



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Fourth Meeting
19 February 2004

Minutes

Members Present: Aigbedo, Andersen, Bard, Berven (K), Bhargava, Blume, Cipielewski, Didier, Downing, Frick, Goslin, Grossman, Howell, Khapoya, LeMarbe, Lepkowski, Mabee, Machmut-Jhashi, Maines, McNair, Moore, Moudgil, Nacy, Oakley, Papazian, Porter, Rowe, Russell, Savage, Schott-Baer, Schweitzer, Stamps, Stano, Thompson, Tracy, Williams, Wood
Members Absent: Berven (D), Dunn, Eis, Fink, Gardner, Giblin, Goldberg, Graves, Hansen, Haskell, Hansen, Hightower, Kidger, Klemanski, Latcha, Licker, Mosby, Otto, Polis, Schochetman, Sethi, Wendell

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Items:

Stadium Proposal ? Mr. Mehl

Academic Affairs Committee ? Mr. Khapoya

Revised programs approved by Graduate Council ? Mr. Moudgil

2. Roll Call. Approval of December 2003 Minutes (Ms. Savage, Ms. Wood).

3. Motion from Steering Committee to approve the new General Education program (Mr. Lepkowski, Ms. Moore). Second reading.

3a. Motion to postpone the vote on General Education until the next Senate meeting. (Mr. Cipielewski, Mr. Porter) Approved.

4. Motion to approve the recommendations put forward by the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction on the proposal for General Education. (Ms. Papazian, Mr. Tracy). Approved.

5. Motion to approve the recommendations put forward by the Planning Review Committee. (Mr. Goslin, Mr. Lepkowski) Approved as amended.

5a. Motion to amend the Planning Review Committee's recommendation in bullet #2 to indicate the goal of working toward two courses in general education meeting the diversity requirement. (Mr. Downing, Mr. Tracy) Approved.

6. Motion to approve the recommendations put forward by the General Education Committee on the General Education proposal. (Ms. Papazian, Ms. Howell) Approved.

7. Motion to approve the recommendations put forward by the Senate Budget Committee on the General Education proposal. (Ms. Rammel, Ms. Papazian) Approved.

8. Motion to change language in the General Education proposal to indicate that beginning Fall 2008 students must complete the rhetoric requirement within the first 32 credit hours taken at Oakland University. (Mr. Tracy, Mr. Downing) Approved.

9. Motion to approve a revised Library constitution. (Ms. Didier, Mr. Lepkowski) First reading.

10. Motion from the Steering Committee recommending procedures for constructing academic

calendars. (Mr. Russell, Mr. Stamps). First reading.

11. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to staff Senate standing committees. (Ms. McNair, Mr. Tracy) Approved.

Calling the meeting to order at 3:15, Mr. Moudgil brought attention to the first informational item on the agenda concerning a project for a new stadium on the Oakland campus. Mr. Moudgil invited Jack Mehl, Director of Athletics, to present an overview of the project. Mr. Mehl began by referring to his last visit to the Senate, a year ago, when he reported that several proposals were under review for a new multi-purpose facility. Currently, there is interest in a specific proposal involving an outside developer who would fund the construction of a minor league baseball stadium on campus that would be used by Oakland University during baseball's off-season. Mr. Mehl pointed out that certain basic guidelines have been observed during discussions: no institutional funds would be committed to the project; existing facilities and space already dedicated to those purposes would be utilized; and the university's need for an improved soccer facility would be served. In addition, he emphasized that a priority has been placed on keeping the university community informed about the proposed facility, listening to and addressing all concerns brought forth by various constituencies across campus.

Throughout the past year, plans for the stadium facility have been presented to administrators in the President's and the Provost's offices, to the Academic Council, and to the Senate Campus Development and Environment, Senate Budget, and Senate Planning and Review Committees. Issues raised by these groups have been incorporated into the talks, and what has resulted is a proposal for one stadium, rather than multiple facilities, for both baseball and soccer. Moreover, all the programmatic needs and long-term interests for the university soccer program have been incorporated into the conceptual design. Mr. Mehl believes that in the next 30-45 days the developer will come forward with approximately twenty million dollars. He also noted that all the external money is new to the university so that there would be no question of funds being diverted from other sources to the building of the stadium. According to Mr. Mehl, the feeling at the present time can be characterized as "enthusiastically cautious."

Mr. Moudgil noted that Mr. Mehl's presentation to the Senate was intended to encourage community involvement in a project of this magnitude. The groups that Mr. Moudgil works closely with, namely, the Academic Council and the Senate, must be duly informed about the progress of such projects and members of those bodies must be given the opportunity to ask questions about how academic affairs may be affected.

