



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Sixth Meeting
March 14, 2002

Minutes

Members present: Alber, D. Berven, K. Berven, Binkert, Clark, Coppin, Downing, Eberly, J. Eberwein, Frick, Gardner, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Hansen-Smith, Henke, Hildebrand, Jarski, Kheir, S. Klemanski, Latcha, LeMarbe, Long, Mabee, Mann, McNair, Mosby, Moudgil, Mukherji, Olson, Osthaus, Rozek, Russell, Sangeorzan, Schmidt, Schott-Baer, Schwartz, Schweitzer, Sethi, Sevilla, Shablin, Sieloff, Smith, Stamps, Surrey, Willoughby

Members absent: Abiko, Aubry, Bazaz, Blanks, Didier, Emrich, Haddad, Khapoya, Lipman, Machmut-Jhasi, Otto

Summary of actions:

1. Motion to approve the minutes of the February 14, 2002 meeting. (Mr. Frick, Mr. Olson) Approved.
2. Motion to recommend approval of a bachelor of science program in Financial Information Systems. (Mr. Gardner, Ms. Eberwein) Second reading. Approved.
3. Motion to recommend approval of a bachelor of science program in Wellness, Health Promotion and Injury Prevention. (Mr. Olson, Mr. Mann) Second reading. Approved.
4. Motion to endorse the General Education Learning Outcomes as presented in the report of the General Education Task Force I and amended through open faculty forums. (Mr. Graves, Mr. Henke) First reading.
 - 4a. Motion to amend the learning outcomes by adding to the knowledge list: " Demonstrate and understanding of foreign languages and cultures" (Ms. Mabee, Mr. Downing)
 - 4b. Motion to amend the learning outcomes by adding "and/or national origins" to "Recognize and appreciate a wide variety of literary forms. " (Ms. Mabee, Mr. Downing)
 - 4c. Motion to amend the learning outcomes by adding to the knowledge list: a) An understanding of the Darwinian basis of the interconnectedness of life; b) Knowledge of the evolutionary basis of humanness; c) An understanding of the biological basis of health and medical issues. (Mr. Berven, Mr. Downing)
5. Motion to direct General Education Task Force II to 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 the General Education Task Force I, together with all of its addenda and related Senate Committee reports. (Ms. Mukherji, Mr. Binkert) First reading.
 - 5a. Motion to amend the motion to read: Moved that General Education Task Force II recommend to the Senate a general education program taking into account the report of the General Education Task Force I , together with all of its addenda and related Senate Committee reports and Senate minutes. (Mr. Binkert, Ms. McNair)
 - 5b. Motion to waive the second reading. (Mr. Olson, Mr. Henke) Not approved. [28 nays, 10

yeas]

6. Motion that the Senate recommend that a 2002-3 faculty/staff phone directory be printed and distributed to all faculty and staff no later than October 1, 2002. This directory should use the format of the 2000-2001 directory and include the office location and office phone numbers for every faculty member with an office and a phone. The directory should be as accurately as possible show the full time faculty as of August 1, 2002. (Mr. Russell, Mr. Sevilla) Approved with 8 dissents.

After calling the meeting to order the Provost reported that the student resolution regarding listing the majors on their diplomas has been referred to appropriate Senate committees and administrative offices for their input and advice. The secretary then proceeded with the roll call and after that, the minutes from the last February 14th meeting were approved as distributed. (Moved Mr. Frick; seconded Mr. Olson)

Mr. Moudgil then directed attention to the first item of old business, the second reading of a motion to recommend approval of a program on financial information systems:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of a program leading to a Bachelor of Science in Financial Information Systems

There was no discussion and the motion was approved unanimously.

Turning to the next item, a second reading of a proposal to establish a program in Wellness, Injury Prevention, Mr. Olson shared with the Senate excerpts of a letter speaking to the timeliness of the program. Again, there were no questions or discussion, and the motion as presented below was approved unanimously

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of a program leading to a Bachelor of Science in Wellness, Health Promotion and Injury Prevention . (Mr. Olson, Mr. Mann)

Under the auspices of new business, Mr. Graves, seconded by Mr. Henke proposed the following motion:

MOVED that the Senate endorse the General Education Learning Outcomes as presented in the report of General Education Task Force I and amended through open faculty forums.

