



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 15 February 2001
Fifth Meeting

MINUTES

Members present: Alber, Andrews, Benson, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Carter, Chapman, Coppin, Didier, Dow, Downing, Eberly, Esposito, Estes, Gilroy, Goldberg, Grossman, Herman, Hildebrand, Kleckner, Kochenderfer, Long, MacKinder, Marks, Mayer, McNair, D. Moore, K. Moore, Moran, Mosby, Nakao, Olson, Rozek, Russell, Schwartz, Sevilla, Shablin, Sharma, Sieloff, Stamps, Sudol, Wood

Members absent: Abraham, Bhatt, Blanks, Early, Eberwein, Emrich, Fink, Gardner, Ginger, Haskell, Laski, McIntosh, Otto, Pfeiffer, Rusek, Schochetman, Sen

Summary of actions:

1. Information items:

- a. Certificate program for Nurse Anesthetists;
- b. General Education Task Force update-Ms. Awbrey

2. Approval of the minutes of the December 7, 2000 meeting. (Ms. Wood, Mr. Brieger)
Approved

3. Resolution to express concern over the Board of Trustee's reversal of building priorities. (Mr. Brieger, Ms. Wood) Substitute motion prepared by Mr. Russell (Mr. Russell, Mr. Moran)
Approved as amended..

4. Motion to endorse the report of the International Students and Scholars Task Force (Ms. Moore, Mr. Stamps) First reading.

4a. Motion to include in the endorsement a provision that the role of foreign languages be examined. (Mr. Brieger, Ms. Buffard-O'Shea)

5. Motion to endorse the Report of the Task Force on Research and Graduate Study. (Ms. Sieloff, Ms. Didier) First reading

6. Motion to recommend approval of a Master of Arts degree in Liberal Studies. (Mr. Andrews, Mr. Downing) First reading

7. Procedural motion staff Senate standing committees (Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Olson). Approved.

Mr. Esposito called the meeting to order at 3:15 and proceeded with the roll call. He reported that the Post Masters [Certificate](#) in Nurse Anesthesia has been reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council and then turned the floor over to Ms. Awbrey who provided a brief update on the progress of the General Education Task Force.

General Education

Ms. Awbrey distributed copies of the report, noting that it is also on the web (www2.oakland.edu/gened/report) and announced that two open forums would be held to

discuss the report. The forums will be on March 19th from 10-12 and March 22 from 2-4. In addition, members of the Task Force will be consulting with department chairs and the Student Congress. She highlighted various portions of the report, in particular the background summary, the concerns expressed by North Central, the learning outcomes matrix on p.9, the skills and values section, and on page 25, the major differences from the current general education curriculum. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea questioned the placement of languages in the knowledge area, noting that it also fits with skills. Knowledge areas are courses that will be taught, Ms. Awbrey responded, while skills cut across all knowledge areas. She concluded her brief report by thanking all the members of the Task Force and recognizing Ms. Piskulich for her assistance in developing the report.

Moving on to the regular business, the [minutes](#) of the December meeting were approved following a motion to do so by Ms. Wood and a second by Mr. Brieger.

Resolution

The first item of new business was continued discussion of a resolution expressing concern over the Board of Trustees reversing building priorities without consulting with those who had proposed the priorities. A [substitute resolution](#) was presented by Mr. Russell, seconded by Mr. Moran. Before accepting this substitute motion for his original, Mr. Brieger asked if the assertion that there was no consultation prior to the vote was really true. Mr. Russell responded that there was no open discussion before the vote; the Board had a private retreat where it may have been discussed but it was not discussed in a public forum. Mr. Esposito agreed, stating that it had not been discussed at the working session of the Board prior to their meeting. The Senate then voted to accept the substitute motion. With the Russell version now on the floor, Mr. Sevilla suggested a friendly amendment, that the phrase "working session" be changed to "*public working session*", since the Board may have discussed it among themselves prior to the vote.