Mr. Moudgil opened the floor for questions. Mr. Russell asked if lights were planned for night games (Mr. Mehl answered that the plan does include lights). In response to Mr. Tracy's question about the size of the stadium, Mr. Mehl explained that the present site dedicated to soccer is too small, and that the area currently used for baseball will be necessary for the stadium. He added that the stadium's elevation will allow it to remain relatively unobtrusive from the level of the road in front of the Rec Center, and that new technologies in lighting allow for fewer number of poles than would have been necessary even a few years ago. The multi-purpose building, containing artificial turf, could accommodate other events aside from sports, including concerts, commencement ceremonies, etc., with a capacity of 4000-6000 people.

Ms. Wood inquired about the responsibility of routine maintenance costs. Mr. Mehl explained that those costs would be divided by use, so that during the time the external user would have use of the facility, costs would be borne by the baseball team. Costs then would revert to the

university during the soccer season. The auxiliary budget of the Athletic Department currently funds the maintenance of playing fields, so that cost will not be new. Custodial services will incur added costs, and costs for game management will also be new. The positive side, however, is that a potential for substantial revenue can offset those costs. Night games are expected to draw larger crowds for soccer and the sale of concessions, OU apparel and souvenirs will generate additional revenue.

A question was raised by Mr. Berven about the academic benefits from the new stadium. Mr. Mehl suggested that student jobs and internships will directly and indirectly affect academic programs. He added that what is particularly appealing about the project is that it is one that cannot fail. The 20 million dollars for the project will be available up front, which insures that it will be started and completed, without the possibility of default. Oakland University will control all aspects of the facility, from signage to parking. There is a 30-40 year lease for minor league baseball, but it is Oakland's facility and will remain so should the baseball league fail.

Mr. Maines brought up the issue of additional parking. According to Mr. Mehl, a car-to-spectator ratio makes it unlikely that 4000 cars would ever materialize at one time. In addition, the baseball season itself, from June to the end of the August, would hardly impact daily activities during the academic calendar. Mr. Moudgil added that additional parking may be considered in the future. On a related issue, Mr. Ciplewski wondered whether "exterior" roads (Adams, Squirrel) would be affected. Mr. Mehl replied that officials from the cities of Rochester Hills and Auburn Hills will be invited to consider those issues. It is anticipated that other issues will need to be addressed, including signage, which is of broader concern affecting the campus community. Mr. Mehl believes that as a result of the stadium facility, revamping campus signage and examining traffic flow may well be subsidiary benefits to the university.

Mr. Moudgil asked Mr. Mehl to comment on the overall impact the stadium would have on community outreach. He replied that events such as high school and club soccer, high school baseball tournaments, and NCAA tournaments and events, will bring people (i.e. prospective students) to campus. The benefits of showcasing the university in this way will be substantial.

Thanking Mr. Mehl for his informative presentation, Mr. Moudgil then requested that Senators direct further comments, concerns, and questions directly to the Provost's office.

The second informational item on the agenda involved the Academic Affairs Committee's election of the new Academic Relations Committee. Mr. Khapoya explained the election process and announced the three newly elected members: Barbara Hamilton, Jim Ciplewski, and Rose Letsholo. Mr. Khapoya expressed his gratitude to Sheryl Klemanski for her help in conducting the election.

The last informational item was an announcement of revised and spin-off programs approved by the Graduate Council: ESL Endorsement (CAS); Post-Master's Graduate Certificate in Higher Education (SEHS); and Master of Science in Nursing/Acute Care (SON).

The secretary proceeded with the roll call after which the [Minutes](#) of the Meeting of December 4, 2003 were approved (Ms. Savage, Ms. Wood).

Old Business

The first item of old business was a motion to approve the new General Education program.

MOVED that [?A Proposal for the Renewal of General Education at Oakland University?](#) from General Education Task Force II be accepted and that the new General Education program be approved. (Mr. Lepkowski, Ms. Moore)

Mr. Moudgil reminded Senators of the decision made during the first reading meeting to ask for reports on the General Education proposal from four Senate Committees: Planning Review Committee, Budget Committee, General Education Committee, and the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction. Recommendations from the committees have been submitted to the Provost and are available on the Senate web page. The Steering Committee requests that the General Education Task Force II review the reports and offer amendments to its own report in time for placement on the agenda of the next Senate meeting.

Susan Awbrey led discussion on the committee reports by reminding senators to look carefully at the substantive issues rather than take time to review minor aspects of the report, for example, wording changes. Motions were then made to approve the recommendations put forth by the various committees.

MOVED that the Senate approve the recommendations put forward by the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction on the proposal for General Education (bulleted items in UCUI's [report](#) referring to pages 10, 13, 16, 47). (Ms. Papazian, Mr. Tracy) Approved unanimously.

