



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Seventh Meeting
April 11, 2002

Minutes

Members present: Abiko, Alber, Aubry, Bazaz, D. Berven, K. Berven, Binkert, Blanks, Coppin, Didier, Downing, Eberwein, Emrich, Frick, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Hansen Smith, Hildebrand, Khapoya, Kheir, Klemanski, Latcha, Lipman, Machmut-Jhasi, Mann, Mosby, Moudgil, Mukherji, Osthaus, Otto, Rozek, Russell, Sangeorzan, Schott-Baer, Schweitzer, Sethi, Sevilla, Shablin, Sieloff, Smith, Stamps, Willoughby.

Members absent: Clark, Eberly, Gardner, Haddad, Henke, Jarski, Long, Mabee, McNair, Olson, Schmitz, Schwartz, Surrey

Summary of actions

1. Report from the President on *Profile 2010*.
2. Motion to amend the General Education learning outcomes to include a statement relating to foreign languages and cultures. (Ms. Mabee, Mr. Downing) Second reading. Approved.
3. Motion to amend the General Education learning outcomes to include the Darwinian basis of life, the evolutionary basis of humanness, and the biological basis of health and medical issues. (Mr. Berven, Mr. Downing) Second reading. Approved.
4. Motion to endorse the General Education learning outcomes as amended. (Mr. Graves, Mr. Henke) Second reading. Postponed upon majority approval of a motion to postpone indefinitely (Mr. Russell, Ms. Alber)
5. Amendment to the motion that General Education Task Force II recommend to the Senate a general education program deleting the text "based on the learning outcomes as endorsed by the Senate" and adding "and Senate minutes" to the end. (Mr. Binkert, Ms. McNair) Second reading. Approved.
6. Motion as amended that General Education Task Force II recommend to the Senate a general education program taking into account the report of Task Force I together with all of its addenda and related Senate committee reports and Senate minutes. (Ms. Mukherji, Mr. Binkert) Second reading. Approved.
7. Motion to recommend approval of a program leading to a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering. (Mr. Frick, Mr. Latcha) First reading.
8. Motion to print the titles of students' majors on undergraduate diplomas. (Mr. Coppin, Mr. Stamps) Approved following approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Ms. Schott-Baer, Ms. Otto)
9. Motion that the Senate endorse the *Oakland University Profile 2010*. (Ms. Schott-Baer, Mr.

Downing) First reading.

10. Motion to staff Senate standing committees (Mr. Coppin, Mr. Binkert) Procedural motion. Approved.

11. Motion to add a Senate meeting in spring/summer terms. (Mr. Frick, Ms. Didier) Noted that it wasn't needed since the proposed April meeting still falls within the winter term.

University report

Mr. Moudgil called the meeting to order, noting that we have a long agenda to deal with today. He asked that Senators sit at the tables with their name tags displayed. Visitors are welcome but should use the additional seating provided in back.

He then introduced Mr. Russi, recollecting that the Senate had indicated its interest in having the President appear at the last Senate meeting of the year to share information on the university's progress and activities. Mr. Russi began with an overview of the funding situation at Oakland. He reminded the Senate that the Strategic Plan approved in 1995 has guided us for the last few years and will continue to be a guiding force. He noted that Mr. Moudgil brings strong faculty perspective to the discussions since he shares faculty interest and concerns. Last September the Senate heard a presentation on the budget and how it was allocated this year. In response to the Provost's advocacy, Academic Affairs was awarded 85% of all new money with the remaining 15% being divided among the other units, e.g. Student Affairs, Finance and Administration, University Relations and the President's Division. And the Provost has shared how the 4.3 million dollar allocation was distributed in Academic Affairs.

