



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Second Meeting  
18 November 2004

## *Minutes*

**Members Present:** Andersen, Bazaz, Berven (D), Berven (K), Bhargava, Chapman, Claiborne, Eberwein, Frick, Goslin, Grossman, Howell, Keane, Khapoya, Klemanski, LeMarbe, Lepkowski, Licker, Mabee, Machmut-Jhashi, McNair, Miller, Moore, Oakley, Polis, Porter, Rowe, Schott-Baer, Schwartz, Sethi, Sevilla, Shablin, Stamps, Stano, Wood

**Members Absent:** Bard, Blume, Cipielewski, Downing, Dunn, Eis, Fink, Giblin, Goldberg, Graves, Hansen, Haskell, Hightower, Latcha, Moudgil, Nancy, Otto, Russell, Schochetman, Schweitzer, Sudol, Thompson, Tracy, Voelck, Williams

### Summary of Actions

1. Roll Call. Approval of September 2004 Minutes. (Ms. Howell, Mr. Porter)
2. Motion to approve Bachelor of Science Program in Information Technology. First reading. (Mr. Licker)
3. Motion to appoint Lynne Williams as Senate representative to attend Board of Trustees meetings through summer 2005. (Ms. McNair, Ms. Eberwein)
4. Motion to appoint Madeline Kissock Chair of the General Education Committee for Winter term 2005. (Ms. McNair, Mr. Hightower)
5. Motion to staff General Education subcommittees. (Mr. Licker, Ms. Mabee)
- 5a. Motion to postpone approval of General Education subcommittee appointees. (Mr. Grossman, Ms. Wood)

At 3:15 p.m. senators were welcomed by Mr. Lepkowski, who, in the absence of both Provost Moudgil and Associate Provost Sudol, presided over the meeting. With no informational meetings on the agenda, the secretary proceeded with the roll call. A motion to approve the [minutes](#) from the 9-23-04 meeting was then made by Ms. Howell, seconded by Mr. Porter, and approved by all.

### New Business

Mr. Lepkowski turned to the first item of new business, a first reading of the proposal for a new

program in Information Technology:

**MOVED** that the [Bachelor of Science Program in Information Technology](#) be approved. (Mr. Licker)

Mr. Sethi, Chair, Computer Science and Engineering, was then invited to make a presentation to the Senate regarding the new program proposal. He began by noting the niche that the new major was intended to fill, situated between the current programs in Computer Science and Management Information Systems. Mr. Sethi stressed the strong professional component of the new program, including courses in communications, ethics, and management, as well as a ? practice in context? approach that would be realized in the form of industry internships and undergraduate research opportunities. Interdisciplinary tracks in upper division courses (12 credits) would also be offered. Among the charts Mr. Sethi presented were highlights from a Carnegie-Mellon report on a new program between music and computer science, comparisons of CIS, IT, and MIS programs, a chart outlining math requirements, and an item appearing in *Information Week* titled ?IT Workers? Confidence Surged in October,? which summarized current industry trends and the growing need for students with IT skills. Mr. Sethi also brought to the Senate?s attention a forecast report, published by John Sargent, Senior Policy Analyst in the Office of Technology Policy, US Department of Commerce, and projecting dramatic 70% growth of the IT sector between 2002-2012, particularly in professional occupational areas, such as engineering, life science, health science, and physical science.

Mr. Sethi then turned to the issue of developing the curriculum for the new program and mentioned several important sources for gathering information: area industry leaders, curricula at other institutions, in particular, the Rochester Institute of Technology and Central Michigan University, professional organizations, and published information by authorities in the field. Among the latter, an article by Peter Denning titled ?The IT School Movement? (2001) outlines a model curriculum for IT programs; Mr. Sethi noted that the proposed program fits very well with the framework of that model. Other issues highlighted by Mr. Sethi were degree requirements, a typical four-year schedule, and a chart that addressed the issue of the possible effect of the IT program on other programs (CIS, MIS).

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Sethi invited senators to ask questions or offer comment. Mr. Anandi Sahu, Chair of the Senate Planning Review Committee, began the discussion by introducing his committee?s memo on the IT program (copies were distributed). Mr. Sevilla then posed a question regarding staffing for the program, and wondered about future needs for new faculty. According to Mr. Sethi, the first year curriculum would require no additional courses, the second only one new course for which a part-time instructor would be sufficient; in the third year additional staff for new courses would be needed. Mr. Sevilla then asked Mr. Sethi if he could comment on the SPRC memorandum.

Although receiving the memorandum only a few minutes before the start of the Senate meeting, Mr. Sethi agreed to respond to the specific concerns raised in the SPRC memo. The following points were responses to the numbered items in the memo: (1) concerns put forward by UCUI have been addressed, according to Ms. Awbrey?s memo; (2) new General Education requirements can be incorporated into the program proposal (they were not available at the time the proposal was drafted); (3a) more letters from industry leaders can be obtained if the committee desires them; (3b) in order not to waste resources no broad marketing survey was done, nor outside consultants hired; (4) library holdings have been assessed (see report of

Mildred Merz, Kresge Library); (5) a Computer Science lab is already available, and no additional lab space or technology room is anticipated; (6) the Department of Computer Science is highly supportive of recruiting minorities and women, and Mr. Sethi was not aware such information needed to be included in the proposal; (7) ABET accreditation can not happen until the first group of students graduates; (8) there is a required course devoted to software development and management as suggested by Compuware; (9) the date of adoption of the proposal by the SEC assembly (September of last year) did not appear on the proposal.

