is significant concern at the national level about this nation's ability to compete in the international economy given the severe shortage of engineers. (This shortage does affect Oakland's ability to recruit good faculty, particularly those with good verbal skills in English.) The perception of graduates and employers about teaching quality is good, although the Dean and the faculty point to deficiencies in technical staff support, student advising, and amount of faculty staffing.

In particular, the need for well-trained mechanical-engineering graduates (and experts in related areas of energy conversion, structure testing, combustion, etc.) is strong, and there will probably be a constant or increasing need in these areas for the future development of Michigan. The Mechanical Engineering faculty group demonstrate a high level of research and instruction quality. One of its faculty members recently received the Outstanding Research Award for 1980 from the American Society of Engineering Education. The research in this area draws many graduate students and post-doctoral associates to Oakland.

Recommendations:

1. Additional resources should be provided to Engineering for faculty and staff positions. However, this should not be allowed to interfere with cooperation with other units. A suggested way of increasing resources in the School while also assisting the Department of Mathematical Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences is given below. One additional staff member should be in the area of machine design, vibrational analysis or combustion engineering.

2. The search for funds to construct an addition to Dodge Hall should be continued vigorously.

3. Steps should be taken to maintain programs at current enrollment levels, at the same time that standards are raised and advising is improved.

4. Mechanical Engineering faculty should be encouraged to pursue with other science faculty the possibilities of instruction and research in Energy Technology.

Comment: As noted in the above summaries, the Committee has recommended increased resources for both major programs in the School of Engineering. As noted earlier, the recommendation for the Department of Mathematical Sciences was to keep its level of resources at the current rate, knowing full well that that Department is grossly understaffed. The two events are not unrelated. The Committee offers the following suggestion to increase the resources of both units at the price of increasing those of the School alone, and maintain quality in so doing.
Let us say that the School of Engineering has been allocated five positions in CIS/EGR at an average of $30,000 for a total of $150,000. Suppose six faculty with applied interests and competence from the Mathematical Sciences Department (and they do exist) are given joint appointments utilizing the higher pay area factor of Engineering. Each would be on a 50-50 arrangement. The incremental cost would be about $10,000 for all six people. So far the Department would have lost three positions, while Engineering would have gained three. The Department will be permitted to employ three Special Instructors primarily to teach pre-calculus offerings. Since each person would be teaching a 3+3 load, they would account for 18 sections, the equivalent load of 4.5 faculty. In teaching terms the Department is now ahead by 1.5 faculty. At $20,000 each (including fringes), the cost of these Special Instructors would be about $60,000, bringing the total to $70,000. This would leave the Engineering School with two positions to fill, for another $60,000, bringing the total to $130,000. Thus both units would have increased staff, better quality, stronger cooperation and communications, and greater opportunities for development of joint activities, while the University would have saved $20,000. In addition money would be saved in recruiting for positions, in having course offerings consolidated and reduced, and in better utilization of equipment. This type of transaction could be accomplished without too much delay.
4. SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

Suggested Priority Level: Increased Resources (limited to undergraduate courses, including general education courses in Economics for non-majors, and to the five-year MBA program).

Summary: The School of Economics and Management is vital to Oakland University. Its admissions standards are relatively high. Its major problems relate to understaffing and high student demand for its programs. Salary demands are high, and few qualified faculty are available. Most faculty in the School are non-tenured. Problems exist with advising, scholarship quality, and the School's inability to fulfill its potential for external service and funding. The School's quality and image have improved over the past three years. The Accounting program is now recognized as being of good quality by the major accounting firms. The School has made strong efforts toward accreditation as a Business School.

There is an immediate need to obtain additional staff necessary to make undergraduate courses more available to students at all levels and to promote the "3 + 2" MBA program. Although the evening MBA program attempts to maintain high quality, it employs many part-time faculty and generally suffers from the inherent weaknesses of evening professional programs. Therefore, the University would be better served for the next three years by a concentration on improving the daytime program instead of carrying out the plan to double the number of students working for the MBA on a part-time schedule.

Recommendations:

1. Faculty should be added to the School, as qualified persons become available, including at least one economist committed to offering general education courses in Economics for non-majors.

2. The School should be encouraged and supported in its efforts to obtain accreditation.

3. As part of the move to a 2.8 GPA standard for admission, a vigorous recruiting campaign should be conducted to bring qualified minority students into the SEM programs.

4. A more extensive general education program in basic Economics should be organized in consultation with other schools and colleges. Economic literacy in our time is a most important goal.
5. SCHOOL OF NURSING

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The quality of this relatively young program seems to range from good to excellent. The program is viewed by alumni and individuals both within and outside of Oakland as being a strong program academically. The curriculum of the program meets the guidelines of both the Board of Nursing and the N.L.N., and the School has been accredited both state-wide and nationally. The program serves the needs of both traditional "FTIAC" students and returning diploma or associate degree R.N.'s who desire to obtain their B.S.N. Opportunities exist in the expansion of the R.N. program component. Twelve members of the faculty are currently working on their doctorates. The unit has a very good external service record, both by providing qualified professionals to meet the nursing shortage which exists in society, as well as providing consultation and resource services to area hospitals. There continues to be high student interest in the Nursing program, so a program of recognized high quality, as this one is, brings visibility to the University and contributes to student recruitment.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be maintained at current levels, assuming maintenance of the current tuition structure. Additional resources could be provided if the University adopts a variable tuition structure.

2. If Nursing and Health Sciences are combined into a single academic unit, resources should be provided to allow smooth merger. (For the Committee's proposal in this regard, see the next portion on the Center for the Health Sciences.)

3. Implementation of the M.S.N. should be contingent upon acquisition of external funding, as well as the availability of appropriate faculty.
6. CENTER FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES

a. CENTER FOR HEALTH SCIENCES

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the Center as an administrative structure.

Summary: The Center for the Health Sciences should be phased out as an administrative structure. In its place there should be created a new School of Nursing and Health Sciences, with the current Dean of Nursing as chief officer. Within this framework the program components would be:

a) Nursing
b) Medical Technology
c) Physical Therapy
d) Exercise Physiology and the Cardiac Rehabilitation Laboratory

This structure would provide the University with a high quality school and set of programs which would enhance its image and clarify its focus in this area. The School would have increased revenue capability within its own organization and would add greatly to the University's overall fund-raising capability.

b. HEALTH BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Suggested Priority Level: Current status should be maintained, but the concentration should be offered through the College of Arts and Sciences.

Summary: At present this program is not attached to a degree and consists of a concentration of six courses, taught by two faculty members whose primary appointments are in the Departments of Sociology-Anthropology and Political Science. The courses are associated with health oriented applications and health care delivery. The program is an outgrowth of the now defunct Allport College. It serves a small number of students, some of whom choose the courses for general education purposes.

Recommendation:

The courses offered in Health Behavioral Sciences should be continued since they do serve some general education needs. However, they should be offered through the College of Arts and Sciences.

c. INDUSTRIAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the program

Summary: The Industrial Health and Safety program was established in 1979 as a program primarily for non-traditional students. All courses have been taught in the evening and have been cross-listed
as Continuing Education courses on a non-credit basis. Students can leave with a certificate after two years. Basic science courses are not required as prerequisites to IHS courses but rather this material is introduced simultaneously with the professional courses.

External funding, deemed to be essential for the success of this program, has not been forthcoming. A close working relationship between this program and the Environmental Health Program, which could result in shared resources, has not been established and appears impossible.

Recommendation:

Because this program is not central to the mission of the University, the Committee recommends that it be phased out. A concentration of courses in this area could be included as an option in the non-credit Labor Education program.

d. MEDICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

Summary: The purpose of this program is to offer a comprehensive review of the basic and medical sciences to foreign medical graduates and to U.S. citizens studying abroad. Thus this program provides valuable service to the community, which warrants its continuation. Through its fee structure the program should remain self-supporting and generate credits at the graduate level. Most appropriately, it should be offered as a continuing professional education program within the proposed School of Nursing and Health Sciences since its purpose is professional licensure.

Recommendations:

1. The program should be continued.

2. The program should be considered as a continuing professional education offering of the proposed School of Nursing and Health Sciences.

e. MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

Suggested Priority Level: Increased Level of Resources

Summary: This relatively new program in Medical Technology attracted its first faculty member in 1978. Offering three fields, its program in Histotechnology was the first in the nation and its program in Cytotechnology was the first in the State of Michigan. The program has achieved high quality in a short period, despite understaffing. With modest additions to resources, the quality of the program can be further enhanced into becoming the best in the State and among the best in the nation. The substantial improvements in the program have been confirmed by testimony from a variety of sources. The program's recent accomplishments, despite sparse resources, the
high scores received by graduates on qualifying exams given by hospitals to interns, and the 100 percent placement record of its students, all attest to the quality of the program. While the program is not characterized as having a low cost, its students spend their first two years taking general education and the sciences. Hence, the Arts and Sciences obtain considerable credit hours as a result of the program.

Expansion of the program is an opportunity for the University. It has one director, one lab assistant who teaches classes in hematology, a part-time lecturer who teaches clinical chemistry, and no AP's or CT's, despite a large advising load. In addition, the necessity for maintaining close communications with fourteen hospitals and other administrative burdens dictate the need for additional help. In programs elsewhere, the director is a full-time administrator, in contrast to Oakland's Director, who is a full-time faculty member who contributes significantly to University service. 12.9/1 student/faculty ratio is misleading, since the program does not get the credit for the first three years of work done by students, as is done elsewhere.

Recommendations:

1. The long standing requests for added staffing in Medical Technology should be addressed positively.

2. The Committee endorses the request for adding a fourth and final concentration to the program in Nuclear Medical Technology. This would give Oakland the most diverse and complete Medical Technology program in the State as well as uniqueness in the nation.

3. The Committee does not endorse the request for a "ladder program" for laboratory personnel with an Associate Degree or any other "two plus two" program in this area.

f. PHYSICAL THERAPY

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: Over the past three years, Physical Therapy has developed its complete curriculum and achieved full accreditation status. It is one of only three Physical Therapy programs in the State. The quality of this new program is good. However, it could be improved if the pre-professional admissions standards were raised to the same level as the School of Nursing. The service contribution of the program to the community makes it essential to the overall mission of the University. The program attracts and retains highly motivated students and thus has served as a good recruiting tool for the University. Present and projected demands for the graduates are very high. Initial efforts at scholarship are adequate. The faculty are well prepared and seem committed to the University's goals. Professional attempts to establish entry into practice at the Master's level are still being debated.
Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be maintained at current levels.

2. The pre-professional admissions standards should be raised to the same level as the School of Nursing.

3. Reassessment should be made of the credit assignments of the courses in the program to determine their proper levels.
a. SCHOOL OF PERFORMING ARTS

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the School as an administrative unit.

Summary: The establishment of a School of Performing Arts was undertaken at an inopportune time economically. Available funding is too low to provide high quality. With competition from the University of Michigan, the pool of potential students is so small that recruiting outside the State of Michigan and considerable scholarship support would be required to maintain a critical mass. Given the low retention rate of students, continued support is not justified. SET and the Meadow Brook Theatre and Festival compete with the School for audience. SET, which provides cultural enrichment for a wider student population, also competes for student talent.

Recommendations:

1. The School of Performing Arts as an administrative entity should be phased out.

2. The Department of Music should be transferred administratively to the College of Arts and Sciences.

3. The Theatre and Dance Program should be phased out. A study of the feasibility of utilizing existing faculty for the instruction of Speech within the Communications group should be made.

4. Student interest in theatre should be diverted to S.E.T.-type activity.

5. Cooperative efforts between the Music Department and performers at the Meadow Brook Music Festival should be encouraged and expanded.

b. THEATRE AND DANCE

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the Program

Summary: This program competes for a pool of talented students with other programs which are well established in the State. To maintain quality, competition from other Michigan schools will force more and more extensive out-of-state recruiting which does not fall within our mission. The program also competes with the Student Enterprise Theatre which meets the needs of a broader segment of the student population. To subsume S.E.T., as has been proposed by the Department, would deny access to large numbers of students who experience the enrichment of theatre and dance outside, but in addition to, their academic programs. Finally, the program competes for audience, not only with S.E.T., but with Meadow Brook Theatre and Festival.
Traditional sources of external funding are drying up rapidly. Here again, competition is severe. The Department's desire for a 50% increase in resources, presumably from the general fund, is unrealistic.

Connections between the Meadow Brooks and academic programs are indeed desirable and must be pursued, but that can be done just as appropriately through the College of Arts and Sciences.

Recommendations:

1. The Theatre and Dance program should be phased out.

2. Theatre Arts and Dance faculty should be employed in the College of Arts and Sciences, to whatever extent is feasible, for instruction in speech and communication and to make whatever contributions are possible in the development of S.E.T.-type activities and other cultural events.

c. MUSIC

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: The quality of the program is uneven, according to assessments by the Dean and the department chairperson. There are some faculty who have been cited for success in bringing acclaim to the University through their teaching, creative activities and research; however, the level of scholarship in the department is uneven. The program is expensive, due in part to low student/faculty ratio.

There is student demand for the program in the first two years, but good students often transfer to more prestigious schools or go directly into performing careers. Attracting good students from outside the limited pool in the region would require extensive out-of-state recruiting and significant scholarship support. Given our budgetary restrictions and the competition at the University of Michigan, such expenditure is not prudent at this time.