Mr. Herman also asked if the intent of the resolution was to bring all capital outlay items to the Senate or just those relating to new construction, noting that not all construction projects go through capital outlay. Mr. Russell stated that he was concerned about his particular Board action. Mr. Herman then suggested that the phrase "*and all other major construction projects*" be added to the resolution, since the intent is to get campus consultation. The addition of that phrase was accepted. Mr. Downing supported the resolution, commenting that, in light of the fact that the capital outlay proposals won't be moving forward this year at all, the campus will be revisiting the area of building priorities next year. Mr. Esposito stated that the President and university administration are committed to both projects and that there will be other opportunities to consider this. The Senate then proceeded to approved the [revised Russell resolution](#).

International Studies

Moving on to the first item of new business, Ms. Moore moved and Mr. Stamps seconded a motion to endorse the recommendations of the [Oakland International Imperative](#), the report of the International Students and Scholars Task Force. Mr. Stamps commented that a lot of good work had gone into the report and that he felt it a step in the right direction. Ms. Benson expressed concern that the report did not include the major in international studies and worried that the academic component was neglected. Ms. Awbrey responded that the Task Force did not want to include anything specific about academic programs until there was a director on board and also felt the IS classes were the purview of the College. The IS classes

would remain in the College, asserted Mr. Downing, but raised the issue of how they would fit into the bigger picture, not only with regard to the report and proposals under discussion here but also with regard to general education. Mr. Esposito stated that academic programs belong in the academic units, but that the Center proposed in this report would provide a coordinating function.

In response to Mr. Grossman's query about a foreign language requirement, Ms. Awbrey indicated that it is part of general education but not part of the International Imperative report. She explained that the recommendations in the report deal with establishing a centralized support system for academic programs in international areas and that academic requirements belong in the academic units. Mr. Esposito concurred, stating that language requirements belong in the College or Schools or as part of general education. Ms. Buffard O'Shea stated that, while she understands that a foreign language requirement might be discussed elsewhere, she still found it puzzling to see a Task Force on international programs that doesn't say anything about foreign languages. Noting that most international studies programs were created in the 50s and 60s because of the Cold War, Mr. Moran argued that we are tinkering with a model that no longer applies, a model that should be rethought from the beginning. Mr. Dow, responding to Mr. Moran's comments, stated that he didn't think the concept of international studies is dated, adding that the principles of facilitating academic exchange is appropriate for this era of globalization.

In reply to a query from Mr. Brieger, Mr. Esposito noted that it would not be appropriate to amend the report but that the Senate could, if it wished, endorse the report subject to reservations or conditions or not endorse it. Mr. Brieger thought that one could add a recommendation that, in the next stage, the role of foreign language study should be included. Mr. Esposito added that the Task Force is done with their work and that discussion of a language requirement or the international studies classes would be more appropriate when considering general education requirements. Ms. Buffard O'Shea felt that we need to state that the university has a commitment to the study of foreign languages. And Mr. Esposito again pointed out again that the issues being raised do not belong with the report and proposals being discussed here but rather in the College or in a discussion of general education

Mr. Brieger, seconded by Ms. Buffard-O'Shea then proposed adoption of the proposal with the provision that that the role of foreign languages in the Imperative be examined. Mr. Stamps noted that a proposal to add a foreign language requirement requires curricular space, something that may be of concern to the Schools. Mr. Esposito felt that discussion of that issue should be in the context of general education.

Research and Graduate Studies Task Force Report

Having completed discussion and the first reading of the *International Studies Imperative*, the Senate then turned its attention to a motion to endorse the [report](#) of the Research and Graduate Studies Task Force. (Moved by Ms. Sieloff, seconded by Ms. Didier). Mr. Russell raised a question concerning the funding for research, noting that one needs to compare numbers of full time faculty; he wasn't sure the figures in Table 1 were a fair representation. He expressed concern over the decentralization that has occurred at OU, where responsibility and authority has been passed down while the resources remained centralized. Ms. Moore felt that graduate studies did not get as much attention as it should have, noting that even the online survey was research oriented. She stated that strong academic leadership is needed for graduate programs and that not enough attention is being given to the graduate students and

their problems. The report focuses on organizational problems and not enough on the fiscal problems, noted Mr. Brieger who added that the graduate programs need more money. Mr. Sevilla questioned the creation of two new associate vice provosts rather than a Dean and opined that we had a better situation when there was a Dean in charge, that things then ran reasonably well. The current decentralization was wanted by the Deans of the Schools and College but he asked if someone could explain how having vice provosts will solve the problems.