Mr. Grossman raised several questions: whether costs for staffing the math courses required for the new program (including APM263) were factored into the proposed budget; clarification for the amount of \$23,000.00 in the budget earmarked for administration; whether page 6 of the proposal contains a typo in the number of credits for math and science; whether there are 8 credits for free electives; whether the new General Education requirements are met, including the Capstone requirement; and whether ME208 would be a new course with prerequisites. Mr. Grossman voiced concern over potential problems with prerequisites, offering as an example CSE447, which has CSE450 as a prerequisite, which in turn has CSE361 as a prerequisite, which also has CSE231 as a prerequisite, a course not in the program. He further remarked that he would feel uncomfortable approving a program that would be difficult to complete, given the number of required courses that had a string of prerequisites in their wake.

Mr. Sethi responded to each question, explaining that the \$23,000.00 would cover the cost of a half-time technical support person to deal with labs, as well as hardware and software support. He also confirmed that by the next meeting the situation with the prerequisites would be addressed, possibly by removing the tracks that may be problematic and leaving those that the Senate felt comfortable with. He also promised that the descriptions for ME208 and CSE461 would be included at the next reading.

Ms. McNair then inquired whether the Budget Committee has reviewed the IT proposal. Ms. Machmut-Jhashi responded that as Chair of the Senate Budget Review Committee, she would post the committee's report on the website in the next few days. She added that her committee has looked carefully at the budget information in the proposal, and has discussed the possible budget scenarios with Mr. Sethi. As requested by the committee, he provided three possible budgets: a worst-case, best-case, and likely case. According to Ms. Machmut-Jhashi, based on the projections for incremental growth of the program and the phased-in approach over three years, the Budget Committee voted to endorse the program. Ms. McNair asked about extra support from the College of Arts and Sciences, to which Mr. Sethi replied that additional funds to support math courses would be included in an amended budget and that in his opinion the amount would not substantially alter the entire budgetary picture. A final question from Mr. Grossman involved CSE230, and whether CSE130 would be required as a prerequisite. Mr. Sethi replied that either CSE130 or CSE140 would be the appropriate prerequisites.

Mr. Lepkowski thanked Mr. Sethi for the presentation and then turned to the second item of new business, moved by Ms. McNair:

**MOVED** that Lynn Williams (Health Sciences) be appointed as Senate representative to attend Board of Trustees meetings through summer 2005. (Ms. McNair, Ms. Eberwein)

With a second from Ms. Eberwein, the Senate voted unanimously to approve the motion. The

next item concerned a procedural motion to staff standing committees:

**MOVED** that Madeline Kissock (Linguistics) be appointed Chair of the General Education Committee for Winter term 2005.

Moved by Ms. McNair, who also noted that this appointment is a sabbatical replacement for Dagmar Cronn, and seconded by Mr. Hightower, the motion was approved unanimously.

The final motion involved General Education subcommittee appointees.

**MOVED** that the persons listed below be appointed to various subcommittees of the General Education Committee through August 2006.

**Arts/Literature**

Gladys Cardiff (English)

Kris Condic (Library)

Gregory Patterson (Dance)

**Formal Reasoning**

Darrell Schmidt (Mathematical Sciences)

**Global Perspectives/US Diversity**

Walli Andersen (Rhetoric)

Peter Bertocci (Sociology)

Carole Crum (General Studies)

Shawn Lombardo (Library)

Chaundra Scott (Education)

Robert Stewart (Psychology)

Ronald Tracy (Economics)

**Natural Science and Technology**

Brian Goslin (Exercise Science)

Anne Hitt (Biological Sciences)

Barbara Penprase (Nursing)

**Social Science**

Joanne Reger (Sociology)

Cynthia Sifonis (Psychology)

**Western Civilization**

Paul Graves (Philosophy)

Derek Hastings (History)

**Writing/Foreign Language and Culture**

Alice Horning (Rhetoric)

Frank Lepkowski (Library)

Ronald Rapin (Spanish)

Mr. Stamps wondered how these particular committee members were chosen, to which Ms. McNair replied that representation was sought from areas involved in General Education, to reach as wide a spectrum as possible. Mr. Bazaz then mentioned that Miron Stano should be added to the Social Sciences committee; Ms. McNair assured him that new committee members would be invited to attend meetings and that their names would be taken up at the next Senate meeting. Other senators offered observations: Mr. Frick noted that there were no representatives from the School of Engineering; Ms. Oakley pointed out that her appointment

to the Knowledge Applications area was not listed; Mr. Stamps observed that Peter Bertocci should be listed as being from Anthropology (not Sociology) and, even more appropriately, as Director of the Center for International Programs; Mr. Stamps also noted that there were no representatives from History or Political Science on the Global Perspectives subcommittee; Mr. Grossman noted that the correct designation should be the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (not Mathematical Sciences).

Given the number of problems, Mr. Licker wondered whether the motion should be withdrawn and resubmitted in a corrected form. Mr. Grossman then called attention to parliamentary procedure with the observation that members of a subcommittee do not need approval by the Senate, and that the motion itself is unnecessary. After a brief discussion about procedure, a motion was made by Mr. Grossman to postpone consideration of the motion, seconded by Ms. Wood, and generally approved.

With no items for the good and welfare, Mr. Frick's motion to adjourn was seconded by Ms. Wood, and the meeting concluded at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tamara Machmut-Jhashi  
Secretary to the University Senate

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