Attempts have been made at enhancing the academic programs through exchanges with Meadow Brook Festival. Such efforts must be encouraged and expanded. The program should also take an expanded role in general education; moving it to the College of Arts and Sciences would enrich both the College and the Music Department.

Recommendations:

1. The Music Department should be transferred administratively to the College of Arts and Sciences.

2. The general education service of the Department should be strengthened.
3. Interdisciplinary teaching within the College should be encouraged.

4. The Department should identify and concentrate on the stronger elements of the program; allowing weaker elements to subside.

5. The cultural experience of greater numbers of students throughout the University could be enriched by more extensive and creative interface with the Meadow Brooks. Such interfaces should be developed.

6. The net costs of commercial music should be studied further, taking into account the positive image in the community that the Meadow Brook Estate and other groups of this nature provide.

d. MEADOW BROOK ART GALLERY

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out General Fund Support

Summary: The Gallery was established in 1962 as a support unit of the Art Department, its academic focus underscored by its being housed in Arts and Sciences. Works by students, faculty and invited artists were hung.

Since the Gallery became the administrative responsibility of the Division of Public Services, and later the Development Division, for the stated purpose of serving a wider public, it no longer served its primary clientele—students and faculty—and any semblance of academic service was lost. In an effort to reach out to a wider audience in the community, which is well within the public service mission of the University, the Gallery lost touch with the instructional mission. That the Gallery would be willing to exhibit student work "on a limited basis" is indicative of the low priority attached to academic needs.

The Gallery Director points to a lack of student interest in the visual arts as opposed to the performing arts as a defect in the institution. Since the performing arts are so aggressively marketed on campus and the Gallery is marketed to no significant degree, such lack of interest should be no surprise.

The Art Gallery is supported by approximately $55,000 from the general fund plus hidden costs for utilities and space with no appreciable return in the form of service to its academic mission.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support for the Gallery should be phased out.

2. If the Gallery is to be maintained, its operating costs should be covered through external funding. In that event a formal mechanism should be established for cooperation between the Gallery and the College of Arts and Sciences.
e. MEADOW BROOK HALL

Summary: Meadow Brook Hall is a jewel on the campus. It adds uniqueness, grandeur, and a vast, unexploited potential for establishing Oakland University as a national center for conferences at which cogent ideas in the forefront of public awareness are formulated and discussed. It could become a highly visible and central attraction for all visitors to southeast Michigan - a "must see" for all tourists - if marketed imaginatively. It also has a great potential for profitability, contributing substantially to the University's cash flow. Shown in the table below is the plateau reached annually by the number of guests at the Hall since 1977-78, the fall in income (measured in dollars of constant purchasing power) in recent years, and the failure of program income per guest to keep pace with inflation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Guests</th>
<th>Program Income Only</th>
<th>Income Per Guest</th>
<th>CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current $</td>
<td>1967 $</td>
<td>Real $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/72-7/73</td>
<td>47,114</td>
<td>169,032</td>
<td>125,209</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/77-7/78</td>
<td>83,835</td>
<td>297,474</td>
<td>153,258</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/80-7/81</td>
<td>84,639</td>
<td>381,144</td>
<td>136,123</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The income per guest is quite low because it is valued in the prices for 1967 (the base year of the Consumer Price Index). Valued in 1981 prices, the amounts for the three years shown chronologically beginning with 1972-73 are: $7.43, $5.12, and $4.50, respectively.

Recommendations:

1. A marketing expert should be contracted to propose a strategy for profitably exploiting the potential of the Hall.

2. The identification of the Hall within the University and its academic programs should be increased.

f. MEADOW BROOK FESTIVAL AND THEATRE

Summary: The Meadow Brook programs are among the strengths of the University. Their major cultural offerings hold the potential of providing unique and significant visibility for Oakland. The marketing of these programs, however, has failed to identify them appropriately as elements of the University. The Festival and Theatre exist and function within the University for the benefit of the institution as well as the public in southeastern Michigan. Their role in cultural enrichment of the internal and external communities is in support of the University and its academic and public service mission. Insufficient cooperation occurs between the Meadow Brooks and academic programs.
Recommendations:

1. The Festival and Theatre must maintain strong identification as part of the University in all promotional/public relations efforts.

2. The Festival and Theatre should be placed on a full-cost basis with hidden expenditures for heat, lighting, space, grounds maintenance, etc., to be met out of revenues.

3. Any deficits incurred by Festival and Theatre operations must be offset by more vigorous fund-raising activities, not through University subsidy. These fund-raising activities should be conducted even in periods when there is no deficit.

4. An indepth study of Festival and Theatre management and operations should be undertaken for the purpose of recommending economies and determining more expansive marketing procedures. In particular, stronger ties between the Meadow Brook functions and southeast Michigan tourism and convention bureaus should be established.
8. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND GENERAL STUDIES

a. BACHELOR OF GENERAL STUDIES

Suggested Priority Level: Phase out the Program

Summary: The Bachelor of General Studies was instituted in the mid-1970's to provide homes for independent majors and 2+2 programs with community colleges. It has also provided an escape hatch for students from other programs. The suggested priority level to phase out the program was deemed necessary to signal the substantial extent to which changes are necessary to bring about consistency with the University's mission.

Recommendation:

Admission standards should be adopted for transfer students to strengthen the eligibility standards for students. Structure must be provided to eliminate the possibility of the B.G.S. serving as an escape mechanism for FTIAC's and other students who wish to avoid the standards of more demanding programs. The B.G.S. program should be dropped and another pattern developed to create a flexible degree for experienced and mature students, who already have an occupation and a life style, and for whom a more structured degree would not be useful or desirable. Thus, the B.G.S./Community College relationship should be replaced by high quality structured alternatives within the organized schools, so as to strengthen the University's relationship with the community colleges.

b. CABLE TELEVISION

Suggested Priority Level: Either a solid commitment in resources or no involvement.

Summary: Cable TV appears to offer a gargantuan potential for use in instruction, research and community service. To be consistent with the mission of the University, the role of the University must be performed either with grace, effectiveness, and excellence, or not at all. If the University does get involved, large resources will be required. Evaluation of the University's participation is premature at this point. It is clear, however, that the choice should be either substantial participation or none at all.

Recommendation:

The Committee recommends that enthusiastic exploration of the potential role for the University be continued with the active participation of the academic administration. The leadership which has already been taken has helped to form a consortium and to link Oakland University to the process for selecting a contractor. As it has reserved both a role and resources for educational institutions to use Channels 30 and 31, it is to be commended. The report by the appointed Committee is eagerly awaited. More integral involvement of
the academic sector of the University is important. The University should proceed with caution. The encouragement of excessive expectations by others of the University is to be avoided. Added administrative control and monitoring may be warranted.

c. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Summary: Except for two programs which are offered as both credit and non-credit (Legal Assistant and Industrial Health and Safety), the programs in this area are all non-credit offerings. The Committee did not attempt to review these efforts, but rather reviewed the concept of Continuing Education and what it might mean for the University. Solid evidence exists that the University has many opportunities in the area of continuing professional education, which should be explored.

Recommendation:

Incentives should be provided to the Schools and the College to participate in programs in continuing education through recommending and approving non-credit professional courses and their instructors. Central administration apart from the schools should be continued with greater controls over the quality of the courses offered. Mediocrity is to be avoided even with non-credit courses. The deans of the schools are to be involved in the control of quality but be shielded from the day to day administrative tasks. Such activities are to be operated as a profit oriented cost center using full cost accounting and to be actively supervised by central administration.

d. EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Summary: The recommendations with regard to the Continuing Education program also apply to the Extension Program. The participation of the schools, involvement of their deans, and profit-orientation when appropriate, with revenue sharing by the schools as an incentive device, all are recommended. The deans of the schools should provide to the President a mechanism for accomplishing these ends.

Care should be taken to avoid a proliferation of extension sites so that quality can be controlled. Distant extension sites, such as the one proposed in Port Huron, are particularly suspect.

Better coordination between School Services of SHEC and the Extension Program should be negotiated by the relevant deans, to clarify the University's outreach image and to avoid unnecessary duplication.
e. LABOR EDUCATION

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: The Labor Education program serves a significant purpose. It can be undertaken through the offering of existing courses and is consistent with the University's mission.

Recommendation:

The Committee recommends that this program be continued and that a selection of courses in occupational health and safety be developed within it.

f. NEW CHARTER COLLEGE

Suggested Priority Level: Elimination

Summary: New Charter College has served its usefulness. It is a small program. Its cessation simplifies the structure of the University without denying students adequate alternative course selections and opens doors to new types of interdisciplinary efforts. The Dean of Continuing Education does not believe that the College belongs under his jurisdiction. The merit for locating it elsewhere is doubtful. The faculty who have taught in this College and its directors are to be commended for their meritorious service over the years. The College was a novel undertaking and offered instruction of high quality. It can no longer be afforded in the current fiscal environment.

Recommendation:

The Committee recommends that New Charter College be eliminated.
9. INSTITUTE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Suggested Priority Level: Same Level of Resources

Summary: Evidence of the quality of the Institute lies in its external funding, its ability to appoint recognized and established research scholars, its collaborative efforts at national and international levels, and the awards it has received. Through its extensive funding, the Institute has been self-supporting and has returned money to the general fund. Prospects for this to continue seem good. The Institute's original mission "to create an environment in which students could participate in interdisciplinary research" has been fulfilled in only a limited fashion. Its new mission statement says that the Institute will "carry out research and provide new knowledge." The Institute does just that and, in so doing, brings honor and visibility to the University.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support should be maintained at current levels.

2. A proposed Ph.D. program in visual sciences in the Institute should not be supported. The Institute has not administered any instructional programs. Its only involvement with students has been on an independent research basis. That should continue.

3. Greater interaction by the Institute with other scientific research people in the University would encourage and enhance interdisciplinary research efforts.
Suggested Priority Level: Increased Resources

Summary: The Kresge Library mirrors the University's commitment to a quality academic environment. Currently the Library collections range in quality from appropriate for graduate-level programs to inadequate for selected undergraduate programs. A policy of development which continued new program development and did not provide for inflationary costs has continuously eroded the Library. The cost of extensive, comprehensive program collection improvement is prohibitive. Furthermore new technology and lack of adequate space preclude extensive use of funds for the necessary development of existing program collections or new program collections. Priorities for some selected program collections and services are necessary. The Library is at a crisis stage and failure to adequately utilize new funds may destroy prior efforts and prevent possibility of meeting future needs. Priorities may insure adequate undergraduate program collections but because of cost, graduate program collection improvement may not be feasible.

Recommendations:

1. A moratorium on new periodical and book acquisitions by current procedures should be declared. Any new purchases should be recommended jointly by program faculty and Library personnel.

2. A moratorium on general fund expenditures for Library acquisitions for any new academic programs should be declared.

3. Competitive funds for current program acquisitions with consideration given to undergraduate level and course-related materials that encourage library research and writing should be provided.

4. All academic programs are urged to design and encourage library assignments in their courses.

5. A review of all standing orders with joint consideration of standing orders by Library staff and program faculty is encouraged.

6. A governance and administrative organization should be initiated to incorporate the Performing Arts Library, Instructional Materials Center, academic program libraries, Audio-Visual Services, Cable TV, and Kresge Library with shared acquisitions, development, and cataloging.

7. Investment in "borrowing" services such as on-line document acquisition, inter-library loan, transportation to area library collections, etc., should be increased.

8. Public and private support should be directed to insure that Kresge Library expansion and upgrading becomes the University's Number 1 building and endowment priority.
9. To improve the quality of library service, all Library staff should be urged to focus on library service even at the expense of professional and University commitments.

10. The Library is encouraged to develop a list of private subscriptions to journals by faculty and staff for purposes of encouraging joint interests and avoiding duplication.

11. The Library is urged to develop and implement plans for encouraging private funding of materials and resources.
11. GRADUATE SCHOOL

Suggested Priority Level: Reduced Level of Resources

Summary: Evidence indicates that the current Graduate Council-Dean form of governance is becoming cumbersome. A primary function of developing new programs, which has been played by this structure in the past, now appears less necessary. The other functions of governance and evaluation could be handled in a more cost-effective and efficient manner by reorganization and reassignment of personnel and functions to existing programs.

Recommendations:

1. General fund support of the Graduate School Office should be reduced and the administrative structure should be diminished in size and complexity.

2. The Provost should be appointed Graduate Dean and assume the responsibilities of that position.

3. The Graduate Council should become a standing Senate Committee consisting of the Provost, Deans, and appropriate faculty and graduate students.

4. All advising and record-keeping functions should be transferred to the appropriate offices already in existence for undergraduate programs.
12. SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Suggested Priority Level: A supplement from the General Fund to compensate for reductions in Federal support, subject to the acceptance of the recommendations given below.

Summary: Through Upward Bound, Summer Support, and the Skills Development Center, Special Programs has made a significant contribution to the advancement of disadvantaged students. Federal support for the effort has already been reduced, and further cuts or complete elimination of the grant are likely in the next three years. It is important that this program not fall victim to the current economy. But it is also necessary to profit from past experience to improve the quality of this activity.

