



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Fourth Meeting
January 16, 2003

Minutes

Members present: Bazaz, D. Berven, K. Berven, Clark, Coppin, Didier, Eberly, Eberwein, Etienne, Goldberg, Graves, Hansen-Smith, Haskell, Henke, Hildebrand, Jarski, Khapoya, Klemanski, Latcha,, Long, Mabee, Machmut-Jhasi, McNair, Metzler, Moudgil, Otto, Papazian, Polis, Porter, Rozek, Schott-Baer, Sevilla, Sieloff, Smith, Vincent

Members absent: Alber, Aubry, Bertocci, Downing, Frick, Gardner, Giblin, Grossman, Haddad, Kamil, LeMarbe, Mann, Mukherji, Olson, Osthaus, Schmidt, Schwartz, Schweitzer, Sen, Sethi, Surrey, Tomina, Willoughby, Zingo

Summary of actions:

1. Information items: Smart Zone, Cooley Law School update, Athletics report, Name changes in performing arts specializations.
2. Motion to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2002 Senate meeting. (Ms. Papazian, Mr. Polis) Approved.
3. Motion to approve a vision statement for Oakland University. (Mr. Henke, Ms. Eberwein) First reading.
4. Motion to change the membership of the Academic Standing and Honors Committee. (Ms. Schott-Baer, Mr. Latcha) First reading.
5. Procedural motion to staff a Senate standing committee. (Mr. Graves, Mr. Henke) Approved.

A. Information Items

The meeting was called to order at 3:15. The Provost announced that Mr. Khapoya would serve as parliamentarian for today's meeting.

Smart Zone. The Provost began the information items with a description of Oakland's involvement with a [Smart Zone](#). This is a program started by Gov. Engler that allows the MEDC (Michigan Economic Development Corporation) to create 10 technology park communities (smart zones) throughout Michigan. Nine have already been organized and, with one still available and a Dec. 31st deadline, a team was organized to prepare a proposal. Such endeavors are intended to stimulate the growth of technology-based jobs by aiding in the creation of recognized clusters of new and emerging businesses, those focused on commercializing ideas. They are usually clustered near universities and research institutes. Oakland was collaborating with Lawrence Tech and Southfield already when it discovered that Rochester Hills was a potential partner and site for a Smart Zone. Only municipalities that

have created a LDFA (Local Development Financing Act) and Rochester had, can create a Smart Zone. The President acted on this opportunity and now Rochester Hills and the OU Board of Trustees have approved this endeavor. This particular zone will have two wings, Rochester Hills/Oakland U and Southfield/Lawrence Tech. This will provide opportunities to work with businesses and will require no money or land from the university. He noted that the faculty at Oakland will play an important role in the development of this zone. And it is timely since the university is facing lowered state appropriations, thus partnering with businesses may provide avenues for additional funding. In response to Mr. Polis's query, Mr. Moudgil explained that a Smart Zone is a technical park in which cities capture tax increments when businesses move in. Mr. Polis asked if the university will get a cut of the revenues and the Provost said yes, adding that the idea is to create a corridor of technology. All Smart Zones are characterized by universities and municipalities working together as partners to create and enhance business opportunities and growth. Mr. Porter asked if there will be any businesses located on the campus. Mr. Moudgil replied no, he doesn't see that happening, although if someone wanted to establish a center and construct a building at their expense, we would consider the pros and cons at that time. Mr. Sevilla asked about the nature of the tax authority. Mr. Zambardi explained that it allows municipalities to capture incremental increases in the value of the property and designate that money to research and development to attract businesses--how the money will be used will be decided by the partners in the Smart Zone and the MEDC. The idea is to attract and keep businesses and to enhance development of research and technology firms.

Cooley Law School Update. The Provost reviewed the developments so far, noting that Cooley's desire to develop a two year program here is awaiting approval from the ABA. If this is approved, there will be a need for additional space and some thought has been given to O'Dowd Hall as a possible site.

Athletic opportunities. Mr. Mehl, Director of Athletics, then provided an [update](#) on athletics at Oakland University. He reviewed the changes that have occurred over the last 5 years since the university moved to Division I. He highlighted in particular both the academic and athletic accomplishments, the support services available to athletes, the majors of OU's student athletes, and the substantial progress Oakland has made in improving its ratings percentage index. Future plans are to showcase the students' scholarship, athleticism and service (each sport has a service component), to continue to meet the needs and interests of the student body and finally, to enhance outdoor facilities, noting that the focus is on improving existing facilities, not adding any new ones. Mr. Mehl indicated he'd be happy to keep the Senate informed about future developments, particularly if new facilities are involved. Ms. Smith asked about the graduation rates of the athletes. Mr. Mehl replied that, when we began the move to Div.I, our rate was 20% higher than their cohorts in non-academic areas; however with the move to Div. I our rate slipped to 58%, mostly due to athletes that left OU to go to other schools. The most recent report given to NCAA has 62% as the graduate rate, which is better than the non-athlete student cohort. In response to a query by Ms. McNair concerning athletic opportunities for women, Mr. Mehl replied that OU is committed to Title IX, we have 8 sports for women and 6 for men; men and women's basketball have the same dollar support; basketball scholarships are awarded to 13 men and 15 women (this imbalance is due to NCAA requirements); coaching salaries are higher for men but that is due to longevity at Oakland. He responded to a query about why we don't have more money for tennis by stating that tennis is not a top tier sport. Mr. Mehl concluded his remarks by announcing that, due to our standing as a Div. I school, we can now host the NCAA basketball playoffs (also known as March Madness) and so, in March 2006, in collaboration with the Palace of Auburn Hills, 1&2 round

games will be played at the Palace. For two days in March, OU will be featured on the playing floor, there will be some money coming in as a result of this, and there will be public service announcements about the school on nation-wide media. Ms. Sieloff asked how the athletic programs are funded and Mr. Mehl answered that the total athletic department budget represents around 3% of the university budget, about 2% of the general fund budget and less than 10% of the auxiliary budget. He added that the Athletics programs are a billboard for the university, that this is a small percent of the total, and good inexpensive PR for the school. There was some concern that the move to Div. I might siphon off funds from academic programs to support athletics. He does not believe that the move to Div. I had any incremental change on the way the institution supported athletics from a percentage standpoint. We realize about a million dollars worth of external revenue; most of the internal revenue goes to scholarships and salaries. He expects the percentages to remain the same.