However, the coming year will be more difficult --the higher education appropriations bill signed last week has the same funding as last year. He felt that, given the economic situation in the state, the flat funding rather than a decrease shows the importance the state places on higher education. However, the flat funding creates challenges for the university as it deals with the forces of compensation, health insurance, technology and energy costs. He also commended Mr. Moudgil's advocacy for new positions, reporting that \$1 million has been added to the base for faculty positions in 2003. The administration is in the final stages of budget development which began with leadership retreats to set the goals and priorities for 2003. Next the Vice President for Finance and Administration developed the budget process and schedule (see [web site](#) for details). Ms. Schaefer is also developing new monitoring processes regarding budgets which will keep departments and other units updated and informed on their budget situation. Plante Moran, a consulting firm, has been hired to assist in the development of policies and procedures and will report on the university's operations effectiveness and efficiency.

Now, continued Mr. Russi, we need to focus on goals and objectives, e.g. strengthening teaching, research, student development and community outreach, so that we can be known as a university of distinction. We know what funding is available now and are poised to put into place steps for curricular transformations. It is an exciting time for Oakland and for all those who want the best for their students. Oakland has been committed to undergraduate education since the first students were admitted and the Meadowbrook Seminars were initiated. We must continue to keep those founding values as our priority, he exhorted, to integrate the liberal arts into the profession schools, to keep the small college feel. The faculty and staff continue to support the idea of a distinctive undergraduate experience but now, we need to consider how that experience comes to life and how to focus it more clearly. As he prepared to turn the podium over to the Provost, he acknowledged and called attention to Mr. Moudgil's e-

mail calling for proposals to enhance the undergraduate experience.

Mr. Moudgil began his comments by stating that he tries to keep in touch with faculty and students, adding that we are a community that cares deeply about students. The result of the Vision 2010 presentations last year was an awareness that we want to work together to provide a distinctive undergraduate experience. To this end he has requested proposals that will strengthen and make distinctive the undergraduate experience. These proposals should be submitted by May 1, although given the pressures of the end of the semester, late submission will also be accepted. The [report](#) of the Washington Advisory Group will assist in evaluating the proposals as will the visions already articulated by the Schools and College. Some possibilities for proposals include alternative methods of teaching and learning, proposals that are interdisciplinary or which involve global perspectives or international focus, the integration of new technologies, or something involving community development. Any ideas that are considered worthy will be discussed with the Board of Trustees and may be funded this summer. He commented that there was wide spread consultation across the campus of the Profile 2010 and looks forward to receiving proposals, adding that some proposals may be become part of the capital campaign fund raising project. He concluded by thanking Mr. Russi for his budgetary support and opened the floor for questions and discussion.

Ms. Eberwein began by noting that the main business today relates to general education and asked what resources are going to be available for general education, e.g. new faculty, classrooms, etc. Mr. Russi responded that he has set aside half a million dollars in a strategic fund that will be used to fund special projects. The key is to move forward with the capital campaign and to identify items that will generate donors' support. He's convinced that there is outside money to support our initiatives, but that potential donors want to know what it is and what does it look like" before they are willing to commit themselves. Other possibilities include grant and foundation support that does not become part of the base budget but can be used to support other needs. Mr. Russi also remarked that if we can come up with something that is transforming or unique, we can make a special appeal to the state for funding. Mr. Moudgil added that they have met with some potential donors and have found that the donors want to fund something that will make a difference. Mr. Binkert raised the question that the Profile talks about a growing university in terms of students and programs but not faculty which leads to increased use of part time faculty and larger classes. Mr. Russi replied that there is no question that additional faculty will be needed. This was noted in the enrollment planning [report](#) the Senate endorsed last year and it is clear we will need more resources to support the additional faculty.

Ms. Smith asked who would evaluate the proposals, an in-house committee or would outside consultants be involved. It depends, responded the Provost; in-house if the proposals fall into existing categories and if governance is needed, the proposals will be funneled through the appropriate bodies. It may depend on the proposal; some of the proposals might be shared with potential donors who are interested in supporting specific areas or programs. Mr. Moudgil concluded the discussion by thanking the President for his generous support of this initiative.