Recommendations:

1. Many more Hispanic students than at present should be recruited and brought into the program.

2. Minority graduate students, supported by graduate assistantships, should be used as counselors and tutors.

3. Improvement should be made in the procedures for identification, screening, and evaluation of prospective students.

4. All of these efforts should be accompanied by a comparable effort to attract highly-qualified minority students.

5. Special Programs should be transferred to Academic Affairs, and the tutorial services should be arranged in closer cooperation with the academic units in which the students are taking classes.
13. ACADEMIC SERVICES

a. OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

Summary: The various academic service areas are very important in maintaining strong, quality programs at any university, including Oakland. The Office of the Registrar, in particular, is absolutely essential to the University. At the present time the Office is having a difficult time because of the lack of an efficient, timely student records system, although plans are in progress to correct this. The process of evaluating transfer credits for advanced standing reports is slow and inefficient. This, however, is also being corrected as the method for evaluating equivalency credits from various area community colleges is being modified through use of word processing equipment. The Registrar's Office, however, still sees need for a person whose time would be specifically devoted to the task of evaluating transfer credits. There is also some concern about relationships between students and faculty and the Office of the Registrar because of the overload of problems placed on the Office.

Recommendations:

1. An on-line computerized student records and registration system should be completed and implemented as soon as possible.

2. A student advisory board should be instituted to advise the Office of the Registrar on its problems with students in its everyday operations.

3. Steps should be taken to require the various academic units to have all class schedule materials to the Office of the Registrar in timely fashion with full accuracy in the details, but never after the deadline given by the Registrar.

4. The request for the additional person to handle Advanced Standing Reports should be set aside until the modifications in the process have a chance to be tested.

b. PLACEMENT, ADVISING, AND COOPERATIVE EDUCATION

Summary: Since Fall 1981 the placement, undergraduate and career advising, and cooperative education services have been administered within Academic Affairs. Student records, orientations, readmissions, and specialized advising for foreign students and handicapped persons are housed in Student and Urban Affairs. Testing is scattered throughout the University with MAT, LSAT, ACT, GRE, etc. generally supervised and administered by different offices and persons. At present 56 students are involved in Cooperative Education with 18 in Engineering, 23 in Management, 14 in Arts and Sciences, and 1 in Human Resources Development. The remaining HRD interns are placed by SHES. Additional interns are placed through Urban...
Affairs. In short, responsibilities for placing students in internship situations are widely scattered. The outcome of all this is that the University's focus is unclear and its image is confused. Additionally, the recently conducted Student Survey indicated dissatisfaction with placement and advising much greater than the national ACT norms.

Recommendations:

1. The concept of cooperative education should be supported and the internship programs should be continued.
   a. Analysis should be made of the proper organizational structure to obtain coordination and clarity of focus.
   b. The relationship of cooperative education to Spring/Summer course offerings and teaching should be carefully studied.

2. A centralized testing service should be established.

3. Advising, orientations, placement, and records should be placed within Academic Affairs to achieve better coordination and more effective administration and program development. Extensive efforts should be directed toward the retention of students through improved placement and advising services.

4. ADMISSIONS

Summary: The Admissions Office is responsible for recruiting and admitting a student body that will be compatible with the mission and priorities of the University. The full support of the entire community is necessary for this to be accomplished.

Recommendations:

1. A sound admissions model should be developed that will provide direction for the recruitment of a student body which is compatible with the University's mission and priorities.

2. The Director of Admissions should be instructed to develop an admissions marketing scheme that will include mechanisms for
   a. recruitment of first time students in large numbers with high quality
   b. selective admission of transfer students
   c. recruitment of non-traditional students
   d. recruitment of qualified disadvantaged students

   in accordance with the admissions model.

3. Full cooperation and support should be given the admissions effort by academic units through their individualized recruitment efforts.
VII. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

General recommendations which do not pertain to any one specific program or unit are contained in this section of the report. They are grouped so that those which require a committee effort come first. Within each group, the order is random.

1. Equal Opportunity

As suggested in the report of the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity, (Appendix 11), there is a definite need for a well-defined, implementable Equal Opportunity Policy and Procedure within the University. The Committee agrees with this and sees it as necessary for the fulfillment of the University's stated mission. The Advisory Committee should develop an appropriate set of statements.

2. General Education

The Committee has taken a very strong stand in favor of a sound liberal arts-professional balance in the academic programs of the University. The decisions and recommendations which have been made center around this theme. To accomplish it in fact and not only in principle, several things are needed. They include:

a. A General Education Policy

The Academic Policy and Planning Committee has proposed a General Education Policy statement to be submitted to the Senate Steering Committee for legislative processing. (See Appendix 7.) This proposal should be moved forward without delay for discussion and action.

b. Course Credit Policy

In conjunction with the establishment of a General Education policy, there should be discussion of the appropriate credit level for most general education courses. For example, one scheme would be for such courses to be primarily 3-credit courses, with a fourth credit being assigned in cases where a course has a laboratory component.

3. Research Institutes or Centers

In recent months several research institute proposals have been introduced into the legislative process, with more to come. Research institutes are important to the University, but that they should be financed primarily by external funding. To avoid proliferation and to permit proper monitoring of such institutes, a procedure for their establishment is needed. The Academic Policy and Planning Committee has proposed guidelines for this purpose. (See Appendix 8.) Formal consideration should be given to these guidelines by an appropriate committee.
4. Faculty Retraining and Development

There is no doubt that as programs are phased out or reduced, faculty position shifts will occur in significant numbers. To ease these situations, a faculty retraining and development policy is needed. Suggestions on this issue have been made by Associate Dean Miller, School of Human and Educational Services, and Dean Copenhaver, College of Arts and Sciences. Their comments are given in Appendices 9 and 10. The University should take steps to develop and implement an appropriate policy in this regard.

5. Monitoring of Equipment Cost and Use

The Committee's investigations and program reviews have revealed instances in which some programs or units have utilized equipment which has been purchased or maintained at the expense of another unit and charged to the latter's budget and in which certain units have charged usage or rental fees to other units. A well-defined and widely-revealed policy concerning these matters of shared purchase and use of equipment should be developed and implemented as soon as possible. As a result inter-program tensions and aggravations will be eased and greater cooperation will be achieved.

6. Concentrations and Minors

During its four-month program review, the Committee did not have time to collect information on and to review the large number of concentrations and minors that exist in the total University curriculum. It is clear that there are more such options than necessary. A thorough study should be undertaken to determine which ones of these should be retained in the curriculum.

7. The Quality of Undergraduate Teaching

To fully implement the academic program of the University in a manner that is consistent with the institution's mission, the University must maintain a strong commitment to high quality teaching in the total curriculum, but particularly at the undergraduate level. The Committee's concerns in this area relate to

a. the level of instruction in general education courses
b. the level of instruction in the large classes at the lower levels
c. the extraordinary imbalances in class sizes between lower-level and upper-level courses
d. the large number of upper-level classes which are taught inload with fewer than four or five students in order to keep various majors afloat.
e. the need to provide greater recognition and rewards for excellence in teaching.

These concerns should be fully discussed by appropriate bodies.
8. Management of the Meadow Brook Functions

In light of the Committee's report on Meadow Brook Hall and its discussions with the various managers of the other Meadow Brook functions, the Committee encourages a review of the management of these operations to determine

a. whether these functions are being marketed and promoted in the best possible manner

b. whether these functions can be coordinated better with the academic programs and units.

In addition, full cost accounting should be utilized for these activities.

9. Variable Tuition

In view of both the heavy costs of administering programs in the various health sciences, nursing, engineering, and computer sciences, and the need to allocate student stations in popular programs for which there is an excess demand, the Committee suggests that the University study the feasibility of a variable tuition schedule by school or program, on the student's entry into that major. Should such a system be feasible and be instituted, then it should be tied closely to the scholarship-financial aid system.

10. Program Evaluation

A workable evaluation mechanism for degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate level should be developed by the respective Schools in conjunction with the Provost's Office.

11. Microcomputers

A determination should be made of the respective roles of the Schools, the MIS Office, and the Library in the acquisition, use, maintenance, and cataloging of hardware and software for microcomputers in academic and administrative areas to achieve maximum coordination and cost effectiveness.

12. Course and Program Monitoring

The University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction should be restructured so that it can effectively oversee academic program implementation and course changes.

13. Implementation of Recommended Changes

It is clear that the implementation of changes which have been recommended will require much time, energy, careful analysis and monitoring. The Committee recommends the appointment of a Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Services to oversee these developments and to be responsible for the establishment and supervision of a mechanism for on-going program review.
Prior to the complete phasing out of a program an opportunity for review should be provided, if requested by program faculty.

Prior to initiating any faculty layoffs an appropriate plan incorporating governance and contractual concerns needs to be developed in cooperation with affected units.

14. Public Relations and Marketing of the University

The Committee's investigations have repeatedly shown that the University suffers badly from poor public relations and poor marketing. The University has much to offer to the people of Michigan. The University's public relations effort must be strengthened and its activities must be promoted in a much better fashion than at present. Similarly, various types of marketing analysis must be done to receive more benefits from the Meadow Brook functions and other types of activities which have revenue capability, such as those in the area of continuing professional education. Through these efforts, public understanding of the University will be increased, and the admissions effort will be enhanced.

15. Student Labor

An increase in the Student Labor budget can be put to good use on behalf of the University. Expanded use of students could occur in various types of clerical activities, maintenance work in non-security areas, food service, and instructional assistance. The outcome would be reduced costs in personnel and greater retention of students. Consideration should be given to such expanded use of student help, particularly during this period of declining resources.

16. Reward System

In the face of position shifts, increased emphasis on public service, and increased cooperation among units with accompanying joint appointments, there is a clear need for appropriate changes in the reward system for faculty members. Such changes should be discussed in review committees and in the bargaining process.

17. Academic Risk Management

To preserve quality in the area of continuing professional education and to provide incentives for growth and development in academic units, the University should engage in academic risk management to a limited extent. For example, an amount of money on the order of $100,000 should be set aside by the Provost for which academic units can compete with program proposals which have revenue-bearing capability and are of high quality. As the program develops, this start-up money plus a percent of the profits would be returned to the Provost, with the remainder staying with the unit for further program development. In this manner, risks could be taken. Where they succeed, the unit and the University would benefit.
18. Social Sciences

Social science activities exist in the College of Arts and Sciences, in the School of Human and Educational Services, and in the School of Economics and Management. Through cooperation and coordination, it would be possible to create some packages and activities that would be attractive to the public and to businesses and that would be of great benefit to the University. In the past, these ingredients have been absent to any great degree. The Committee strongly urges the deans of the three schools to come together in encouraging these types of developmental activities. In particular, the three units should develop a strong doctoral program in Administration with appropriate tracks for educational administration, public administration, and health care administration.

19. Fund Development Efforts

The Committee urges the University to continue aggressively with developmental efforts with strong cooperation between the academic units and the Development Office. These efforts are critical for the upgrading of the Library and scientific laboratory facilities and for the expansion of the scholarship-financial aid support for students, items which have been given top priority by the Committee.

20. Graduate Follow-up

Except in a few schools and departments, follow-up activities with respect to graduates are relatively weak and uncoordinated. The Committee urges the development of a standardized follow-up mechanism for graduates. It is possible that this could be done by the Office of Institutional Research.

21. Outside Employment

A large number of faculty members are employed in significant ways outside of the University. In some instances the faculty members have virtually full-time private practices. In several cases, these outside activities have caused internal problems which relate to the work of the Department or school. The University should review this problem and enforce the clear-cut policy on it which exists in the Faculty Agreement.

22. Cost Accounting

The programs which provide service and that are intended to be self-supporting should be required to use an approximation to full cost accounting. The pricing of such services should be structured accordingly.

23. Resource Allocation and Productivity Studies

The Committee became well aware during its work that the concept of "program costing" has been little developed at Oakland. The only dollar data currently available have been assembled using a variety
of definitions, many not useful for internal program-costing purposes, and these data are often aggregated into non-comparable units (that is, sometimes by program, sometimes by department, sometimes by school). The Committee made substantial use of the data available to it, but with a keen awareness—heightened by the insightful report on costing prepared for CAMP by the Office of Institutional Research—of its limitations. The University is urged to give increased study to the manner in which it collects and analyzes data on resource inputs and quantitative measures of academic productivity.

24. A-P and C-T Staffing

The Committee encountered great difficulty in examining appropriate A-P and C-T staffing levels for various programs and units. The University is urged to study a formulation of appropriate levels by need, productivity, and type of work done.
VIII. FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCERNS

As it reviewed Oakland University's academic mission and program priorities, the Committee worked on a three to five year time projection into the future. To go that far, given the instability of the economy and other factors, involved certain risks. To go beyond that period was simply unreasonable.

There are many determining factors in program planning for the future. These include demographic changes in the service region and the State of Michigan, changes in State and Federal government in both personnel and policies, changing economic conditions for better or worse, and, within the University, changing leadership, opportunities, accreditation policies, research funding capability, enrollment, quality of feeder schools, and financial policies. In short, there are so many factors involved that predictions and projections beyond a three or five year time span are exceedingly risky.

So what should the University do in terms of future planning? First, the University should decide what it wishes to do and to be and then not stray too far from that position for a sufficiently long period of time so that the public image can catch up and stabilize. Second, in the implementation of its mission statement, the University should be consistent in all aspects of its activities. In particular, the selection of a student body which is fully compatible with the goals and mission of the University is vital. Again, the admissions process must demonstrate consistency and stability over a period of years until high school counselors, community college liaison personnel, and other key people become thoroughly familiar with the University's goals and mission.

Third; there must be continuing discussion and dialogue within the University community on the deep issues that are involved in the planning and review process. The Committee has attempted to provide a start in this direction. As it has emphasized in its report, the Committee views its work as the first stage in a lengthy process. What must follow are discussions on

a. possible changes in organizational and curricular structures for the future,

b. the liberal arts/professional program balance,

c. the community and public service role to be played by the University and its personnel,

d. issues of cultural perspective on national and international levels,

e. the University's relationship to higher technology developments.

