



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Second Meeting
November 15, 2001

Minutes

Members present: Abiko, Alber, Aubry, Bazaz, Bertocci, D. Berven, Binkert, Clark, Coppin, Didier, Eberly, Eberwein, Frick, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Haddad, Hansen-Smith, Henke, Hildebrand, Klemanski, Lipman, Mabee, Mann, Machmut-Jhasi, Moudgil, Mukherji, Oden, Olson, Osthaus, Polis, Rozek, Russell, Schott-Baer, Schwartz, Schweitzer, Sevilla, Shablin, Sieloff, Smith, Surrey.

Members absent: K. Berven, Blanks, Downing, Emrich, Gardner, Haskell, Jarski, Khapoya, LeMarbe, Long, Otto, Schmidt, Sethi, Wedekind, Willoughby, Zingo.

Summary of actions:

1. Information items:

- a. Student Research Awards
- b. New charter schools
- c. General Education Learning Outcomes
- d. Academic Affairs Review Committee Report

Resolution regarding the Academic Affairs Review Committee Report (Mr. Graves, Mr. Olson) Approved.

e. Motion to instruct the Steeriing Committee to draft a resolution re-endorsing faculty liaisons to the Board
of Trustees (Mr. Russell, Ms. Hansen-Smith)

2. Approval of the September 20 minutes. (Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Sevilla)

3. Steering Committee Election

4. Senate committee appointments (Mr. Schwartz, Ms. Sieloff) Approved

The Provost called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m. and began the information items by announcing the establishment of a \$35,000 fund to support undergraduate research.

Currently the university has some units that provide student research awards but their availability is not widely known. As we move to support the concept of undergraduate education as a distinctive feature of Oakland, he is hoping to eventually provide 35-40 research awards for undergraduates although initially the number of awards may be smaller. The Provost's office will be working with the Research Office and hopes to solicit applications in the winter term. Mr. Moudgil indicated that he wants the research activities to be broadly based, not just centered in a few units. The awards can be used to support research activities, to enable students to attend conferences, to complete special projects and he asked the Senators to please share this opportunity with colleagues and students. He expects faculty mentors to sponsor student research and anticipates that it will be beneficial to both faculty and students.

A small ad hoc committee to review the applications will probably be established since the Research Committee has its hands full with faculty grant requests.

Mr. Moudgil also noted that the university will be reviewing applications for new charter schools. The Public School Application Review Committee will be looking at applications and the Senate may see the proposals early in the coming year.

The General Education Learning Outcomes have been forwarded to the Senate Planning Review Committee for their comments and input and Senate review will occur after the SPRC has finished their work on this report.

The next item, the [Report of the Academic Affairs Review Committee](#), was presented by Mr. Jaymes who was standing in for the AARC chair, Mr. Shepherd, who was unable to attend. Mr. Jaymes reviewed the events that brought about the establishment of the committee and summarized the 15 recommendations in the report. The AARC has presented the report to the Board of Trustees and asked them to form a committee to deal with the recommendations. Mr. Jaymes indicated that he was here at the Senate to answer any questions about the report and that he hoped that the Senate would approve a resolution to supporting the recommendations.

Mr. Lipman asked if the report assigned any culpability. In response, Mr. Jaymes said that if one were to poll the committee members as to whether the dismissal of the provost was justified, you would not find a unanimous opinion among members of the committee. Speaking for himself, he commented that there was enough blame to go around. Mr. R. Cramer, a member of the AARC, stated that he thought the report was fair and balanced, that there was no attempt to assign blame but rather to address the problems that we have. Mr. Mann noted that there were reports that were not available to the committee and asked if that hindered the committee in its deliberations. Mr. Jaymes responded that there was only one report that was not available, a report done by Price Waterhouse, Cooper which OU claims is protected by attorney-client privilege. The other item was the audit conducted by an outside firm and that hasn't been completed yet, although a preliminary copy was available and is being reviewed. Mr. Jaymes reported that both Russi and Esposito were very helpful in providing the information requested.