General Education Learning Outcomes

The Senate next turned its attention to the motion to endorse the Learning Outcomes, starting the discussion with the amendment proposed at the previous meeting by Ms. Mabee:

MOVED that the learning outcomes (knowledge area) include:

Demonstrate an understanding of foreign languages and cultures
Recognize and appreciate a wide variety of literary forms and/or national origins.

In response to Mr. Lipman's request for further explanation of the "national origins" phrase, Ms. Berven stated that the department felt the need to include something in the Learning Outcomes that would represent foreign literatures in translation. Mr. Downing added that the intent was to ensure that literary study would include a wide variety of other cultures. Mr. Lipman argued that the second part of the motion was unnecessary and unclear and proposed a friendly amendment to strike the second line, e.g. "Recognize and appreciate...". Both Ms. Berven, representing Ms. Mabee as the mover, and Mr. Downing who provided the second agreed to the change since the concepts are included elsewhere in the Learning Outcomes list. Mr. Russell wondered if the remaining part of the motion was an attainable goal and Ms. Berven said yes, that she thought it was self-explanatory, e.g. that a student taking a foreign language would be able to demonstrate an understanding of the language and culture. Wouldn't it be better if students could demonstrate an understanding of a foreign language, asked Ms. Abiko and Mr. Latcha noted that understanding isn't measurable, proficiency is.

In response to Ms. Smith's query as to whether the Task Force was charged with developing assessable objectives, Ms. Awbrey replied that that responsibility actually rested with Task Force II. Mr. Russell and Mr. Lipman both saw this request as being a foreign language requirement. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea expressed concern over the Learning Outcomes and asked if the students will have to complete all of them. Ms. Awbrey said no, that the learning outcomes are what the faculty said was important for OU graduates, that students will not necessarily have to fulfill all of them but she also emphasized that any given course will likely satisfy multiple learning outcomes. Referring back to the motion on the floor, Mr. Binkert noted that many linguistics courses could also fulfill the requirement, so that it wouldn't necessarily be a "foreign language" requirement. Ms. Otto commented that "understanding" could include both reading a foreign language or reading a translation and that it is the job of Task Force II to figure out how to implement and assess the outcomes. Ms. Hansen-Smith thought that if proficiency were what was desired, it would belong more appropriately in the outcomes/skills section. Mr. Osthaus, referring to one of the models presented at the Jan. 17, 2002 Senate meeting, noted that the model included a category for foreign language but nothing for international studies and asked if foreign language study would supplant the international students requirement. Ms. Berven indicated that the intent was not to take the place of IS. Mr. Tracy felt that we are looking too closely at the details and not realizing that students will not be able to fulfill all the learning outcomes that are listed, that the outcomes will be reduced to a reasonable number. After Task Force II has completed its work the Senate will have a chance to consider the changes. He stressed that the outcomes should be looked at broadly and that the General Education Committee will eventually decide which courses meet the learning outcomes. Mr. Russell's motion to postpone further discussion of the main motion was ruled out of order since the Senate needed to act on the amendment on the floor first. The Senate proceeded to do so by approving the amendment [Senators voting against: Coppin, Latcha, Sangeorzan, Schott-Baer, Willoughby. Senators abstaining: Frick]

Attention then turned to the second amendment, proposed by Mr. Berven and seconded by Mr. Downing at last month's meeting:

MOVED that the learning outcomes (knowledge area) include the following:

- An understanding of the Darwinian basis of the interconnectedness of life ;
- Knowledge of the evolutionary basis of humanness
- An understanding of the biological basis of health and medical issues.