Fourth, the University must develop a set of specific goals and objectives with respect to program planning which truly represent its blueprint for the future. Prior to the setting of these goals, each unit should review its role and mission to insure congruence with that of the University. No unit should have a role and mission as expansive and broad as that of the parent institution.

Fifth, the University must maintain a strong public relations effort to publicize its program and activities, keep its public image clear and well-focused, and to provide the University with the visibility it deserves.
Finally, there must be established a periodic program review mechanism to guarantee that the University stays on course or give it good reason to change courses.
IX. APPENDICES

TO THE REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISSION AND PRIORITIES

This section of the report contains the various appendices referred to in Section II-3, plus a bibliography on program evaluation in higher education.
Please provide short, concise responses to the questions given below. It is most important for the review that you include criteria of judgment in each case. Specific information and evidence are desired. If a particular question is not applicable for your program or unit, please mark it accordingly. You need not supply data, other than that of a general nature and course or program evaluation data, as it may exist in your program or unit. Standard data on enrollments, credits, number of majors, grades and cost analyses are already available, so there is no need for you to include those items in your report. Your written responses will form the bases for discussions of individual programs as well as for the examination of a variety of cross-disciplinary activities. Your cooperation in this matter is vital and is most appreciated. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Provide an outline of the chronological development of your program, including changes in direction over time.

2. How does your unit, as a center of scholarship, contribute to the advancement of knowledge and bring critical acclaim to the University?

3. How well does your unit prepare students for professional success in the discipline? What mechanisms do you have in place to evaluate your success?

4. How does your unit contribute to the general education and intellectual growth of students outside your discipline?

5. What is the proportion of upper and lower division work offered by your unit? Are there ways to alter this proportion to serve students better?

6. If your unit offers graduate work, what is the proportion of undergraduate to graduate offerings? How does the graduate program relate to the undergraduate? Could the resources given to one be better used to strengthen the other?

7. What are your major concerns in attracting and retaining students? How do you address these concerns?

8. What has been the community and public service record of your unit? What value do you place on that service?

9. Who actually does the work (instruction, scholarship, advising, service) of your unit and in what proportions? Tenured faculty? Untenured faculty? Part-time faculty? Graduate students? A-Ps? C-Ts?

10. Are there needs for additional support essential to preserve the quality of your unit or to bring it up to the standards of the discipline? Specify the types of support and the rationale for their essentiality.

11. What sources of external funding are available to you? Which ones have you explored? What has been the extent of your external funding over the past five years?
12. Are there economies of operation or personnel that you can make (or are making) without lowering the quality of your program? Specify.

13. Are there compelling reasons why the University would benefit by giving your unit increased support during a period of declining resources? Specify.

14. What would be the impact on the University if your unit (or program) should be eliminated or combined with another unit? What would be the impact of such actions on the public or the community?

15. Which institutions compete with your program(s)? How is yours unique or not duplicated elsewhere?

16. What efforts are being made to attract and retain female and minority students, faculty, and staff in your program? How successful have those efforts been?

17. Is there additional evidence of the quality of your unit that should not be overlooked? Provide evidence of such quality that is not readily apparent from the standard statistical reports of the University.

18. Is there any other relevant information about your unit that has not been covered in the previous questions? Specify.

19. After reviewing your answers to the above questions, please prepare a brief summary of the mission, goals, and priorities of your unit for the next three years. Emphasize the areas of opportunity that will enable your unit to enhance and increase the public perception of Oakland University.
1. Institute of Biological Sciences
2. Continuing Education and General Studies
3. School of Nursing - Dean's Summary and Program Report
4. Center for Health Sciences
   a. Director's Summary
   b. Industrial Health and Safety
   c. Medical Technology
   d. Physical Therapy
   e. Medical Review Program
   f. Health Behavioral Sciences
5. School of Performing Arts
   a. Dean's Summary
   b. Theatre and Dance
   c. Music
6. School of Engineering
   a. Dean's Summary
   b. Computer and Information Sciences
   c. Computer and Electrical Engineering
   d. Systems and Industrial Engineering
   e. Mechanical Engineering
7. School of Economics and Management - Dean's Summary and Program Report
8. School of Human and Educational Services
   a. Dean's Summary
   b. Foundations
   c. Reading
   d. Human Resources Development
   e. Guidance and Counseling
   f. Physical Education
   g. Early Childhood
   h. Special Education
   i. Education Specialist
   j. Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership
   k. Continuum Center
   l. School Services
   m. Advising Center
   n. Field Services
   o. Instructional Materials Center
   p. Lowry Center
9. College of Arts and Sciences
   a. Dean's Summary
   b. Area Studies
   c. Art and Art History
   d. Biological Sciences
   e. Chemistry
   f. English
   g. Environmental Health
   h. History
i. Linguistics
j. Mathematical Sciences
k. Modern Languages
l. Philosophy
m. Physics
n. Political Science
o. Psychology
p. Rhetoric, Communications and Journalism
q. Secondary Education
r. Sociology - Anthropology

10. Kresge Library
11. Special Programs - Dean of Student Services
12. Meadow Brook Functions
   a. Art Gallery
   b. Hall
   c. Music Festival
   d. Theatre
13. Student Enterprise Theatre
The following cross-disciplinary activities have been identified for examination. The purpose of each examination will be to clarify program purposes and needs, in relation to each other, and to determine possible areas of coordination and better utilization of resources.


3. Area Studies and Modern Languages.


8. Public Administration, Management, Educational Administration, Health Care Administration.

9. Philosophy, Foundations in SHES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Subject of Interview</th>
<th>Interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Interviewer(s)</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 25</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Institute of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>V. Reddy, Director</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Monday)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Feeman's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Area Studies and Modern Languages</td>
<td>J. Moeller</td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Coppola</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Barnard</td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td>V. Khapoya</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Heubel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>School Services</td>
<td>H. Hahn, Director</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Feeman's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>401 ODH</td>
<td>Continuing Education and General Studies</td>
<td>L. Eklund, Dean</td>
<td>K. Gregory</td>
<td>R. Christina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Spencer</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Philosophy and Foundations</td>
<td>R. Burke</td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Conference in SHES Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Clatworthy</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Fish</td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>D. Shantz</td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wednesday)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Braunstein</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Otto</td>
<td>C. Akers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Meyer</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Bezdek</td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Casstevens</td>
<td>G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Subject of Interview</td>
<td>Interviewee(s)</td>
<td>Interviewer(s)</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>401 ODH</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>A. Lindell, Dean</td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wednesday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>401 ODH</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>E. Heubel</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Briod</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Tower</td>
<td>N. Boulos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Elementary Education, (Conference</td>
<td>J. Easterly</td>
<td>R. Christina</td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Education, Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Services</td>
<td>W. Jorns</td>
<td>R. Buner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Malm</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>401 ODH</td>
<td>Center for Health Sciences</td>
<td>M. J. Pak, Director</td>
<td>N. Boulos</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Meadow Brook Functions (Conference</td>
<td>K. Usui</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
<td>G. Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Friday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Hyke</td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Kilburn</td>
<td>R. Buner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Eklund</td>
<td>N. Boulos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Twyman</td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:15 p.m.</td>
<td>401 ODH</td>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>J. De Ment</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td>C. Akers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Morse</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Schwab</td>
<td>C. Akers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. Cafone</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Malm</td>
<td>K. Gregory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Pierson</td>
<td>R. Christina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Moeller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Subject of Interview</td>
<td>Interviewee(s)</td>
<td>Interviewer(s)</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>School of Performing Arts</td>
<td>L. Hetenyi, Dean</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
<td>G. Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Friday)</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>(Conference Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Boulos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>207 ODH</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>M. Ghausi, Dean</td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Monday)</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>School of Economics and</td>
<td>R. Horwitz, Dean</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Conference</td>
<td>(Conference Management</td>
<td>Management Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td>K. Gregory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>207 ODH</td>
<td>Health Sciences and Nursing</td>
<td>A. Lindell</td>
<td>C. Akers</td>
<td>R. Christina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U. Reischl</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Tomboulian</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td>R. Christina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Canfield</td>
<td>G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Stransky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Unakar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Chopp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Stano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Vann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>D. Daniels</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Allvin</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Halstead</td>
<td>R. Bunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Cameron</td>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Stevens</td>
<td>N. Boulos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Aston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Dovaras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Subject of Interview</td>
<td>Interviewee(s)</td>
<td>Interviewer(s)</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH (Conference Room)</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean</td>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>G. Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Kresge Library</td>
<td>G. Gardiner, Dean</td>
<td>C. Akers</td>
<td>R. Christina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Friday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Stinson, R. Christina</td>
<td>R. Christina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>School of Human and Educational Services</td>
<td>G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>G. Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Area Studies and Modern Languages</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Philosophy and Foundations in SHES</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean, G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>C. Akers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Monday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Haskell, C. Akers, J. Stinson, R. Bunger, K. Gregory, G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Subject of Interview</td>
<td>Interviewee(s)</td>
<td>Interviewer(s)</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8 (Monday)</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH (Conference Room)</td>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean, G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>K. Gregory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH (Conference Room)</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean, R. Horwitz, G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>C. Akers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10 (Wednesday)</td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>207 ODH</td>
<td>Health Sciences and Nursing</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean, A. Lindell, M.J.Pak, G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>207 ODH</td>
<td>Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Field Services</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean, G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>G. Schatz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12 (Friday)</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH (Conference Room)</td>
<td>Graduate Studies and Research Services</td>
<td>L. Pino; Acting Dean, Graduate School and Director of Research Services</td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>211 ODH</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean, R. Horwitz, G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td>G. Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>211 ODH</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, Dean, L. Hetenyi, R. Andreas, G. Pine, Dean</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Subject of Interview</td>
<td>Interviewee(s)</td>
<td>Interviewer(s)</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>L. Eklund, Dean, B. Copenhaver, R. Haskell</td>
<td>K. Gregory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Monday)</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>(Conference General</td>
<td>General Studies, School Services</td>
<td>S. Miller, G. Feeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services, and Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>401 ODH</td>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>L. Bartalucci, Registrar, W. Connellan, J. Stinson</td>
<td>J. Dawson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Kevern, Assistant Provost, J. Rose, Atkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Reilly, L. Snider-Feldmesser, C. DiFelice,</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Titus, E. Hitchingham, W. Cramer, L. Akers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>401 ODH</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>L. Reilly, L. Snider-Feldmesser, C. DiFelice,</td>
<td>J. Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Titus, E. Hitchingham, W. Cramer, L. Akers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>520 ODH</td>
<td>Applied Sciences, Quantitative</td>
<td>B. Copenhaver, M. Ghausi, R. Haskell, J. Green</td>
<td>R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Conference Engineering, and Room)</td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>Dean, M. Ghausi, Dean, R. Horwitz, R. Haskell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Year of First Entry to Oakland University:
   Year(s) of Graduation:
   Degree(s) Earned at Oakland University:
   Degree(s) Earned at Other Institutions:
   Major Field at Oakland University:
   Minor Fields or Concentrations at Oakland University:

2. What proportion of your academic work was done at Oakland University? If not all, which other schools or colleges did you attend?

3. How long have you resided in Michigan after your last enrollment at Oakland University?

4. Please evaluate the quality of your education in your major at Oakland University?

5. Are you presently employed in a position related to your major field?

6. Please list courses or academic programs from your Oakland University experience which have proved to be valuable or beneficial.

7. Please list programs of study to which you think Oakland University should give highest priority.

8. Please list courses or programs of study which you wish you had taken some of or more of that would now be beneficial to you.

9. Please indicate one curricular or program change which you think would be beneficial to Oakland University students.

10. Your views are very important to us. Please add any comments you wish to make. Use additional sheets if necessary.
APPENDIX 6

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISSION AND PRIORITIES

LIST OF UNIVERSITY, COMMUNITY, AND LEGISLATIVE
PEOPLE INTERVIEWED IN THE EXTERNAL PHASE

1. Joseph E. Champagne, President, Oakland University
2. Richard Headlee, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Oakland University
3. Keith R. Kleckner, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Oakland University
4. Wilma Ray-Bledsoe, Vice President for Student and Urban Affairs, Oakland University
5. John DeCarlo, Secretary to Board of Trustees, Vice President for Government Affairs, Oakland University
6. Arthur Saltzman, Board of Trustees, Oakland University
7. Ken Morris, Board of Trustees, Oakland University
8. David Lewis, formerly of Board of Trustees, Oakland University
9. Donald Bishop, State Senator
10. Frederick Whims, Director, Higher Education Division, Department of Management and Budget, Executive Office, Lansing, Michigan
11. Rick Bossard, Fiscal Agent for Higher Education, Michigan Senate
12. David Murphy, Fiscal Agent for Higher Education, Michigan Senate
13. Norman Weston, President, Oakland University Foundation
14. Robert McGarry, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Oakland University
15. Robert Swanson, Vice President for Development, Oakland University
16. Al Lorenzo, President, Macomb County Community College
17. William Keane, Superintendent, Oakland County Intermediate Schools
18. Lewis N. Pino, Director of Research Services, Oakland University
19. David Bricker, Associate Professor, SHES; Chairman, AASCU Exchange Team 1980-81, Oakland University
20. Rosalind Andreas, Dean of Students, Oakland University
21. Doreen Bieryla, Director, Residence Halls, Oakland University
22. Elaine Chapman-Moore, Coordinator of Field Services, General Studies, and Extension, Oakland University
23. Jerry Dahlmann, Assistant Vice President for Development, Oakland University
24. Thomas Evans, Controller, Oakland University
25. Steven Fasbinder, Assistant Director, Computer Services, Oakland University
26. Ray Harris, Associate Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Oakland University
27. Ronald Kevern, Assistant Provost, Placement and Advising, Oakland University
28. Richard Light, Assistant Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Oakland University
29. James Llewellyn, News Director, Oakland University
30. William Marshall, Director, Oakland Center, Oakland University
31. Freddie Martin, Director, Community Education, Oakland University
32. Mondine McNeil, Coordinator, Student Records, Oakland University
33. Jane Mosher, Director of Community Relations, Meadow Brook Theatre and Music Festival, Oakland University
34. Manuel Pierson, Dean, Student Services, Oakland University
35. Gladys Rapoport, Director, Financial Aid, Oakland University
36. Jerry Rose, Director of Admissions and Scholarships, Oakland University
37. Corey Van Fleet, Director, Physical Education and Athletics, Oakland University
38. Jack Wilson, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, Oakland University
APPENDIX 7

ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

POLICY STATEMENT ON GENERAL EDUCATION

The APPC urges the CAMP to assign a very high priority to insuring that sufficient resources be made available to provide a strong component of General Education which would be common to every undergraduate program at Oakland University. The APPC recommends that this component constitute at least thirty-six credits of every baccalaureate degree.