Mr. Moran opened the discussion by questioning whether the Senate has the authority to speak for the faculty as a whole since there are non-faculty on the Senate and expressed concern that the faculty as a whole will not have an opportunity to vote on the general education outcomes. Along the same lines, Mr. Russell noted that the faculty on the General Education Task Force I were appointed by the administration, not elected from the faculty.

Mr. Binkert explained that the Senate is not being asked to endorse a final list, that changes can and will be made as Task Force II considers all the information available to it. Mr. Berven thought that Task Force II would feel constrained to use the list and furthermore, that the list had too many items and yet was still missing some. Ms. Awbrey and Mr. Grossman agreed that the list was too exhaustive, Ms Awbrey commenting that we need to distill them and Mr.

Grossman noting that under critical thinking, items listed as quantitative reasoning are not quantitative. The problem of assessment was on Ms. Sieloff's mind, as she noted the need to reduce and consolidate the learning outcomes in order to assess them.

Mabee was concerned over the absence of foreign languages and moved several additions to the list with Mr. Stamps providing the second

MOVED that the Learning Outcomes knowledge list be amended as indicated below:

Add: -Demonstrate an understanding of foreign language and culture;
Add the phrase "and/or national origins" to the bullet :-Recognize and appreciate a wide variety of literary forms.

The latter half of this motion was chosen in lieu of an additional bullet that would have said: Discuss the contributions to literature of key foreign literary texts in translation. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea expressed her preference for the additional bullet rather than the edited version of the existing text. Mr. Goslin reported that the SPRC had issued an amended report in which the Committee expressed its support for the inclusion of language and culture as a general education outcome.

Mr. Berven then offered a further amendment, seconded by Mr. Downing

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.

Ms. Awbrey pointed out that general education outcomes will only be a small part of what is taught in a course. How would one assess the 82 outcomes wondered Mr. Willoughby. Ms. Hansen-Smith suggested that we consider voting on the general concept of the list of outcomes and not get into the details. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea countered that it is not a concept, and that what is on the list will have a strong impact on general education. Ms. Eberwein was reminded of a line from Whitman, "I discover myself on the verge of the usual mistake," adding that we've been through this before, that once before a group had presented a program that was rejected and had to start over. In terms of the learning outcomes, she remarked that none of us want to have students graduate who aren't knowledgeable but she is concerned about where writing, ethnic diversity, literature and American studies fit into an impossibly long list. She also expressed concern over blending international studies with ethnic diversity and concluded by stating that the list needs to be streamlined.

Mr. Moudgil noted the task is very difficult, since there would also be great concerns if the list were very short. He pointed out that the university is confronted with the issue of general education and asked if the learning outcomes are in principle acceptable. He indicated that the concerns are being noted but that we do need to move this process forward. Mr. Gardner observed that his previous experience with general education revision at SUNY-Binghamton had involved a representative group that kept their constituents informed during the process. He thought having a smaller group deal with the issues and carry it through to the end might

work better rather than have the Senate involved at this intermediary stage. However, Ms. Buffard-O'Shea reported that during Task Force I's deliberations, modern languages expressed concerns but were told not to worry about them since the report would be discussed at the Senate. Now she is concerned that if we don't talk about their concerns now, the existing list may be the one we end up with. Mr. Moran opined that the list of learning outcomes will constrain and direct Task Force II and that now is the time to raise concerns. With such a long list, it will be difficult to decide what it is that students should know.