Mr. Stamps spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that it supports good concepts of knowledge, while Mr. Russell argued that the outcomes should not have this degree of specificity and urged a vote against. Mr. Berven stated that the concepts in the amendment are not department specific and the Senate proceeded to vote and approve the amendment with 12 nays and 3 abstentions. [Senators voting against: Abiko, Bazaz, Kheir, Latcha, Mukherji, Osthaus, Russell, Sangeorzan, Schott-Baer, Sethi, Sevilla, Willoughby. Senators abstaining: Coppin, Frick, Goldberg]

Mr. Russell, seconded by Ms. Alber

MOVED to postpone consideration of the main motion indefinitely.

The Senate approved the Russell motion with Mr. Graves and Mr. Stamps voting nay.

Having thus dispensed with the first item of old business, the Senate then turned to the second item, a motion to amend the motion below by deleting the phrase "based on the Learning Outcomes as endorsed by the Senate and" and adding the phrase "and Senate minutes" to the end.

MOVED that General Education Task Force II recommend to the Senate a general education program ~~based on the Learning Outcomes as endorsed by the Senate and~~ taking into account the report of General Education Task Force I, together with all of its addenda and related Senate Committee reports **and Senate minutes** .

The amendment was approved unanimously. Mr. Downing then spoke in favor of the amended motion, noting that the whole process began with constructive dialog and arguing that this motion endorses the process and recognized all the work that has been done while also moving the process forward. Mr. Tracy, a member of Task Force II, assured the Senate that there will be additional opportunities for discussion. The amended motion below was then approved unanimously.

MOVED that General Education Task Force II recommend to the Senate a general education program taking into account the report of General Education Task Force I, together with all of its addenda and related Senate Committee reports and Senate minutes.

The Provost took the opportunity to thank all the members of Task Force I and II for their hard work and contributions. Ms. Awbrey suggested that a resolution of thanks and appreciation for the work of the General Education Task Force I would be appropriate for a future meeting.

Mechanical Engineering Ph.D. proposal.

The Senate then turned its attention to the first item of new business, the motion below which was moved by Mr. Frick and seconded by Mr. Latcha:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of a program leading to a Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering.

Mr. Grossman opened the discussion by asking about the proposal's request for 3 new faculty positions; since the program will have only 7 students per year that would be 2.3 faculty for each student. Given our limited resources he questioned the faculty/student ratio. Mr. Barber indicated the projections are for 7 graduates each year with 30 students in progress when the program reaches a steady state. This will represent a significant increase in the university's production of Ph.D.s. Ms. Hansen-Smith asked if the Senate's approval of the program has any bearing on the budget and also how does the program work when students are working in industry rather than being full-time graduate students. Students in industry have to complete the same courses as do full time graduate students, Mr. Barber replied. Mr. Frick commented that they are currently searching for 5 new faculty members for the School of Engineering, he added that one advantage with students in industry is that they have lab facilities and equipment available for their research at their places of work. Ms. Jackson, chair of the Senate Planning Review Committee, spoke in favor of the proposal, highlighting the opportunities it will provide for collaboration and partnerships. Referring to the 5 faculty searches, Mr. Downing noted that 2 of the positions are replacements. Mr. Lipman was pleased that the students would be taking a number of credits in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

Ms. Didier drew attention to the budget for library materials, pointing out that the figures given in the library report are understated since they were done several years ago and publication costs have increased over those years. She indicated that the budget figures should be increased to reflect the 8-10% annual increases in costs, for example the actual costs for supporting the program in the first year should be \$71,000, not \$59,000. There are around \$80,000 worth of journals that should be added but the library modestly only recommended \$20,000. Mr. Moudgil stated that the Senate should only concern itself with the academic aspects of the program, not worry about library support. Mr. Binkert commented that the university approved a masters program in linguistics but never followed through with adequate funding for it. Since we are being told that resources are limited and likely to decline, he asked what new money will be available to support this new program, or will support come from someone else's slice of the pie. Mr. Moudgil responded that the university is going to launch a capital campaign and that the region is rich in resources. He indicated that he will support programs as much as he can and added that he will not support any program that causes deficiencies for other programs. Ms. Hansen-Smith noted that a previous proposal was not funded and asked why are we approving programs if funding isn't in place for them. Mr. Moudgil stated that the funding was not the reason the program never got started. We need to realize that each Ph.D. program can be funded in different ways, Mr. Sevilla pointed out. Some programs can be funded by corporate donors and he opined that allocation of resources is the purview of the university administration. He declared himself totally in support of the program.