During the month of January 1982, the APPC has consulted with representatives of professional schools and the College of Arts and Sciences. While it has rediscovered again the practical difficulties that exist in formulating a specific program, it has also found a common commitment to this goal and support for the feasibility of a program of the size recommended above.

Over the next several weeks, the APPC will formulate specific legislation for the Senate to implement such a program. In support of the APPC recommendation to the CAMP, the likely nature of that legislation is outlined below.

A University-wide committee will be charged to administer the program in General Education. Its primary responsibility will be to approve and maintain a pool of courses that may be used to satisfy the requirement. It is likely that the initial pool will closely resemble, but will not be restricted to, the current one that exists in the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee supports the eventual inclusion of courses from the professional schools in this pool. Those courses offered by the Department of Rhetoric to satisfy the writing proficiency requirement would be part of the pool so that the thirty-six credits could include this work. Only courses approved for the pool could be used to satisfy the requirement, and no courses in the pool would be excluded from a student merely because they are required within the major program.

The following responsibilities would likely be included in the committee's charge:

(a) To define areas via groupings of courses and set distributional requirements over these areas,

(b) to invite and consider approval of additional courses for the pool from the Schools and the College,

(c) to monitor the program and to recommend to the College or appropriate Schools the offering or development of courses needed to strengthen the program,

(d) to consider the exclusion of certain courses in the pool from students of particular programs at the request of the sponsors of that program, and

(e) to consider exceptions for specific programs to the General Education requirements.
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING INSTITUTES

DEFINITION

An institute is an amalgamation of faculty for the purpose of putting forth a coordinated program of research or public services and which is empowered to represent itself as an agency of Oakland University in contracting for external support for its activities.

PROCEDURES

Persons wishing to obtain approval for a proposed institute are required to complete the following steps:

1. The initiating parties will seek approval from the appropriate Academic Dean(s).

2. The initiating parties will forward an approved proposal to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee.

3. The Academic Policy and Planning Committee will forward its recommendations to the Provost. Proposals which are not approved will be returned to the initiating parties with reasons for their disapproval.

4. The Provost may forward positive recommendations to the President who may forward positive recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Proposals which are not approved will be returned to the initiating parties with reasons for their disapproval.

QUESTIONS

Initiating parties should respond to the following questions:

1. What is the research or public service need that serves as a rationale for the existence of the institute?

2. What is the extent of support that exists within the unit which will house the proposed institute?
   a. Willingness to provide shared instructional and research appointments.
   b. Availability and adequacy of space, equipment, and personnel, including graduate students.
   c. Extent of sponsor interest in the area/areas of research covered by the proposed institute.
   d. Availability of core financial support during the formative stage of the proposed institute.

3. What is the extent of library holdings and other necessary support services for the proposed institute?
4. What is the five-year plan for the proposed institute?
   a. Detailed statement of objectives.
   b. Plans for meeting those objectives.
   c. Procedures for hiring institute personnel.
   d. Outline of the administrative structure.
   e. Detailed budgetary structure which clearly defines all expenses.
   f. Type of advisory board.
   g. Plans for periodic evaluations for the purpose of continuation.

5. What is the potential impact of the proposed institute?
   a. Responsibilities of participating faculty members who are also expected to contribute to the areas of scholarship, teaching and service.
   b. Changes in levels of support for other units.
   c. Cooperation among different units within Oakland University.
   d. National and state visibility.
   e. Viable contribution to the communities served by Oakland University.

6. What is the record of productive research, teaching, service and administration on the part of those who would provide leadership for the proposed institute?

7. Does the institute offer substantial faculty expertise focused on one or at most two areas?

8. How does it compare with similar or related institutes at other colleges and universities in Michigan?

9. How do the standards of the institute compare with the standards developed by national professional organizations?
The purpose of this statement is to urge a high priority for faculty-and-program development within the academic mission of the University because of its central role in facilitating constructive change and qualitative growth.

The essence of the University is the program of activities which relates faculty and students. When changes in these activities are under consideration, it is important that faculty have sufficient opportunity to participate in shaping the nature of those changes and the formulations of plans and processes by which the changes are to be implemented.

The efficiency and effectiveness of possible changes cannot be examined simply through quantitative analysis. The qualitative alternatives and implications require faculty examination that is adequately supported by institutional priorities, policies, and resources. Disregard, or only minor attention to faculty-and-program development will limit constructive change, ignore the latent talents and potentialities of faculty, and discount creative problem-solving.

Current University priorities and provisions for faculty-and-program development are inadequate.

Traditional provisions exist: sabbatical leave is available, limited travel funds are allocated, research support is competed. The Education Development Fund was established to facilitate program and instructional growth. However, in 1981-82 this Fund has only $6,000 with which to serve the whole campus. This same amount has been available each year since its inception. In selected areas during the past ten years, these internal funds have been augmented by several external grants for faculty and program development.

Yet for a considerable period of time, at several Michigan colleges and universities a high priority, as well as supporting policies and provisions, have been assigned to faculty and program development. For instance, development programs have existed for several years at Michigan State University and at the University of Michigan; in 1980-81 Western Michigan University established a fund (planned at $100,000) for faculty and program development.

The current student demographic and revenue uncertainties are only two of many factors that critically affect faculty and programs and that call for

constructive and developmental responses. Among other factors, of equal importance and consequence, are:

-the knowledge explosion and the increasing scope and vitality of the knowledge industry

-the growth and expansion of high technology, especially in the fields of computer hardware and software; these technological advances carry with them important humanistic as well as scientific implications

-the heightened expectations for educational opportunities at all age levels and for all groups and sectors of society

-changes in student attitudes, motivations, and aspirations

In recent years, these and other factors have caused systematic and vigorous faculty-and-program developments at many colleges and universities throughout the country.

These developments have involved a wide variety of activities and topics such as: computer assisted instruction, programs for computer literacy, studies of curriculum experiments and innovations, curriculum evaluation, application of instructional technology, implementation of independent study and individualized instruction, seminars on issues and problems in higher education, workshops on audio visual aids and multi-media instructional methods, training in group dynamics, clinics on teaching problems and strategies, study groups on knowledge about human development and learning in the adult years, experiments in non-traditional teaching methods, on-campus consultants for teaching and learning, training in testing measuring of learning, workshops on assessing student needs.

The literature summarizing this body of knowledge and experience has been steadily increasing during the past ten and more years. In one of the most widely respected reports, it is observed that "oddly enough, most professors are not given enough occasions to discuss either their teaching or their professional development. Researchers have found many faculty willing to examine what they are trying to do, how they go into it, what the difficulties are, and how well they are doing. They want to talk about ways in which they would like to change or have their institutions change."

A major conclusion from this body of study and research is that clear priorities and deliberate provisions for faculty-and-program development are needed at the highest administrative and institutional levels.

We believe that faculty-and-program development is a key element in effectively accomplishing changes that impact on faculty-student academic relations. To initiate a systematic approach to such possible changes we suggest the following actions:

One, a high institutional priority should be declared for faculty-and-program development as a major means of facilitating constructive change and qualitative growth. This priority should be conceived as an integral element in the processes of implementing the actions resulting from recommendations of the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities. And, this priority should be accompanied by supporting organizational arrangements, policies, and resources: two major provisions are suggested below:

Two, a Committee on Faculty-and-Program Development should be established by which priority can be implemented and its program of activities coordinated. This committee would need (a) to plan and arrange the most effective organizational structure and processes, (b) to design a program of activities, and (c) to initiate and coordinate the program in correspondence with the availability of resources.

Three, a dedicated effort at the highest institutional level in support of the priority should be made to obtain external grant funding to augment on-campus resources allocated to this program.

We urge a central role for faculty-and-program development in the academic mission and priorities of the University. Its role is essential for any changes in the mission and priorities, for maintenance and advancement of the University's standards of quality, and for improving the academic and learning experiences of students.
APPENDIX 10

"COMPETENCE," "EXPERIENCE," AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

The social-institutional structure of a university, including such entities as departments, schools, colleges, programs, institutes, etc., reflects the prevailing mode of organizing knowledge and inquiry within the society whose culture the university propagates and nourishes. But this reflection is not a precise, one-to-one mapping of the epistemic on to the institutional. One of the causes of imprecision is that institutions are more conservative than minds, i.e., what individuals know and ask is likely to change faster than the institutions that are meant to sustain their knowing and asking. The gap between institutional and intellectual change in the university is, depending on where one sits, either notable or notorious. In June, graduation speakers wearing thirteenth century clothing will speak enthusiastically of electron transfer in silicon chips to graduates wearing simpler models of the same ancient garb and bearing in their minds the seeds of even more amazing novelties.

No one knows how to do without institutions or their unlovable, bureaucratic impediments. Institutionalization, formality, bureaucracy—these are the prices we pay for size and complexity. Specialization, competence and expertise are essential, not accidental features of the university's work, so if we are sometimes stymied by the barriers that separate departments of the university, we should also remember that these barriers are the walls that keep the edifice erect. But walls have doors in them, sometimes.

The university has a strong interest in opening doors. While questions of specialization, competence and expertise are often and justly emphasized in procedures for hiring, tenuring and promotion that decide the relations of individuals to the university, such questions do not exhaust the significance of those relations. The university values a faculty member not only as someone who understands and teaches a given subject, but also as someone who understands well and teaches well simpliciter, and again as someone who thinks and teaches in the circumstances peculiar to Oakland. We sometimes use the word "experience" to describe the emergence of these skills that lie outside the strict limits of topical expertise, but neither institutionally nor individually are we confident about evaluating such skills.

"Competence" and "experience" may sometimes refer to the same set of skills in a faculty member. Moreover, the same person who is "experienced" in teaching a given subject may also be "competent" as a teacher in ways not specific to any subject-matter. But if arbitrarily we let "competence" stand for the skills that are associated with expertise and specialization and if we use "experience" to refer to the more generalized skills, then it is clear that "experience" will be something more permanent and stable than "competence" since the former is more closely associated with institutional change, the latter with intellectual change. "Competence" is also sensitive to socio-economic change in as much as the general society's valuation of skills specific to a given topic may diminish while the esteem of specialists for those skills remains intact. People, not philologists, have changed their minds about the value of understanding the Greek aorist.

The university uses its resources to develop both "competence" and "experience" in its faculty. Can the university preserve its investment in "experience" while it changes its array of "competencies" to conform to
changes in the general society and economy? This question has moved many universities to undertake programs of "faculty development" in the past decade, and it will be clear that the question is most pressing for publicly supported institutions whose responsibility to the larger society is more direct.

As opportunities for mobility in higher education have been decreasing, median ages of faculties and percentages of tenured faculty have been increasing. Universities can no longer depend on external infusions of youth and fresh thinking to stimulate intellectual change and individual development, so support for professional, personal and organizational growth must come from within. One means of fostering this growth is to locate and develop areas of the university's curriculum where "experience" can be shifted from one area of "competence" to another. If the university decides to adopt a policy of faculty development along these lines, it must be clear to faculty that Oakland views such shifts as opportunities, not as gambles. This will require not only the allocation of administrative resources to the general problem of faculty development but also the determination to adapt the university's reward system to the needs of faculty development.

Brian P. Copenhaver  
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
January 19, 1982
Responses to Question 16, on efforts made to attract and retain female and minority students, faculty and staff, vary widely. Most responses lacked specificity and referred in very general terms to "abiding by university guidelines" or the "difficulties everyone has in recruiting minorities." Often there was no reference at all to students, or conversely, to faculty. In the College of Arts and Sciences, for instance, responses varied from "no such efforts have been made," from Area Studies, to thoughtful and well-reasoned responses with some support either from local or national data. The Departments of Art, Philosophy, Political Science and several others seem to take their responsibilities in this area quite seriously, although in some cases the actions described seem to have been in the somewhat distant past. References are made to people hired or courses given in 1968, 1971 and 1972. Those efforts were important then, and they remain important; they are, however, not sufficient, and it is crucial that new efforts be made now in spite of budgetary constraints. The Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity expressed concern that the responses, taken as a group, point up a larger problem that cannot be considered simply on a program-by-program basis. We, therefore, offer our comment primarily in general form.