MOVED that the Senate approve the [recommendations](#) put forward by the Planning Review Committee, bulleted sections referring to pages 11, 17, 19, 22, 59, and Appendix G, on the proposal for General Education. (Mr. Goslin, Mr. Lepkowski)

Ms. Papazian raised a question regarding bullet #2 on U.S. Diversity and wondered whether two courses may be an impractical requirement. Mr. Goslin responded that it is reasonable to expect that a substantial number of existing courses can be revised to reflect diversity issues in course content. This measure does not require the creation of additional courses; rather, it is a situation that entails revision of existing courses. Mr. Stamps voiced concern over a situation in which faculty may be revising courses to include areas outside their areas of expertise. Mr. Goslin replied that faculty would be dealing with diversity within their fields, so that a health scientist would examine diversity issues from the perspective of health science, and would not be expected to be an expert in the field of gender studies, for example. Mr. Tracy expressed concern that devoting 7 weeks, or half the term to diversity issues may be excessive when so many other issues are covered in general education courses. Ms. Howell suggested that this should be an opportunity to rethink the way we approach general education, which could, in fact, prompt us to think more broadly about diversity issues. Mr. Parks commented on his student experience in general education courses, where, he believed, diversity was not addressed adequately. Mr. Grossman remarked that a 7-week, 50% requirement might make us more hypocritical than we are now. It may create a situation in which courses are rubber-stamped for approval simply to meet the content requirement. Ms. Awbrey then noted that there have been no objections to the idea of increasing attention to diversity, but that the concerns have addressed the successful implementation of the requirement. She suggested that an amendment be offered to indicate the goal is to be building toward having two courses

properly meet the diversity requirement.

Mr. Downing voiced support of Ms. Awbrey's suggestion, and then moved to make an amendment (to the previous motion) to modify the language in bullet #2 of the Planning Review Committee's report to indicate that the goal is to work toward two courses in general education meeting a diversity requirement. Upon Mr. Tracy's second, the Senate voted unanimously to approve the amendment.

Returning to the motion made by Ms. Papazian, Mr. Downing then asked for clarification on bullet #6 regarding "laboratory space and resources." Mr. Goslin explained that the information in bullet #6 reflected Planning Review Committee's support of the sentiment expressed in the General Education proposal of "working toward" developing laboratories during the course of the next five years. The Senate voted unanimously to approve the motion as amended.

MOVED that the Senate approve the [recommendations](#) put forward by the General Education Committee on the General Education proposal. (Ms. Papazian, Ms. Howell) The Senate voted unanimously to approve the motion.

MOVED that the Senate approve all [recommendations](#) (#1-3) put forward by the Senate Budget Committee on the General Education proposal. (Ms. Rammel, Ms. Papazian)

Mr. Downing remarked that his sense of the Budget Committee's recommendations was that they intend to more rigorously back up the numbers in the projected budget supplied in the proposal. Ms. Rammel expressed that the concern of the Budget Committee was primarily with achieving success of the program. Ms. Awbrey then asked for flexibility in the budget as needs would likely change once the program gets underway. The Senate voted unanimously to accept the Budget Committee's recommendations.

Further discussion on the General Education proposal included Ms. Awbrey's request that the Senate consider modifying the stipulation that students complete their rhetoric requirement in their first year to instead indicate that the requirement must be completed before junior standing. Mr. Tracy opposed this adjustment as, in his view, it would ultimately disadvantage the student to postpone courses; he urged that Rhetoric be adequately supported so that the first year requirement can indeed be met. Mr. Downing backed Mr. Tracy's opinion, as did Mr. Moudgil, who commented that postponing courses can adversely affect the time and rate of graduation. Mr. Grossman asked for clarification on how this policy would be enforced; would students be turned away if the requirement were not met? Ms. McNair voiced a similar concern. Mr. Tracy then moved to amend the proposal to allow time to phase in the new rhetoric requirements:

MOVED that within three years of implementing the new General Education program, beginning Fall 2008, all students must take the rhetoric requirement within the first 32 credit hours taken at Oakland University. (Mr. Tracy, Mr. Downing).

Without further discussion, the Senate approved the motion. As a final action on the General Education proposal, a motion was made by Mr. Cipielewski to postpone the vote on General

Education until the March meeting of the Senate. Duly seconded by Mr. Porter, the Senate voted unanimously to approve the motion to postpone.

