



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY OAKLAND ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

November 17, 1960

Minutes

PRESENT: Messrs: Amann, Appleton, Beardslee, Mrs. Caulkins, Chernow, Clarke, Mrs. Collins, W. S. Collins, Eklund, Fromm, Galloway, Hammerle, Hetenyi, Hoopes, Kluback, Mrs. Kovach, George Matthews, Miss North, Obear, O'Dowd, Pearson, Mrs. Popluiko, Rhode, Mrs. Rothschild, Schwab, Shishkoff, Simmons, Miss Stevenson, Stoutenburg, Susskind, Swanson, Tafoya, Taulbee, Tombouljian, Varner

ABSENT: Alexander, Burke, Fitzsimmons, Gherity, Holmes, Mrs. Matthews, McKay, Pope, Mrs. Shapiro, Samuel Shapiro, Straka, Mrs. Urla, Mrs. White, Wilder, Wisner

Meeting called to order by Mr. Varner at 12:40.

Mr. Hoopes explained that the electrical lines for the language lab will be installed next week so it is necessary that classes now meeting in rooms 165 and 167 be moved by the Registrar. Each instructor affected will be notified. These changes are effective Monday, November 21, 1960, at 3:00 A.M. and will remain in effect for the balance of the fall quarter.

Mr. Varner announced that the Building will be at 2:30 this Huron dedicating the building ground breaking ceremony for the new Science afternoon with Senator Frank Beadle of Port All faculty members and their families are invited.

Mr. Hammerle moved that "It is the intent of the University to meet, within the limits of its resources, the educational aspirations of persons who cannot enroll as full-time day students. Within the limits of our resources, we will offer as many classes as feasible at night. At present, enrollment and resources limit the University to guaranteeing evening classes in the University courses at the rate of approximately three per term, with all University Courses available in approximately four years. Other courses cannot be guaranteed, but may be offered later if enrollment and resources permit. However, it is not our present intention to offer a baccalaureate degree via evening classes exclusively." Seconded by Mr. Tombouljian.

Mr. Hammerle discussed the background for the motion stating that it was impossible for the University to offer more than the University Course in the evening because of the small number of students who would be available in the immediate future to enroll in specific courses in major fields. If at a later time we should have a large evening demand, this policy could be changed.

Mr. Vamer asked Mr. Stoutenburg to outline the enrollments in the evening courses. Mr. Stoutenburg explained that approximately 90 students started in the fall of 1959 and this number dwindled to about 60 students in the spring of 1960. This fall, he said that we have over 120 students enrolled and it is expected that this figure may be reduced to

80 students by spring term.

Mr. Amann pointed out that in previous discussions there was a lack of consensus that the night course could be as satisfactory as the day course and amended the motion to include a proficiency examination which would evaluate a night student's class work if the student should desire to transfer to a day program. Mr. Hoopes seconded the amendment. Following a short discussion as regarding the quality of night and day courses by several faculty members, Mr. Amann withdrew his amendment to the motion and Mr. Hoopes withdrew his second.

Mr. Appleton pointed out that he felt this is an issue of great importance and we really do not have the time to do it justice here. Therefore, Mr. Appleton felt that a committee should be appointed to study this problem carefully. In addition, the committee should be instructed to consult with any member of the faculty who has a feeling about this matter. The committee then would report its findings back to the Senate.

Chairman Varner pointed out that the proper procedure was to return this motion to the EPC and that the EPC then would establish a special "*ad hoc*" committee to study the problem. Mr. Appleton then made the motion to return this matter to the EPC as suggested by Chairman Varner and to instruct the "*ad hoc*" committee to involve all interested parties. The EPC then would submit the committee's recommendations to the Senate for a vote. Seconded by Mr. Tafoya. Approved.

Mr. Eklund asked if the demand for evening courses increased, would there be a chance for this policy to be reviewed? Mr. Varner said he assumes these conditions are subject to review at anytime, but we must now act on existing conditions for the benefit of the present students. Mr. Eklund then asked that the record show that this action is a matter of administrative expediency at this time rather than on the basis of philosophical grounds.

Mr. Hammerle moved that "Any student giving evidence of proficiency in any course required for graduation may, upon petition to the Dean of the Faculty, be granted permission to demonstrate this proficiency. If the results are satisfactory, he may be exempted from this graduation requirement but will receive no credit in the course. This failure to give credit does not apply to Advanced Placement." Seconded by Mr. Tomboulian.

Mr. Hoopes asked that the last sentence of the motion be revised for clarity to read, "This failure to give credit does not apply to entrance with Advanced Placement".

Mr. Vamer asked if anybody objected to this statement being changed in the motion. No one did.

Mr. Matthews stated that present procedure allows a student to file a Petition of Exception to initiate his request for a subject waiver or a proficiency examination in an area in which he feels he has adequate background. When appropriate, the Committee on Instructions recommends the student to the particular subject matter department for testing.

Mr. Tafoya moved that insofar as languages were concerned, this motion be sent back to the EPC for further study. Mr. Tafoya felt that the EPC should consult with people in the Language Department before it is presented to the Senate for acceptance. Seconded by Mrs. Popluiko.

Mr. Tafoya withdrew his motion and Mrs. Popluiko her second subsequent to additional discussion. Mr. Tafoya then pointed out that on this matter information has been published that students graduating from MSUO will be proficient in a language. This is impossible to do for any student taking only two years of a language. Therefore, Mr. Tafoya moved that the foreign language requirement read as follows: "That students who come to MSUO from high

school with two years of a foreign language must take two years at MSUO: students presenting three or four years of a foreign language from high school will be required to take one year of literature or composition in the same language to satisfy graduation requirements; and those coming to MSUO with no foreign language from high school, must take two years of a foreign language. Seconded by Mr. Simmons. Mr. Hoopes then put the following chart on the board to clarify this motion.

Presenting to MSUO	0-1 yrs. of a For. Lang.--Student must take 2 yrs.*.
*to satisfy	2 years -----Student must take 2 yrs.
graduation	3 years-----Student must take 1 yr.
requirements.	4 yrs.-----Student must take 1 yr. .

Mr. Matthews pointed out that extraordinary cases could be handled by the Petition of Exception. Mr. Schwab stated that he agreed with Mr. Tafoya that two years of a foreign language was certainly not sufficient for proficiency and further felt that a student should have some English or American Literature before graduation. Mr. Schwab asked that further consideration be given this point also.

Mr. Hammerle said that this whole question has been before the Senate since we started on the requirements for graduation. The University Courses were established as minimum requirements for everyone graduating from MSUO. If a student can pass an examination in a given area, let him take it and pass it, but we should not increase the minimum requirements because a student has an unusually fine background in a given area. The EPC is now discussing a policy that we actually become less strict than we are now so that a student can graduate earlier if he demonstrates a particular facility. The present foreign language proposal is a compromise which allows the student to pass the examination without credit and go on to take some other course. I believe the student should get credit toward graduation if he can pass an examination.

Mr. Schwab asked if the motion could be changed so as to make no reference to graduation requirements, but only to course work.

A question was asked by Mr. Chernov if more than one amendment at a time could be made to the motion. Mr. Appleton said that since it is one decision that is being made, the Body may wish to consider all alternatives, therefore, any number of amendments are in order. Mr. Rhode ruled that only one motion could be made at a time before bringing up another.

Mr. Simmons asked for the question on Mr. Tafoya's amendment to Mr. Hammerle's motion. Approved (yes 24; no 3)

The vote was then taken on the Hammerle motion as amended by Mr. Tafoya. Approved.

Meeting adjourned at 1:45 P.M.



Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page