Mr. Sevilla suggested that perhaps it was no use going forward with an unworkable plan and that Task Force II should be charged to come up with a second list of learning outcomes. We need to move forward Mr. Moudgil urged and indicated that the Senate could approve the list of learning outcomes in principle and charge Task Force II to work on implementation. In response to a query about the timeline, Ms. Awbrey indicated that Task Force II is prepared to work through the summer. Mr. Grossman disagreed with the idea of endorsing the learning outcomes in principle since the Senate is being asked to endorse a specific set of outcomes and argued that this is the time for discussion. Ms. McNair expressed concern over the perception that faculty were not adequately represented in the groups that have been involved with the learning outcomes. Mr. Russell suggested that we ask Task Force I to give us a list of learning outcomes that would be expected of every OU graduate rather than voting on something that is going to be distilled and changed by another group. Mr. Henke commented that at some point the Senate will be asked to vote on a revised General Education program. He felt that we are just micro-managing the process, that the next motion on the agenda directs Task Force II to take everything into account all the discussion, and that the Senate should add whatever they feel is missing from the learning outcomes and move on. Mr. Moudgil emphasized the fact that faculty were the ones who developed the list of learning outcomes, adding that there's no way we would agree on all of them. Mr. Binkert thought that if this motion doesn't pass, then we might amend the second motion on the agenda, forget the learning outcomes and direct Task Force II to proceed to work on the general education revisions.

Ms. Awbrey pointed out that Senate input was wanted. This is the opportunity for the Senate to indicate what is on the list that we don't want as well as to indicate any additions. She also emphasized that the learning outcomes were what the faculty said were important and that it will be the faculty who will decide how these will be incorporated into their classes and how they will be assessed. Since the North Central Accreditation team was very concerned over the lack of learning outcomes for general education, we need as an institution to address this issue and the list of learning outcomes was a first step. Ms. Hansen-Smith commented favorably on the skills section although she wondered why the learning outcomes were so specific and not more generalized. Ms. Awbrey noted that the learning outcomes are not discipline specific and so may be learned in a variety of classes. Ms. Piskulich reported that they were told to think as broadly as possible, as if there were no budget constraints, hence the large number of outcomes and skills. Ms. Hansen-Smith thought that the skills are the essential things while Mr. Graves indicated his opinion that skills are not separable from knowledge.

Mr. Kheir worried about how many credits would be involved and pointed out that many of the professional programs are very constrained because of the large number of required classes their majors much take. The list was long, stated Ms. Berven, but not long enough; the request to include foreign languages was denied because it was department specific but there are other learning outcomes on the list that are department specific. She suggested going back to the drawing board and defining what students should know in a different way. Mr. Osthaus indicated that he will vote against the motion and expressed support for Mr. Binkert's proposal

to have Task Force II move forward. He stated that we need to look at what we are doing now, to define outcomes and figure out how to assess them.

Next the Senate's attention was directed to the second item of new business. Ms. Mukherji moved and Mr. Binkert seconded the following motion:

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.

Mr. Binkert then proceed to propose an amendment to the motion to delete the words "based on the Learning Outcomes as endorsed by the Senate" and to add to the end "and Senate minutes," an amendment which was quickly seconded by Ms. McNair. The amended motion would then read:

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 the General Education Task Force I , together with all of its addenda and related Senate Committee reports **and Senate minutes**.

Ms. McNair opened the discussion by wondering if the Senate should waive the second reading on this motion. Mr. Binkert commented that while Task Force I was instructed not to pay attention to the cost implications, Task Force II is to consider the costs of implementation and in particular, to consider what is implementable, given the resources we have. Mr. Moudgil thought that Task Force II could be asked to engage the university in dialogues over the summer, adding that many of the learning outcomes are things on which we all agree. Mr. Downing asked if the amendment might also include Senate reports as well as the minutes of the discussions. Ms. Eberwein stated that the knowledge areas are the core of the current system and that Task Force II might look at the existing classes to see how they fit. She added that skills are important but a skills oriented general education requirement also means smaller classes, and may require additional faculty and classes. Mr. Olson endorsed the idea of getting Task Force II underway. Mr. Berven also thought that the existing general education classes should be reviewed against the list of learning outcomes and that it is important to consider how assessment of the learning outcomes can be accomplished. Ms. Piskulich responded that it is difficult to assess what we have because in none of the courses are learning outcomes specifically stated. She felt that much of the existing general education will continue. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea pointed out that the Assessment Committee requires learning outcomes and assessment tools and stated that we could assess what we have now. Assessment for departments is different from assessment for general education purposes, replied Ms. Awbrey, adding that general education needs its own purposes and goals. Mr. Moran disagreed with the idea that we need quick action and argued against hurrying this proposal through the governance.