Undergraduate diplomas

The next item of business, a motion to add majors to undergraduate student diplomas was moved by Mr. Coppin and seconded by Mr. Stamps:

MOVED that Oakland University print the titles of majors on undergraduate diplomas.

Mr. Moudgil commented that this was requested by the students adding that the reports from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, the Academic Standing and Honors Committee and the Registrar are available as part of the agenda. Mr. Sevilla wondered if there was enough room on the diplomas if students had multiple majors and also asked if honors would be shown. Mr. Moudgil responded that after the Senate has approved the motion, he would consult with the appropriate bodies to determine the best ways to implement the change. Mr. Grossman expressed his discomfort with this change, stating that one's college education consists of more than just classes related to the major, but is willing to accede since the students clearly want this. Ms. Schott-Baer, seconded by Ms. Otto, moved to waive the second reading. That motion was approved unanimously. The main motion was approved with one dissent [Senator voting nay: Goldberg]

Oakland University Profile 2010

Ms. Schott-Baer, seconded by Mr. Downing then

MOVED that the Senate endorse the Oakland University Profile 2010.

Mr. Graves opened the discussion by expressing his concerns regarding the document based on what's happened in the past. The Strategic Plan, he reminded the Senate, indicated that our highest priority was undergraduate education but enrollments have grown without an increase in full-time faculty. The Creating the Future document stressed critical thinking and values but the Philosophy department which devotes entire classes to these concepts has suffered from underfunding. He expressed skepticism about the Oakland University Profile 2010, which emphasizes a growing student body but is silent about faculty and other resources, would be any different. The full text of his remarks are included [below](#).

The Provost responded by stating that this is the first time he's heard a negative comment about the Profile, that he talked to the Deans and the Academic Council about it. He also pointed out that the faculty ranks have grown with many new faculty being hired in the last few years. Mr. Russell found the document too vague and stated that it is incumbent to come up with specific views on how we'd like to see OU achieve distinction. Mr. Grossman shared the concern about the vagueness and given the emphasis on undergraduate education, wondered what it means to be 'graduate intensive'. Mr. Moudgil replied that graduate intensive means that the selective strong programs which would be further strengthened. Mr. Grossman also wondered about the emphasis on first year students since so much of Oakland's student body consists of transfer students. Ms. Didier indicated that the document had already undergone a great deal of editing and word-smithing and that it is difficult to get everything on one piece of paper. The lateness of the hour precluded further discussion; the Profile will have its second reading at the next Senate meeting.

Senate Committee

The next agenda item required a minimum of discussion. Mr. Coppin moved the roster of appointments to the Senate standing committees for the coming academic year and Mr. Binkert provided the second. Mr. Downing asked why so few of the committees included the specification of the chair and was told that the Steering Committee is still working on the staffing and that additional information would be forthcoming at the next meeting. The Senate then approved the appointments.

Additional Meeting

A motion for an additional Senate meeting to consider the Mechanical Engineering proposal and the Profile was proposed by Mr. Frick and seconded by Ms. Didier. Mr. Grossman offered a friendly amendment to also include the staffing of senate committees, which was accepted by the movers. Mr. Grossman then noted that since the next meeting was proposed on April 18th and since that is still within the winter term, the motion is not needed.

With the business of the day concluded, the Senate adjourned at 5:23.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate.