New Business

1. Motion from the Library to approve a [revised constitution](#). (Ms. Didier) First reading.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the revised Constitution for the Library. (Ms. Didier, Mr. Lepkowski)

Commenting that the Library Constitution is reviewed every five years, Ms. Didier outlined the key points of the revised document: the removal of the reference to a Performing Arts Library; four places where the term "provost" was added to reflect changes in the university's administrative structure; and language deleted under "L Cap" that would require a one year delay in the granting of tenure, also following the general changes in university policy. Mr. Russell then asked about the issue in Article 5, paragraph 2 pertaining to a faculty member's service on a review committee during a year in which the faculty member is also under review for promotion. Ms. Didier responded that the issue had not been discussed by the library faculty. Mr. Lepkowski suggested excluding faculty under review for promotion to professor rank might pose a problem due to the small number of faculty. The library faculty will consider this issue prior to the next Senate meeting. As this was the first reading, Mr. Moudgil suggested that Ms. Didier take time to make changes to the document before returning to the Senate. Additional editorial changes should be forwarded to Ms. Didier.

2. Motion from the Steering Committee recommending procedures for constructing academic calendars (Mr. Russell).

MOVED that the University Senate recommends the following criteria be used when establishing calendars for fall semesters: (1) Fourteen weeks of classes for each class module; (2) Fall commencement held on the Saturday after final exams; (3) One or more study days between the end of classes and the start of finals; (4) New student convocation held on the day that classes start in the evening. (Mr. Russell, Mr. Stamps).

Mr. Russell commented that the Steering Committee responded to the Provost's charge after the last Senate meeting to generate a series of guidelines to establish a calendar. According to Mr. Russell, there was a consensus amongst the members of the Steering Committee that students would prefer classes to begin after Labor Day, but that ultimately, the calendar should be driven by academic considerations. It seemed to the Steering Committee that the administration was committed for academic reasons to have graduation after the conclusion of final exams, to which the members of the committee were not opposed. Mr. Russell then distributed a hand-out which outlined possible start/end times for fall semester. He noted that all four criteria could not be met by any one scenario. Various problems arise when pushing back the semester too close to the holiday break, including the undesired possibility of holding commencement as late as December 23. Mr. Russell urged Senators to examine the spreadsheet closely, as always starting after Labor Day would mean that many classes would have only 13 weeks. Mr. Russell noted that he devised the spreadsheet so that at least 2 study days were included for each calendar variant.

Mr. Moudgil then invited questions and comments. Mr. Porter reminded the Senate that students should be consulted regarding this important issue since it will affect them the most. Mr. Porter also asked for clarification as to the timing of recording final grades by the Registrar; Mr. Russell explained the procedure of faculty submitting grades within 48 hours of final exams. Mr. Moudgil asserted that student opinion is extremely important so that input is very much desired from student leaders. Mr. Grossman admitted confusion regarding the language in the motion regarding 14 weeks of class for each module. Mr. Russell explained that 14 weeks could only be achieved if classes began on a Monday, but that the faculty agreement prohibits this possibility. With a Wednesday start, Monday classes would then have 13 weeks. Mr. Grossman suggested that another sheet be prepared which would reflect a scenario in which all 4 guidelines of the motion could be met; Mr. Russell agreed to do so. Mr. Parks, President of Student Congress, remarked that a pre-Labor day start would be preferable for students. Ms. Williams noted a problem of low class attendance in the days before Labor Day, to which Mr. Parks replied that a majority of Michigan colleges and universities begin before the holiday, and if students do not show for classes they should be marked absent. Mr. Cipielewski stated that students could forfeit a place in a class should they not appear the first day. Ms. Howell observed that students getting bumped in Rhetoric classes could cause a major bottleneck. Mr. Berven mentioned that students would be losing a week of summer employment with a pre-Labor day start. Ms. McNair brought up the problem posed for the Michigan tourist industry with early starts. Responding to a further question from Mr. Parks for clarification on the negative impact of a post-Labor day start, Mr. Russell recapped the issue of the number of classes that would be limited to a 13-week semester. He also remarked that the AUPP survey resulted in 78% of faculty voting to start after Labor Day, but that they had not seen the information gathered on the spreadsheet. Mr. Moudgil reminded Senators that this is the first reading of the motion, and that student leaders be allowed time to seek advice and opinions, and that discussion continue at a later time.

The final motion of the meeting was a procedural motion from the Steering Committee to staff Senate standing committees, which the Senate voted unanimously to approve.

MOVED that Gladys Cardiff (English) be appointed to the Planning Review Committee for winter 2004 (replacing Joel Russell) and that Richard Pettengill (Library) be appointed to the Library Committee for winter 2004 (replacing Dana Keyse). (Ms. McNair, Mr. Tracy).

With no good and welfare items, the Provost's call for a motion to adjourn met with general approval and the meeting concluded at 5:15 p.m.

Submitted by
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi
Secretary to the University Senate

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