Name changes in Performing Arts degrees

Mr. Moudgil thanked him for his presentation and announced that, beginning with this meeting, we will include among the information items any changes in academic programs that have been brought forward by the College, Schools, or the Office of Graduate Study. The Steering Committee will review these items and direct them on to one of three tracks: (1) technical changes to be presented as information items on a Senate agenda, (2) programmatic changes that may require the advice of one or more Senate committees, and (3) new programs that require full review by committees and the Senate.

He then read the following information item so that it might be recorded for future reference in the Senate minutes.

Name changes in performing arts specializations, College of Arts & Sciences

Change Performing Arts, Dance, B. A. to Dance, Performing Arts, B. A.

Change Performing Arts, Music Theatre, B. A. to Music Theatre, Performing Arts, B. A.

Change Performing Arts, Theatre Performance, B. A. to Theatre Performance, Performing Arts, B. A.

Change Performing Arts, Theatre Production. B. A. to Theatre Production, Performing Arts, B. A.

These changes were made to make them more in line with programs at other institutions and also was based on advice from an accrediting agency.

The roll call was then conducted.

Vision Statement

The Provost then called for the first item of new business, a motion from the *ad hoc* Vision Committee to adopt a vision statement, moved by Mr. Henke, seconded by Ms. Eberwein.

Oakland University fulfills its distinctive role among Michigan public universities by steadily enhancing an intellectual and ethical environment that prepares students to lead and serve in the local and world communities.

Mr. Polis commented that he wasn't sure he understood "our distinctive role" and asked for

clarification. Mr. Henke responded that the intent of a vision statement is to show where the institution wants to go, that it is future oriented, a global umbrella, not specific but a statement that would provide direction to units as to where they should be headed when they state their more specific goals and objectives. We want to distinguish ourselves somehow from other Michigan state universities. It is very general, very broad, very fundamental and basic but provides a direction for the institution. Ms. Eberwein explained that the committee wanted to find a way to set Oakland apart, to define ways in which we differ from the big three research institutions, or the regionals, or even OCC. Noting that this is the first reading, the Provost suggested that ideas and suggestions be sent to the committee rather than being presented as amendments from the floor. Ms. Vincent commented that it would be helpful to include the distinctive role in the vision statement. Mr. Sevilla responded that a vision statement is very short and you cannot really put what the distinctive role is into it, but you could have a sub-statement that defines what a distinctive role is. Mr. Russell, who is on the committee, added that it would be difficult to get everyone to agree on what a single distinctive role that could be put in this one sentence, so having something to go along with this might be the best way to go. Ms. Sieloff commented that this implies that there is one role; she thought maybe it should say "its role of . . . by steadily enhancing . . .". She added that any university could subscribe to this proposed vision statement. Mr. Moudgil remarked that when *OU 2010* was discussed, the comments then indicated that it could apply to any institution. Mr. Khapoya remarked that he doesn't think OU has a distinctive role, but rather that it does certain things distinctively--that we do that by enhancing an intellectual and ethical environment. He felt that the phrase distinctive role doesn't really sell us. Mr. Russell responded that the committee felt that we do have a distinctive role, that we have our own niche and don't want to be grouped with the other 15 state universities. Mr. Wiggins suggested that instead of saying OU has a distinctive role, we say Oakland strives to distinguish itself among other institutions by enhancing.... Ms. Eberly proposed "Oakland University maintains its distinction among public Michigan universities by enhancing. . ." Mr. Moudgil reiterated his request that changes in wording be sent directly to the committee for their consideration.

Committee membership change

Ms. Schott-Baer, seconded by Mr. Latcha:

MOVED that the Director of the Academic Skills Center be added as an *ex officio* and non-voting member of the Academic Standing and Honors Committee.

When Mr. Henke suggested that the Senate waive the second reading on this motion, Ms. Hildebrand responded that there had been some question about the wording and stated that it would be better to wait, to let the Steering Committee decide exactly how they wanted the membership to read and then consider it again at the next meeting. The motion will be held over for a second reading at the next meeting.

A procedural motion to appoint Ron Rapin as replacement for Margaret Pigott on the Research Committee for Winter 2003 was moved by Mr. Graves, seconded by Mr. Henke, and approved with dispatch.

The **Minutes** of the November 21, 2002 meeting were then approved. (Moved Ms. Papazian, seconded Mr. Polis)

Good and welfare:

--Under the rubric of good and welfare Mr. Russell asked about the capital campaign and expressed concern about the roles of outside consultants. Mr. Moudgil responded that, in order to have up-to-date and correct information, he would address it at the next meeting.

--Ms. Klemanski announced that Kevin Nathan, Assoc. Prof. in SBA, passed away on Tuesday. If you would like the family's address, please contact the Provost's Office.

--Ms. McNair wanted to remind the Senate that she and Prof. Schmitd are attending Board of Trustees meetings; any concerns the faculty would like to be brought to the Board's attention should be sent to them in advance of the Board's meetings.

Submitted by:

Linda L. Hildebrand

Secretary to the University Senate

2/11/03

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

SENATE

Home Page