Friends,

By "popular" demand, the following is the text of my diatribe

My Fellow Senators

Roughly eight years ago, The Strategic Plan was brought before this body for endorsement. At that time, at least two senators spoke against the plan on the grounds that it was too vague, and therefore incomplete. The Strategic Plan said that our highest strategic priority was excellence in undergraduate education. But it didn't say how that excellence was going to be achieved or what would count as excellence. The intervening years saw 25% growth in enrollment without corresponding increases in the number of professors. The result was that part-time credit hour delivery rose to almost 50% of total credit hour delivery. In light of this development, we were even chided by NCA for misleading advertising. Although our high student faculty ratio was praised by some as evidence of "efficiency," I do not believe there is anyone in this faculty who believes that on balance our students, or our broader academic mission, are served better by lecturers than by professors.

The Strategic Plan was elaborated with a document called "Creating the Future." I have to say I was pretty enthused by this document because it mentioned teaching "critical thinking" on just about every page and teaching "values" on almost every other page. I thought Now we're cooking. Those are subjects that our students desperately need and where my department has dedicated entire classes. Creating the Future is now becoming passe and is being supplanted by the Vision 2010. In the interim my department has had to fight tooth and nail to stand still, while donating tens of thousands of salary dollars to other departments through retirements. I am told that Oakland University is now turning students away for lack of seats in those very classes on "values."

So perhaps in light of this history you can understand that I approach these strategic planning documents with healthy skepticism.

My major concern about the document before us is in what it doesn't say. An earlier version - now apparently withdrawn from the University website - said that we had a goal of 20,000 students by 2010. That is growth by approximately one third in the next eight years. I am very

skeptical that we have or will acquire the resources to grow at that rate while maintaining the present level of quality. I look for a similar statement about growth in the professorate and find nothing. If our goal were to grow to 600 professors by 2010 - roughly growing by 1/3 - new hires would have to exceed deaths, resignations and retirements by about 20 each year. I have been advised by my Dean that next year the College might hire as few as six or eight professors and we have at least four pending resignations that I know about in the College. The chairs in the College recently requested five times the number of positions that the Dean of the College believes we might be allotted. Five times. Of course I have parallel concerns about classroom, laboratory, library, housing, parking and office space. I will not support the Vision 2010 unless first It makes a statement about growth in the professorate and infrastructure that would be proportionate and comparably specific to the statements we hear about growth in the student body, and second It ties ongoing growth in the student body to ongoing growth in the professorate and infrastructure.

But mere growth in the professorate and infrastructure are not enough. I also want to know something about the projected shape of the growth. My colleague Brian Connery said to me that when he looks at the vision of Oakland University in 2010, he does not see himself. I share that concern. I do not see the Department of Philosophy in this document. We hear a lot about technological enhancements and preparing students for jobs. While I favor technological enhancement and I think preparing students for jobs is an important part of our mission, I do not believe it is the totality of our mission. We are also engaged in the project of transmitting our civilization from one generation to the next. In the process we hope to liberate our students from ignorance, superstition and prejudice. This in turn will make them worthy leaders for a free society. To my mind that project is at least as important as getting our students their first jobs after graduation.

It is therefore not enough to say that we will be distinguished, for there are many ways of becoming distinguished, not all of them good. It is not enough to let market forces dictate the shape of the university. I will not support a vision statement, indeed I don't think a document counts as a vision statement, unless it takes up the general issue of the shape of the university. A real strategic vision would say "This is the kind of university we want Oakland University to be. This is the right balance between professional and academic programs. We choose to make Oakland University look like this because this is the best university we can make." The document before us does not do that. It is at best a collection of principles for developing a real vision statement.

If, as we grow, we are to change the balance between the academic programs and professional programs, let it be a deliberate choice resulting from a vigorous debate in this body and across the campus, rather than resulting from a random walk in academic marketing space.

In conclusion, because it is vague and incomplete in the ways I have discussed, I urge you to vote no on the Vision of Oakland University 2010.

Paul R. Graves

are

4/11/02

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page