Mr. Wiggins reminded the Senate that the list of learning outcomes originated with faculty, that these are values the faculty has identified as important for general education. It is important for the university to clarify and articulate the learning outcomes as a way of saying what general education should be and probably already is. He wondered why we seem so afraid of learning outcomes as a part of general education and noted that great care was taken

not to departmentalize them. And found it surprising that we don't seem willing to acknowledge that we already have learning outcomes and should be willing to articulate them. Some of the learning outcomes may be better sited in the major and minors, he admitted but the general list represents the things that Oakland faculty said they valued as general education concept. Ms. Mukherji thought that we need to evaluate current general education classes using the list of learning outcomes but Ms. Awbrey argued against that. Ms. Smith said that we need to establish a baseline in order to know where we are now. Ms. Awbrey countered that the faculty themselves had a poor evaluation of the current general education matrix and said she doesn't want to spend another year looking at the same material.

Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Henke, then moved to waive the second reading on the Binkert amendment. Mr. Graves argued against the motion, stating that Task Force II was hoping for a clear statement of the Senate opinion of the learning outcomes. Mr. Moudgil noted that there doesn't seem to be any opposition to the learning outcomes as they have been presented but that some additions have been proposed. Saying he understands Task Force II's desire to begin work, Mr. Downing however stated that he would favor continuing the discussion. Ms. Alber and Mr. Grossman agreed that addition time for consultation and for processing the information was needed. The motion to waive the second reading was then voted upon and defeated. [Those in favor: Binkert, Hansen-Smith, Henke, Latcha, Mann, Olson, Schweitzer, Sevilla, Shablin, Stamps. Those opposed: Alber, D. Berven, K. Berven, Clark, Coppin, Downing, Eberly, Eberwein, Frick, Gardner, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Kheir, Klemanski, LeMarbe, Long, Mabee, Mukherji, Osthaus, Russell, Sangeorzan, Schmidt, Schott-Baer, Schwartz, Sieloff, Smith, Willoughby]

Mr. Moudgil then directed the Senate's attention to any good and welfare items they might have. Mr. Mann brought up the continuing frustration of dealing with e-mail that is not working as it should. Ms. Klemanski responded that there are three consultants who have been brought in to deal with this problem and to come up with solutions. The Provost noted that Oakland is not the only university that is experiencing email problems.

Ms. Mabee raised the concern over the omission of part-time faculty from the new, recently released telephone book. Ms. Klemanski indicated that the administration is aware that the new phone book is far from satisfactory, that the problem is that all the information comes from Banner and there is clearly a need to clean up the data as well as to decide who or what categories of employees will be listed. She promised that the next edition would be much better. Mr. Russell, seconded by Mr. Sevilla then proposed the following motion:

MOVED that the Senate recommend that a 2002-3 faculty/staff phone directory be printed and distributed to all faculty and staff no later than October 1, 2002. This directory should use the format of the 2000-2001 directory and include the office location and office phone numbers for every faculty member with an office and a phone. The directory should be as accurately as possible show the full time faculty as of August 1, 2002.

Mr. Stamps wondered why just full time faculty were to be included. Mr. Russell explained that most full time appointments have been made by Aug. 1 while part-time hires frequently occur at the last minute. He thought the electronic telephone book would suffice to list the part-time faculty. Mr. Moudgil suggested that if faculty wanted a print directory they should print it out from the electronic version on the web. Ms. Klemanski explained that missing information such as offices are not included because no one was assigned to input the data. Ms. Berven thought it important to include part-time faculty, Ms. Alber disagreed, saying that part-timers

come and go and the department should issue their own directory of faculty. The motion was then approved with 8 dissents. [Those voting against: Gardner, Frick, Henke, LeMarbe, Klemanski, Olson, Shablin, Willoughby]

Having completed the business of the day, a motion to adjourn was called for, several Senators complied and the Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

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

4/4/02

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page