There appears to be much confusion and many assumptions made about minority recruiting. Liberal Arts programs suggest they have few minority students because those students choose professional/vocational programs. But our professional programs such as Economics and Management, Engineering and Health Sciences have almost no minority representation either. Apparently, the highly popular professional schools do not have the need for strong recruitment programs, and will not develop them in the absence of a university-wide thrust. Other areas (e.g., Chemistry) assume that recruitment and retention programs are necessarily extremely expensive, and blame budget constraints for their lack of programs.

Again and again in our discussions, a coordinated program of recruitment with strong staff support was raised as our major need if we are to be serious about recruiting women and minorities. The problems of minority students are university wide, and recruiting and support services need to be offered at every level.

For females, representation and availability is much greater except in the hard sciences. It was felt that here, too, some centralized programmatic thrust which recruited and supported women in the hard sciences both
financially and in terms of academic and social support would be the only way to increase the number of women in the hard sciences and engineering.

The lack of coordination among the various departments, schools and colleges and the Admissions Office is pointed up again and again when departments refer to efforts that they have made individually, which have not met with much success. Likewise, efforts to get grant funding for programs for minority or female students are not centrally coordinated, and even when occasionally successful (e.g., Engineering) seem to die for lack of support. The entire thrust for recruiting and continuing support seems to be entirely without any sense of policy direction or focus. This problem will not be resolved merely by encouraging departments to do better, but rather by a centralized effort to assess where we are and where we want to be, before we discuss how we are going to get there.

In the College of Arts and Sciences, both the Department of Rhetoric, Communications, and Journalism, and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology suggest plans for increased recruiting, but these plans will be much more useful if they can be developed and implemented for the entire college, or even the entire university. Such a project would require executive support and direction.

The School of Engineering provides a good example of this kind of problem. The School of Engineering details efforts in the Cadet Program and the other pre-engineering programs initiated there. However, only about a dozen black students have graduated from the School of Engineering since 1975. It is not clear from the description exactly what kind of program development is taking place based on the three Ford Motor Company awards; nor do we have much information about the success of students receiving GPOP or National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering or Bendix Corporation Scholarships. We encourage the efforts of the School of Engineering but would suggest that they need more focus. They need a "home" in the School of Engineering--a person or office specifically given the responsibility of doing recruiting and doing the work necessary for the success of female and minority students.

Better centralized support systems and tutorial services for minority and female students and programming services for these same students would benefit another group protected by affirmative action regulations: handicapped students who presently also lack a coordinated program for tutorial service, readers for the blind or other services of that nature.

In the area of hiring of faculty, the attached availability and department faculty composition statistics make clear that greater effort must be made at a variety of levels for attracting and retaining minority faculty. In some areas we are making progress. However, in almost no case do we employ females in proportion to their availability in the market. Even those departments whose comments reflect a sense of success in their employment of female staff do not compare well to national averages. In minority faculty hiring, we are closer to national figures, but still fall short.

For example, the School of Human and Educational Services, although in a field which nationally has a 42 percent availability of female Ph.D.'s, has only 28 percent female faculty. Likewise, the national availability of minorities in the field approaches 14 percent--but we have minority representation on our
SHES faculty of somewhat less than 8 percent.* These numbers, of course, must be taken in context, but excuses such as "other people offer more money," or "there are no fully qualified minority or female faculty out there, but if we could ever hire one we certainly would," wear thin when continually used to explain lack of progress.

Even in times like these when there are painfully few hiring opportunities, gains can be made. When there are few opportunities, each one becomes more important and necessary to equal opportunity efforts. Opportunities exist for promotion—but are often missed. The absence of any female department chairs is especially noticeable. More support could be given minority and female junior faculty who feel the lack of senior role models and mentoring relationships.

In summary, the ACEO suggests that the problem of attracting and retaining minority and female students and faculty cannot be viewed on a departmental basis, but must be viewed as an institutional priority, worthy of serious support at the university level.

BGM:m

*Attached university-wide data by rank show the problem in its larger perspective. (Available in C.A.M.P.'s supplementary file.)
MEMORANDUM

January 29, 1982

To: George Feeman, Acting Associate Provost
   and Chairperson, CAMP

From: Ravi Parameswaran

Subject: Tri-County Community Perceptions of Oakland University
vis-a-vis Neighborhood Universities: MKT 405 (Fall 1981)
Class Project

Two groups (three or four students each) of my MKT 405 students researched
tri-county community perceptions of Oakland University in Fall 1981. I
understand that your committee would be interested in the results obtained.

One hundred and ten adult respondents, who had at least one family
member currently attending a university or planning to do so within
the next two years, participated in the survey. Method of contact was
through the use of telephones. (The students and I gratefully acknowledge
Dr. Kleckner's support in this project.) Selection of respondents was
confined to the tri-county area (Wayne, Oakland, Macomb). A representative
sample of respondents were selected using random-digit-dialing (a random
number generator was used to generate the last four digits of the telephone
number; these digits were appended to triple-digit numbers—appropriate
exchanges in the tri-county area—again selected randomly).

I shall now detail the major findings below. Unless otherwise stated,
the sample size is 110 respondents.

(1) Seventy three (66%) respondents stated that at least one
member of their family currently attends a university to 37
(34%) respondents stating that they expect at least one member
in their family attending a university within the next two years.
As the object of the study was to determine attitudes towards
neighborhood colleges and universities, households that did not
expect to have a college-going member within the next two years
were not interviewed.
(2) The predominant interest in colleges/universities is in degree programs—a third of the interest in graduate programs and two-thirds in undergraduate programs. Eighty-five percent of the respondents mentioned that a family member(s) is/are currently attending or planning to attend a college or university in the tri-county (Wayne, Oakland, Macomb) area.

(3) Eighty-nine percent of the respondents answered the following question:

Now I would like to get your opinion about the importance of higher education to you and the members of your family using a scale of 1 to 10. If higher education is important, give it a high number. Otherwise, give it a low number with an 8, 9, or 10.

(4) Respondents were asked to evaluate the importance of 19 college/university related attributes ("How important is ______ to you personally while choosing a college/university to attend"). Any respondent was exposed to nine or ten of these characteristics.

All respondents (110) were asked to evaluate eleven of these characteristics in terms of whether colleges/universities in the community possessed these attributes.

Table 1 summarizes these results.

(5) Oakland University compares favorably with the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Wayne State University, and University of Michigan—Dearborn (from among 29 universities/colleges) in terms of knowledge (have heard), consideration (would consider), lack of interest (would avoid), and overall evaluation. Key results are presented in Table 2. Appendices A-1, B-1, B-2, and B-3 present the results for all 29 universities/colleges.

(6) The responses to the following question are indicated in Table 3.

Colleges/Universities offer several programs. On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 means not at all important while 10 means extremely important) please tell me how important is the program in ________ to institutions of higher learning?
Several Oakland University specific questions were asked of respondents. Since many issues were probed, not all respondents were asked about all the issues. Presented below is a summary of these findings.

About Oakland University in General

(i) Sixty eight percent of all 110 respondents knew the exact location of Oakland University. Sixty one percent have been on campus at sometime or the other.

(ii) Twenty four of forty one (59%) respondents agreed with the statement, "the name of Oakland University suggests a school striving for academic excellence." Ten of forty one (24%) felt that the statement did not apply to Oakland University. The remaining were not sure.

(iii) Twenty one out of forty one (51%) respondents thought or were unsure as to whether "Oakland University is a part of the Oakland Community College system."

(iv) More than three fourths of the forty one respondents queried knew that Oakland University was a commuter school.

(v) Twenty one out of thirty six (61%) respondents queried emphatically disagreed with the statement, "the name Oakland University suggests a small, neighborhood oriented university with limited programs." Ten (28%) agreed with the statement while the rest were not sure.

(vi) Twenty seven of thirty three (82%) respondents queried emphatically disagreed with the statement that "Oakland University is a private school."

(vii) Fourteen of thirty three (42%) respondents queried thought that or were not sure as to whether "Oakland University is a two year college." Nineteen (58%) knew that it was not.

(viii) Half of the respondents queried (seventeen of thirty three) were not sure about the statement, "Oakland University has adequate facilities for married housing on campus." Eight agreed with the statement while eight disagreed.
Regarding Programs:

(a) Only ten of thirty six (36%) disagreed with the statement, "Oakland University is primarily a liberal arts school." The rest either agreed with the statement or were not sure.

(b) Only thirteen of forty one (32%) agreed with the statement, "Oakland University has a reputed business school in the state." The rest either disagreed with the statement or were not sure.

(c) Only nine out of thirty three (27%) agreed with the statement, "Oakland University has a reputed engineering program in the state." The rest either disagreed with the statement or were not sure.

(d) As many as twenty two of thirty six (61%) agreed with the statement, "Oakland University offers educational programs at several extension sites in the tri-county area."

(e) More than half of thirty six respondents were not sure whether "Oakland University offers a wide variety of non-degree programs."

(f) Seventy one percent of forty one respondents queried agreed that "Oakland University offers several graduate programs."

Regarding University Size

Generally, respondents had little knowledge of the correct student population at Oakland University. However, they seem to err on the side of bigness.

See Table 4.

About Sports Activities at Oakland University

The impact of Oakland University sports programs is depicted in Table 5.

About Meadow Brook Activities:

The impact of Oakland University's Meadowbrook activities is shown in Table 6.

I am also sending a copy of the questionnaire for your reference. In case you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 7-3514.

RP:sm

cc: Mr. Joseph E. Champagne, President
Mr. Keith R. Kleckner, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Mr. Ronald M. Horwitz, Dean, School of Economics and Management
Mr. Karl D. Gregory, Professor, School of Economics and Management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Neighborhood Colleges/ Universities Possessing These Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High quality instructors</td>
<td>58 91</td>
<td>110 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality educational programs</td>
<td>58 90</td>
<td>110 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reasonably strong graduate program</td>
<td>52 87</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized education</td>
<td>52 85</td>
<td>110 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of degree programs</td>
<td>58 83</td>
<td>110 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient schedule of classes</td>
<td>58 83</td>
<td>110 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient location (within driving distance)</td>
<td>52 81</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly and helpful administrators</td>
<td>58 71</td>
<td>110 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State support for university</td>
<td>52 69</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong faculty involvement in research</td>
<td>52 69</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral programs</td>
<td>58 66</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger faculty to student ratios</td>
<td>52 64</td>
<td>110 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of financial aid packages</td>
<td>58 60</td>
<td>110 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad range of student services</td>
<td>52 54</td>
<td>110 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private college/university (no state support)</td>
<td>58 50</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses of general interest for adults</td>
<td>58 48</td>
<td>110 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of school</td>
<td>52 33</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A quality sports program</td>
<td>58 32</td>
<td>110 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reasonably good football team</td>
<td>52 16</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/College</td>
<td>Sample Size (n)</td>
<td>Have Heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan--Dearborn</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Community College</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Community College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb County Community College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ford Community College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Institute of Technology</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Percent of Respondents Giving an 8, 9, or 10 Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Agreeing</th>
<th>Disagreeing</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000 students attend OU</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student population at OU is around 12,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20,000 students attend OU</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Agreeing</th>
<th>Disagreeing</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU's swim team won the Division II National Championship in 1980</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Detroit Lions hold their pre-season camp at OU</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU has a reasonably good basketball team</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU has a reasonably good track team</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU has a reasonably good soccer team</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU has a reasonably good baseball team</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>Disagreeing</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Brook Theater is an amateur theater group at Oakland University</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadow Brook Festival is conducted by Oakland University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Detroit Symphony makes OU its summer home.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadow Brook Mansion is on OU campus</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you even been to the Meadow Brook Festival?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been to Meadow Brook Mansion?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been to Meadow Brook Hall?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>Adjusted Frequency</td>
<td>Mean Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M</td>
<td>97%**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKLAND UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Institute of Technology</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of D</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Community College</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State College</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy College of Detroit</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion College</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian College</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Institute of Technology</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna College</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Community College</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ford Community College</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh College</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Flint</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb County Community College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Christian College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Lutheran Jr. College</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley College</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City State College</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Jr. College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those cases with missing values are eliminated when the frequency is calculated.

**Each school was rated on a scale from 1 to 10 (where 10 means very good and 1 means very poor). The adjusted frequencies reported include only that percentage of the population who defined each college/university as high (ratings 8, 9 and 10).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency*</th>
<th>Mean Answer**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Community College</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of D</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKLAND UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Institute of Technology</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Institute of Technology</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Community College</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State University</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb County Community College</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna College</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ford Community College</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian College</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion College</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Christian College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Flint</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta College</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City State College</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Lutheran Jr. College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those cases with missing values are eliminated when the frequency is calculated.*

**No = 0, Yes = 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency*</th>
<th>Mean Answer**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKLAND UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Institute of Technology</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of D</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Community College</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Institute of Technology</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy College of Detroit</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb County Community College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Community College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna College</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh College</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State College</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian College</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion College</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ford Community College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Christian College</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta College</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Flint</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley College</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City State College</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Lutheran Jr. College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Jr. College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those cases with missing values are eliminated when the frequency is calculated.