Mr. Esposito commented that, at the end of the process, and after he has heard the Senate's reactions, he will report back to the Senate as to what parts of the reports (IS and R&GS) will be implemented. He added that, when it comes to centralization or decentralization, OU tends toward the latter. Mr. Downing stated that the key is resources and wanted to call attention to Recommendation no. 5, adding that there would be more flexibility and we would be in a better position to support research if a lot of the indirect costs didn't end up in the general fund. As an aside with regard to decentralization/centralization issue, Mr. Esposito reminded everyone that OU will be instituting an annual faculty report that will cover a uniform time span. He was surprised to find that units at OU had different requirements and different time frames for their faculty reports and brought this up as an example of the decentralization ethos that is typical of OU. Ms. Jackson reported that the Graduate Council brought up the same issue regarding a dean vs an associate vice provost and felt that the office needed the stature of a vice provost in order to get the resources that would be needed. The Senate Planning Review Committee however, was not convinced of that need. The Task Force's view was that the departments lacked the authority and funds to get things done. Mr. Esposito related that at UMass-Boston, all indirect costs came to the Provost's Office and then went to support graduate programs. He isn't proposing this model for Oakland but noted that Oakland isn't supporting its graduate programs adequately.

Master of Arts in Liberal Studies

Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Downing, then

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President the approval of a Master of Arts in Liberal Studies.

Mr. Downing then read the following statement into the record:

The College of Arts and Sciences at Oakland University is pleased to present to the Senate for its consideration this [proposal](#) for a Master of Arts in Liberal Studies. The MALS degree program will be a highly challenging, interdisciplinary exploration of the liberal arts and sciences, designed for adult post-baccalaureate students wishing to broaden their education through rigorous study outside of Oakland's traditional areas of specialization. The objectives of this program are in harmony with the goals of a liberal education: that is, to develop critical thinking skills, encourage creativity and intellectual flexibility, and cultivate the individual's ability to integrate diverse fields of human knowledge and activity.

The idea of such a degree is nearly a half-century old and successfully has been practiced at many respected institutions of higher learning across the United States. The Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs, which Oakland has joined as an affiliated institution, has just celebrated its twenty-fifth year. This

program will extend to the graduate level the college's long-established interdisciplinary tradition, embodied in interdisciplinary concentrations and areas of study, such as international studies which we discussed earlier and women's studies which just implemented a new major a short time ago. The program will be built on the varied interdisciplinary pedagogical and research activities of the college's and associated faculty and will foster greater sharing of faculty knowledge and expertise, something that will further the intellectual mission and reputation of Oakland University in a fashion consistent with both the Strategic Plan and the Creating the Future initiative.

My appreciation and thanks go to everyone who worked on this proposal, especially Associate Dean Mary Papazian. We also appreciate the thoughtful comments and strong support of the college's Graduate Committee, Executive Committee and Assembly, and the Graduate Council, SPRC and SBRC

Other

With no discussion regarding the MALS, the Senate turned its attention to the final item of new business, a procedural motion to staff Senate standing committees which was moved by Mr. Schwartz and seconded by Mr. Olson. The motion was approved by the Senate.

Moving onto Good and Welfare, Mr. Esposito encouraged Senators to check the new "[Reports and Proposals](#)" site on the Senate home page which is replete with new reports and proposals that need Senate consideration. He also announced that the Master Plan Task Force [final report](#) will be completed soon and will be on the March Senate agenda. And since the President wants to take the Master Plan to the Board in April, the Senate will have only the month of March to consider the recommendations in the Master Plan. He also thought that additional Senate business might require an additional meeting in May. There were no other good and welfare items forthcoming and Ms. Gilroy made the motion to adjourn.

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

3/13/01

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page