Mr. Binkert asked about the disposition of the Board members who served on the Committee. In response, Mr. Jaymes noted that Mr. Baskin was the first Board member appointed to the committee and Mr. Fischer was appointed as his replacement. The Board members did meet with the committee on several occasions but did not attend towards the end of the investigation and were not involved in the final deliberations. Mr. Polis commented that a lot of the recommendations relate to having an adequate budget and wondered what effect approving the recommendations will have if the real problem is the budget. Mr. Jaymes responded that the Board members stated that there's no more money; however the committee feels that there should be more of the money on the table, that programs and base budgets could be adequately funded. Depending on your point of view, Mr. Esposito claimed that Academic Affairs funding had gone down, Mr. Russi claimed it had increased. Probably both are correct. One was speaking of the base budget, the other, the expenditure budget. Mr. Polis noted that the problem is that there is no discretionary money available and that buildings are counted as an academic resource. Mr. Jaymes indicated that, according to one of the Trustees, buildings are not a big drain, many are self funded and are not a problem. The committee saw evidence that money is held back and doled out during the year. But that programs were still not adequately

funded. Given the finite amount of money, Mr. Bertocci wondered should we change the process so that money is not doled out. Yes, stated Mr. Jaymes, the process should be more open and more deliberative and consultative. The committee believes the money is there and more of it should be put on the table at the beginning of the year.

Mr.Graves , seconded by Mr. Polis, then

MOVED

- (1) That the Senate endorse the recommendations of the AARC;
- (2) That the Senate urges Dr. Russi, Dr. Moudgil and the Board of Trustees to enact the recommendations of the AARC;
- (3) That the Senate asks Dr. Moudgil and Dr. Russi to report back to the Senate at its last meeting of the academic year, i.e. April 2002, on what progress has been made in implementing the recommendations of the AARC.

Mr. Bertocci wondered if anything can be done without the Board's cooperation. There was no further discussion and the Senate approved the motion unanimously.

In the light of the AARC recommendation concerning a faculty liaison to the Board, Mr. Russell then took the opportunity to

MOVE that the Steering Committee be instructed by the Senate to come back with a new resolution re-endorsing the resolution the Senate passed concerning faculty liaisons to the Board of Trustees.

The motion was approved, also unanimously, following Ms. Hansen-Smith's second.

Having dispensed with information items, the roll call was taken and the [minutes](#) of the September 15th meeting were approved (moved by Ms. Eberwein, second by Mr. Sevilla) Before moving on to new business, Mr. Moudgil thanked the members of the AARC for doing their work with integrity and objectivity, for preparing a balanced report with recommendations that will advance the university's mission.

New Business

Mr. Russell, chair of the Senate Elections Committee, then conducted an election to replace Judette Haddad on the Steering Committee. Ms. Haddad had to resign due to work conflicts. The floor was opened for nominations, Ms. Alber was nominated, no further nominations were forthcoming and she was elected unanimously to the Steering Committee.

Turning next to the last item of new business, a motion to staff Senate committees, Mr. Schwartz so moved, Ms. Sieloff seconded, and the Senate approved the nominations as listed in the agenda.

Good and Welfare

Ms. Eberwein opened the good and welfare portion of the agenda by asking why the Senate has not yet seen the General Education Task Force [report](#), especially since there have already been open hearings and there's a second Task Force in place. Ms. Awbrey responded that the

document has gone to the Senate Planning Review Committee for their comments and then the report would come to the Senate for approval. Mr. Polis asked whether or not things in the report could be changed. Any changes in the learning outcomes, Ms. Awbrey stated, will need to come from the SPRC and the Senate. Input has been already gathered from the open hearings and from external reviewers and the Senate was updated on the Task Force progress and given copies of the report last year, [Feb. 19, 2001] prior to the open hearings. The learning outcomes will be on the Senate's agenda and then implementation will be planned, she concluded. Mr. Moudgil assured the Senate that the report would be moved forward following its review by SPRC. Mr. Grossman asked about the process. If the Senate endorses or endorses with reservations the learning outcomes, then the implementation group will work on the outcomes and develop catalog copy. Will the Senate then see the implementation plans? Ms. Awbrey responded that the Senate will look at just the learning outcomes in December but that the whole general education package including implementation, will come to the Senate sometime in the future. Mr. Binkert wondered what would happen in the implementation group found that some of the learning outcomes could not be implemented. Ms. Awbrey replied that she hasn't heard anything like that so far from the implementation task force, but if that turns out to be the case, then we will deal with it. Mr. Polis asked what happens if the Senate changes the learning outcomes. Mr. Moudgil responded that the Senate is advisory only and that while he hopes its recommendations are honored, if something can't be done, we will need to deal with it.

With no further discussion or items of concern, the meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Submitted by
Linda Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

12/04/01

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