**No = 0, Yes = 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Answer**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley College</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State College</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian College</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ford Community College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb County Community College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Community College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna College</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Christian College</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy College of Detroit</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Lutheran Jr. College</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Community College</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion College</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City State College</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Institute of Technology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Flint</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of D</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta College</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Jr. College</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKLAND UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Institute of Technology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those cases with missing values are eliminated when the frequency is calculated.

**No = 0, Yes = 1.
ENCLOSED is our philosophic statement on university public service and the analysis of CAMP materials. (Ed. Note: This refers to the responses to Questions 8, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19; those portions that discuss the outreach of a program.) However, we found the analysis difficult to do, as explained in the report, because we could not compare the reports from the various units. Some departments reported service from many years ago; others were incomplete. Many counted activities as university public service that the committee did not regard in this light. We have given President Champagne the report, but must point out that our work is not complete and the report is not finished. We are now in the process of looking at non-academic public service and will be engaged in this activity until March 15. However, because President Champagne charged us with the responsibility of giving CAMP our materials so that they would be included in your deliberations, we wanted to complete this part of our task as fast as possible.
PUBLIC SERVICE AT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

REPORT OF THE

PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE
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This report has been prepared by the President's Public Service Task Force to define and clarify the meaning of university public service at Oakland University, to explain the importance of public service activities in the university's mission, and to suggest ways of stimulating university public service activities by integrating them more effectively in the academic program of Oakland University.

Justification

As a publicly sponsored institution of higher education, Oakland University has a responsibility to serve many publics. This commitment has been recognized within the university since its founding and has been demonstrated in such activities as continuing education, applied research, outreach units (e.g., the Continuum Center, Urban Affairs), voluntary service by faculty and staff (e.g., consulting, advising or leading programs outside the university devoted to public needs), cable television organizational tasks, and a host of cultural, educational and social projects. As a mature institution, with a well established reputation for academic excellence, research productivity, and teaching quality, we should now give particular attention to the public service components of our program. We believe that efforts to integrate, coordinate and focus upon university public service activities can enhance both our basic teaching and research functions.

In this report, we will clarify what we mean by university public service, propose institutional directions for public service activities, suggest mechanisms to encourage public service within the institution, and propose ways of developing a more active posture in response to public needs that fit within the constraints of our resources.

OUR GOAL IS TO MAKE PUBLIC SERVICE CENTRAL

TO THE LIFE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Definition

By public service we refer to the application of the intellectual resources of higher education to public concerns. This is characterized by commitment, relevance and excellence, and rests upon the belief that Oakland University has a responsibility to enhance the quality of life for people within its sphere of influence.
Clarification

University public service is distinct from community service which is rendered as a private citizen and not related directly to the individual's professional identity (example: working with church groups, the Boy Scouts, local political campaigns); and university service which includes committee work, governance activities and other internal activities.

University public service activities can be identified by one or more of the following characteristics

1. They identify and respond to public need.

2. They are intrinsic to the intellectual mission and priorities of the university.

3. They capitalize upon the expertise of the university community.

4. They have relevance to the academic programs of the university.

5. They make the resources of the university accessible to many different publics.

Public service is not meant to be a self-serving exercise that is solely for the benefit of the institution. Rather, it is meant to help the public by the application of intellectual resources in ways other than those offered in classroom, library, laboratory and office settings. The basis of university public service rests upon the responsibility of a state supported institution of higher education to serve in ways that utilize intellectual resources for those who may not be served by traditional university activities.

In our view, the university's commitment to public service has to be given full academic respect, support by faculty and staff at every level of the university, and infused throughout all university programs. To accomplish this, university public service must be fully recognized as an integral feature of Oakland University's mission. Public service is a philosophic orientation and a moral commitment: it is not distinct or separate from other university functions but an inherent feature and extension of our fundamental intellectual traditions.

We recognize that one of the most important conditions of scholarship and teaching in higher education is a degree of autonomy and freedom to investigate and study uncharted areas. The free play of imagination is precious for human creativity. Public service, by definition, locates the questions for study and the cognitive goals to be achieved, as well as the forms of service delivery, in the hands of those who may not share the university commitment to and responsibility for disinterested inquiry. The university's response to public needs may be controversial: it will be time-consuming and in some cases, inconvenient. But at the same time we believe that it can be beneficial, intellectually stimulating and a way of enriching our intellectual mission.

Both service and scholarship are essential. Just as research activities that generate new knowledge must be balanced with teaching efforts to disseminate knowledge, so outreach must be balanced with traditional scholarly interests.
Ultimately all knowledge is useful: truth provides the only justification for learning. Our goal is to integrate and encompass new approaches to scholarship while preserving the noblest and highest traditions of university life.

If we are serious about encouraging university public service, we must consider the implications of our commitment as carefully as we now view other university activities. Involvement in public service will require the university to find ways of protecting the intellectual integrity of applied scholarship; facilitating exchanges between on-campus and off-campus activities; recognizing and supporting existing university public service activities and those persons engaged in this work; maintaining an ongoing presence in local communities; promoting applied scholarship; and examining institutional public service commitments in ways similar to those used in the more traditional functions of teaching and scholarship.

Institutional Priorities

The Task Force recognizes that the demands for public service are always much greater than the resources available. In our view, the following opportunities for university public service should be encouraged:

1. To address the economic crisis of the local economy; to promote community and economic development; to assist in the personal and social problems associated with economic dislocation.

2. To advance the university's cultural enrichment activities.

3. To improve the quality of public education.

4. To respond to the needs of special populations, such as the aged, minority groups, handicapped persons, small business, and the unemployed.

5. To use traditional academic programs and facilities in more creative ways that respond to public concerns, such as in continuing education, extension courses, and cable television.

6. To enhance civic education in a democratic society.

Although the university's potential for public service extends throughout the state and nation, the financial, social and moral pressures currently affecting southeastern Michigan demand that the institution focus its energies immediately on serving the pressing needs of our neighbors. To achieve this end, we must give immediate attention to programs that stimulate the redevelopment of industry and the revitalization of labor, that encourage economic diversification and job development, and that assist with retraining and education of workers and non-traditional students.

Guidelines

1. University public service activities should be related to the teaching and research expertise of the individual. Ideally, such activities would have programmatic impact. An important by-product of these should be an enlarged perception of the university in the eyes of the general
public. Most important, university public service should demonstrate that Oakland University views such activity as a responsibility stemming from the institution's state financing.

2. Although historically some units, such as the School of Nursing and the School of Human and Educational Services, have been expected to integrate public service activities within their operations, public service should be an obligation of all units. At the same time that we recognize that some individuals have more talents, skills and expertise than others in this area, we also believe that all members of the university should be encouraged to engage in university public service to some degree.

3. It is particularly important that those persons engaged in university public service activities be given recognition and rewards in the review process because of their contributions in this area. We believe that as public service becomes better integrated and coordinated with teaching and research, both will be invigorated.

4. Financial considerations, or the absence or presence of remuneration for service, should not be an issue as long as the activity meets the definition of public service adopted by the institution. However, we note that private entrepreneurial activities do not meet this definition, since we refer to institutional priorities and programs, not individual preferences. While the Task Force does not distinguish between paid and unpaid consulting, the expectation is that outside consulting should not interfere with the performance of teaching and related duties and must conform to university policies regarding conflict of interest.

5. Professional service, such as serving as an officer in a leadership role for professional association, can be thought of as meeting the guidelines because such visibility does relate to university programs. Membership per se, or participating by reading papers or attending conferences, while clearly valuable, does not qualify.

Recommendations

The Task Force believes that one of the most urgent issues before the university is to find ways that "institutionalize" our public service mission. This task will require additional clarification and specificity in explaining university public service activities so that all members of OU understand the meaning, intent and range of university public service activities internally and off-campus, monitoring the system of reporting that will document uniformly these activities, and promoting new activities.

1. We recommend the creation of an administrative position to direct university public service to provide sustained support and visibility for all activities. This person will be charged with developing the initiatives and institutional mechanisms that support university public service activities during a developmental period of not more than three years. At the end of this time, we expect that university public service will be infused throughout the institution and routine reporting and monitoring activities will be in place. Specifically, we expect this person to do the following:
a. Advise the President on university public service activities.

b. Prepare an annual report, similar to that circulated on faculty publications, that will document regularly university public service activities.

c. Publicize existing university public service activities.

d. Develop mechanisms to recognize outstanding university public service contributions.

e. Assist in the identification of service.

f. Suggest mechanisms to coordinate and stimulate public service throughout the university to the Provost.

g. Report directly to the Provost. Since the key to institutionalize public service is to convince faculty and staff that this activity is important, not only to OU but also to their own professional advancement, ultimately this responsibility will fall to the Provost.

2. All university units must review their current activities to determine ways in which they can be made more accessible to the public by means of more effective scheduling, outreach programs, dissemination or publicity.

3. All units should examine the institutional public service priorities to determine ways in which these can be integrated into existing activities. The first institutional priority should be given considerable attention.

4. An extensive public relations campaign should be initiated to explain to the general public what is being done at OU.

5. University public service activities should be routinely reported and considered in the personnel review process, just as research, teaching and university public service are now reported.

6. University public service proposals should be evaluated in a similar fashion to that used in research proposals.

7. An appropriate level of general fund support must be devoted to university public service, consistent with the public service priorities and mission of the university.

8. The Vice President for Development should be charged with responsibility of raising external funding for supporting public service activities and awards for such efforts.

9. A University Public Service Council, made up of representatives from throughout the university and from the public should be appointed to advise the administrator responsible for developing university public service. The Council should also be responsible for suggesting policies and monitoring the work of the administrator.
Examples

Attached are representative examples of university public service drawn from the reports prepared for the University Committee on Academic Priorities and Mission. It was not possible to develop a comprehensive inventory of all public service activities currently existing at the university because there were varying perceptions of university public service in the CAMP reports, wide differences in the specificity of responses, large gaps in the information collected and no agreed upon time framework. These examples illustrate the philosophy and priorities explained in this report.

Assist Public Schools

This category of assistance was the most frequently mentioned public service among all academic units. The activities took many forms, but the two main services were working with teachers and working with high school or junior high students. In addition, almost every department reported speaking to students or in high school classes.

Working with High School Students:

Tutoring (Curriculum Instruction and Leadership); visits to campus (Engineering, Modern Languages); the Teacher Corps (School of Human and Educational Services) Student Science Training Programs, sponsored by NSF (Math), special contests and competitions (Math); hosted Michigan League for Academic Games (Math); judge writing (English); preparation for GMAT, SAT, LSAT exams (Continuing Education); Summer camps (Special Education, Math); foreign language summer institute (Modern Language); cadet engineering programs (Engineering).

Recruiting Students:

Letters to National Merit scholars (English); seeking minority scholarships (Engineering); honoring math students in Troy (Math); performances in schools (Dance); sponsoring apprentice scholars (Rhetoric); teaching health and nutrition (Nursing); designing a crisis intervention center for students (Psychology); inviting students to campus (Biology).

Special Relationship with Renaissance High School:

(English, Physics, Modern Languages, History).

Working with Teachers:

Workshops, in-service training programs (Reading, Curriculum Instruction and Leadership, Early Childhood); writing workshops (English); in-service training (Math); workshops (Modern Languages); sponsor teachers meetings (Physics); year long in-service training on global education (Areas Studies).

School Speakers:

Almost all departments, especially noted by History, Art and Art History, Modern Language, Area Studies, SHES, Sociology-Anthropology, English, Area Studies, Nursing.
Consulting Activities

Most units identified consulting activities as part of their public service activities. Some have formal arrangements, such as the Math Department's Statistical Consulting Service and Economics and Management's program with Volkswagen of America. Some were in response to specific requests for technical assistance, as in the Environmental Health Program, dance program and chemistry. In other cases, long-term consulting takes place by participation on the Board of Directors. For example, New Detroit (Psychology), Rochester Historical Association (Sociology), Physical Therapy Association (Physical Therapy). Some departments are called upon for special assistance under unusual circumstances, such as Modern Languages for translating materials.

Conferences

Several units hold conferences regularly, such as the Young Writers Conference held by School Special Services, annual infant and toddler conference (Early Childhood), and the Cranbrook Writers Conference (English). Other units use conferences as a way to bring other professionals up-to-date (Engineering in transportation, simulation, robotics).

Speech Presentations

Most departments list talks as part of their public service. Area Studies, for example, has its own speaker's bureau and gives 40-50 annually. Physics, History, English, Art History all have an organized speaking program.

Internships

The largest internship program exists in the School of Human and Educational Services (1489 in 150 schools and human service agencies per year). Students in HRD, Guidance and Counseling and Education all serve an internship in local hospitals, schools, agencies and business. Attached is a representative list. In addition, political science students serve internships in local and state governments, courts and agencies; journalism students in newspapers, radio stations and organizations throughout the metropolitan area, sociology students in social service agencies and criminal justice agencies. Smaller programs include internships in History, Art and Art History. In addition, there is a small, but important Cooperative Education Program in many fields.

Foreign Study

Programs of study overseas have been sponsored by History, Area Studies, Modern Languages, Education, Anthropology, and English.

Hosting Visiting Scholars

Engineering and Area Studies have both sponsored delegations of foreign scholars.

Applied Research

Engineering, Education and Human Services, Sociology and Anthropology, Political Science and the Continuum Center list applied research projects.
These range from surveys about PPB and the Sixth Circuit Court (Political Science), satisfaction with city government and communication programs (Sociology), death and dying programs (Education) to human factors problems (Engineering), and hospitals (Economics and Management and Political Science.)

Archaeological Digs

Professor Richard Stamps (Anthropology) lists over 40 digs undertaken during the past five years. In addition, Art and Art History has participated in several archaeological surveys, including the restoration of Thomas Edison's boyhood home in Port Huron, excavation of the French fort and a land-use history of the city.

Special Projects

The Cardiac Rehabilitation Project (Physical Education, Health Sciences) has worked with heart patients extensively.

The School of Nursing has developed patient education programs such as: self-learning packages on cataract surgery, parental loss and grieving, self-learning booklet on pacemakers, patient instruction for cardiac tests, a recipe book for pediatric snacks, directions for intermittent self-catheterization, and information for patients having hysterectomy surgery. In addition, nursing faculty and students conduct CPR instruction, blood pressure screening and health education for various service clubs and community groups.

The Continuum Center has developed a series on programs and workshops for those in career transition, and peer counseling among the elderly. Continuing Education provides information to small businesses. In addition, Continuing Education's program "Altars of the World" has received critical acclaim. Professor Burke of Philosophy has also contributed to this program.

The Institute of Biological Sciences has a program of service to the Lions Club, Michigan Eye Bank and local schools.

Continuing Education has developed public assistance to Oakland County communities with cable television franchising.

The Rhetoric, Communications, and Journalism Department has an active forensics program. The Oakland University Library serves as a depository for federal and state documents.

Professional Leadership

All units report professional involvement by staff. The Institute of Biological Sciences has a role in the planning activities of the National Institute of Health; several staff members serve as editors of journals in the School of Human and Educational Services, Sociology, History, English, Modern Languages. Members of the Teacher Corps project have assisted in editing the Allyn and Bacon elementary school social studies books.

Access

Most units discuss extension programs and special workshops developed to meet public needs. An innovative approach to access is the Channel 56 "Open Math
Class" sponsored by the School of Human and Educational Services. Another is the Legal Assistants Diploma Program in Continuing Education. The Library's Hot Line has made information available to many. Short courses in computers and microprocessors have been introduced by the School of Engineering.

Continuing Education

The School of Nursing has a program on Primary Nursing for Registered Nurses and a Drug-Evaluation Program.

The School of Human and Educational Services has an office of Professional Development to design and implement in-service and staff development programs for teachers and administrators.

Counseling

The Continuum Center provides counseling for approximately 1,500 people annually in one-day workshops, group counseling and training programs.

Cultural

The School of Performing Arts offers inexpensive programs in theatre, dance and music for the public and has made special efforts to work with the deaf. The summer piano institute, a preparatory program for students and teachers, attracts many to campus annually. "Other Things and Company," a dance troupe, has more bookings in the community than can be easily handled. Several faculty conduct local orchestras and serve on the Board of Directors of community music groups. The President's Trio is an outstanding professional performing group that makes an important contribution to the cultural life of southeast Michigan. The Music Department sponsors free recitals regularly, open to students and the general public. All the performing groups tour local high schools and make special efforts to work with the elderly.
APPENDIX

Examples of Department Reporting

I. Examples of Agencies for Internships: Guidance and Counseling

Lake Orion Help Center
Gateway Crisis Center
Commonground Crisis Center
Oakland University Community Counseling Center
Macomb Community College Campuses
Oakland Community College Campuses
Rochester Public Schools
Utica Public Schools
Crittenton Hospital
Waterford Senior Citizens Center
Jewish Vocational Services
St. John Hospital
Oakland County Probate Court, Juvenile Division
Oakland County Children’s Village
Southeast Oakland Vocational Education Center
Oakland University Advising and Placement Center
Oakland University Center for General and Career Studies
Southfield Department of Human Resources
Harper-Grace Hospital
Clinton Valley Community Mental Health Center
American Cancer Society
Henry Ford Hospital
Pontiac General Hospital
General Motors Corporation, Truck & Coach Division
8th District Court, Probation Department
Catholic Social Services of Macomb County
Mt. Clemens Youth and Family Counseling Agency
Southfield Public Schools
Farmington Area Advisory Council
The Sanctuary

II. Applications for funding for research in last two years - School of Engineering

National Science Foundation
Department of Energy
Department of Transportation
U. S. Army Research Office
U. S. Air Force
Office of Naval Research
NASA
University of Iowa (subcontract)

Detroit Edison Company
Bendix Corporation
Ford Motor Company
General Motors Corporation
Eaton Corporation
Wilson Fund
Mott Foundation
DeVlieg Company
Honeywell Corporation  Rockwell International, Inc.
Goodell-Grivas  General Electric Corporation
Westinghouse Corporation  B. F. Goodrich Corporation
Industrial Holographics, Inc.  Chrysler Corporation
Firestone Tire and Rubber Co.

III. Art and Art History Consulting


IV. Examples of Internships Used by H.R.D.

Schools
Berkley Public Schools
Detroit Public Schools
Oakland Intermediate School District
Rochester Schools
Wayne-Westland Schools
Genesee Intermediate School District
Macomb Intermediate School District
Washtenaw Intermediate School District
Utica Schools
Pontiac Schools
Walled Lake Schools
Avondale Schools
Bloomfield Hills Schools

Business and Industry
Sandy Corporation
Ford Motor Company
Tektronix Corporation
Chrysler Corporation
Burroughs Corporation
Knoppow Industries
Institute for Economic Education
Assoc. for Field Service Workers

Government Agencies
Michigan Dept. of Education
Michigan Dept. of Public Health
U. S. Department of Labor
U. S. Department of Defense
U. S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare
Michigan Office of Substance Abuse
Michigan Employment Security Commission
City of Detroit
CETA Programs
V. HRD Consulting Organizations

M.E.S.C.
Michigan Civil Service
Oakland County Youth Assistance
Oakland-Livingston Human Service Agency
U.S. Dept. of Civil Service
U.S. Dept. of Labor
SRI, Inc.
Michigan Civil Rights Commission
Michigan Bell
Oakland Cty. Comm. Mental Health Services
Chrysler Corporation
Detroit Institute of Technology
Detroit Public Schools
Ferndale School Dist.
Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.
Pontiac CETA
Pontiac Schools
Pontiac Urban League
U.S. Dept. of Immigration
City of Pontiac
Federal Mogul Corp.

GMC Truck & Coach
Internal Revenue Service
National Secretaries Assoc.
Parents Without Partners
Pontiac Motor Div.
Sinai Hospital
U.S. Army
American Soc. for Training & Development-Professional Development
Colorado Springs Public Schools
Hazel Park Schools
M.E.S.C.
Florida Prison Task Force
Santa Fe Comm. College, Gainesville, Florida
Teacher Corps Inservice Project, University of Florida
VI.

Avon Township Survey
Waterford Survey
Canton Township Survey
O.U., E. Campus Water System Survey
Walled Lake Villa Survey
Flint Sewer Survey
Harsen's Island Fire Station Survey
Manufacturers-Chesterfield Township Bank Site Survey
Rouge Park, Winter Sports Area
Rouge Park, Athletic Complex
SEMTA Commuter Rail Parking Lot - Pontiac
U.S. Postal Service Facility Bldg., Farmington Hills
Sewer Projects, Sec. 27, 28, 36, City of Burton
Saginaw Twp.: Manufacturers State Bank
Farmington Hills Villa Survey
Orchard Lake Towers, Farmington Hills
An Archaeological Survey of the Northwest Park, Sterling Heights
An Archaeological Survey of the Proposed M-53 Right-of-Way in Macomb and Lapeer County
An Archaeological Survey of Port Huron 24th St. Industrial Park
An Archaeological Survey of the Bloomfield Knolls Park Site, W. Bloomfield Twp.
An Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Site of the Sebewaing Branch of Manufacturers Bank of Bay City
An Archaeological and Architectural Survey of Proposed General Motors Plant in Sec. 34, Orion Twp. and Oakland County
An Archaeological Survey of Proposed Site of Gratiot Road Branch of Manufacturer Bank, Bay City, MI
Groveland Oaks County Park Survey
Phase I Arch. Survey of Proposed M-53 Ext. Right-of-Way in Lapeer County
Pilot Survey of Oakland County Archaeological Resources
Phase I Arch. Survey of Proposed M-59 Right-of-Way Macomb County
Cultural Resource Survey of Addison Oaks County Park
Cultural Resources Survey of the Dove Road Bridge over the Pine River in Kimbel Twp., St. Clair County
An Archaeological Survey of the Jackson Rd. Branch of the Manufacturer's Bank of Saline
Archaeological Invest. at the Proposed Wellington Woods Estates Subdivision, Oakland County, MI
Archaeological Invest. at the proposed Heatherwood Village Sub., Avon Twp., Oakland County, MI
An Archaeological Survey of the proposed citizen housing project in Sec. 24, Sterling Twp., Macomb County, MI
A land-use history of a portion of downtown Port Huron
A cultural resources survey of the proposed waste water lagoon ponds north of Memphis, St. Clair County, MI
VII. Nursing Projects

Healthorama, Blue Cross/Blue Shield and WXYC-TV
Project Health '81
CPR Instruction (Various Community Sites)
Blood Pressure Screening (Various Community Fairs)
Hypertension (Northville Senior Citizens)
Racism and Health Care, Staff Development at Pontiac General Hospital
Teaching of Health and Nutrition in local high schools
Determinates of Accountability for Primary Nursing and Reliability Analysis of a Primary Nursing Instrument. Presented at St. Joseph Mercy Hospital Pontiac, MI
"The Use of the Narrative Journal to Increase Integration of Theory and Practice in Public Health" for the PHN session entitled Innovative Techniques in Undergraduate CHN Education
Whitmer Human Resources Center, Child Health Education Project
Health Related Activities North Circle Jaycees
Avondale Convalescent Home Inservice Planning
Pontiac General Hospital, October 1980 - May 1981 - Pediatric Critical Care
Pontiac General Hospital, Pediatrics
Physical Assessment Course for Registered Nurses in Community Agencies, C. Milewski
Programs and Staff Development in In-patient Psychiatric Nursing, Pontiac General Hospital Nursing Administrative Staff
CPR Training, Parents and Scouts, Clinton Valley Boy Scout Council, Orchard Lake, MI
Member, Nursing Research and Special Project Review Committee, St. Joseph Mercy Hospital, Pontiac, MI
Chairperson, Bylaws Committee, Oakland County District Nurses Association
Co-Discussion Leaders, Philosophy 318, Oakland University
Advisory Board Member, Children's Center of Wayne County, Westside Branch
Proposal: Running an Effective Therapy for Depression, South Oakland Community Mental Health Clinic, Southfield, MI
Nursing Process, Practical Implications, Nursing Staff; Inservice Directors; Nursing Administration, Pontiac General Hospital
Inservice, Staff Development Seminar, Avondale Convalescent Center, Rochester, MI
Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, Adams Woods Condo Association; Rochester Community House; Lake Orion 4-H Club; Oakland Community College, Auburn Hills Campus
Seminar: Nursing Process in Critical Care, Pontiac General Hospital, Pontiac, MI
Cooperating Instructor for NRS 0782 Two Graduate Students, Wayne State University College of Nursing
Consultant/Participant Conference on Directions for Research in Nursing; Peer Reviewer, Research DHEW, Division of Nursing, Washington, D.C.
Participant, Boards and Associate Editor, Research in Nursing and Health; Nursing Research; Image
Counselor, Common Ground Crisis Intervention Clinic, Birmingham, MI
Psychotherapist, Woodland Hills Center, Troy, MI
Chairperson, Oakland Health Educational Programs Nursing Committee
BIBLIOGRAPHY ON PROGRAM EVALUATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION


Cott James, Program Budgeting and Higher Education, 1972, Department of Accounting and Public Finance, Public Finance Monograph No. 1, The Australian National University: Canberra, pp.9,125.


Fierney Michael L. and Mortimer Kenneth P., The Three "R's" of
the Eighties, Reduction, Reallocation, and Retrenchment, AAHE-

Fuller Bruce, "A Framework for Academic Planning", Journal of
Higher Education, Vol. XLVII, No. 1, January/February, 1976,
pp. 65-77.

Gardner Don E., "Five Evaluation Frameworks", Journal of Higher
Education, Vol. XLVIII, No. 5, September/October, 1977, pp. 571-
593.

Glenny Lyman A., Autonomy of Public Colleges, The Challenge of
Coordination, pp. 59-87, 1959, McGraw Hill.

Hample Stephen R., Editor, "Coping With Faculty Reduction", New
Directions for Institutional Research, Vol. VIII, No. 2, 1981,

Heydinger Richard B., Guest Editor, New Directions for Institutional
Research, Academic Planning for the 1980's, Vol. VII, No. 4, 1980,

Heyns Roger H., Leadership for Higher Education, The Campus View,
pp. 149-175, 1977, American Council on Education.

Jellema William W., Editor, Efficient College Management,

Miller Richard I., Guest Editor, "Institutional Assessment for
Self-Improvement", New Directions for Institutional Research,

Millett John D., Allocation Decisions in Higher Education, 1977,
Academy for Educational Development.

Mims R. Sue, "Resource Allocation: Stopgap or Support for
Academic Planning?", New Directions for Institutional Research,

Shirley Robert C. and Volkevair J. Frederick, "Establishing
Academic Program Priorities", Journal of Higher Education, Ibid.,
pp. 472-488 and the references given there.

Williams Harry, Planning for Effective Resource Allocation in
on Education.

Wilson James A., "Management Science Applications to Academic
Administration", New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. IX,
