

## Oakland University Senate

Eighth Meeting

April 30, 1998

### *Minutes*

Members present: Alber, Bertocci, Blume, Connellan, Cronn, Downing, Eberwein, Frankie, Gilroy, Hildebrand, Keane, Landau, Lilliston, Moore, Mukherji, Olson, Polis, Reynolds, Rozek, Rush, Sieloff, Simon, Sudol, Wood

Members absent: Barnett, Belanger, Benson, Berger, Blanks, Boddy, Brieger, Dillon, Doane, Goslin, Grossman, Halsted, Hansen Smith, Haskell, Herold, Jarski, Johnson, Lombard, Long, Longan, Mabee, Mahamwal, McNair, Miller, Moudgil, Otto, Papazian, Patterson, Riley, Schochetman, H. Schwartz, R. Schwartz, Sen, Speer, Weng

#### Summary of actions:

1. Approval of the minutes of the April 16, 1998 Senate meeting. (Mr. Olson, Mr. Downing) Approved
2. Senate Library Committee Report- Ms. Eberwein
3. Motion to staff Senate standing Committees (Ms. Reynolds, Mr. Dillon) Approved.
4. Motion to revise the General Education requirements for students pursuing a second undergraduate degree (Mr. Grossman, Ms. Gilroy) Second reading. Motion to postpone until the fall (Mr. Connellan, Ms. Rush) Approved.
5. Motion to amend the policy for admission of home schooled students to delete the age restriction (Mr. Connellan, Mr. Long) Approved.
6. Motion to amend the policy for admission of home schooled students to by changing the language in 3a of the policy. (Ms. Alber, Ms. Eberwein) Approved.
7. Amended motion to establish a policy for admission of home-schooled students (Ms. Alber, Ms. Eberwein) Approved.
7. Discussion of sign at Adams/Walton

The Provost called the meeting to order and entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the [April 16th meeting](#). Mr. Olson so moved, Mr. Downing seconded and the minutes were approved as distributed. Attention was called to the schedule of Senate meetings for next year that had been distributed with the agenda. The Provost noted that the dates were selected in order to mesh better with meetings of the Board of Trustees and its committees.

In response to some concerns and rumors, Ms. Eberwein then provided a brief Senate Library Committee report dealing with the proposed journal cancellations. She applauded the vigilance of her colleagues in defense of the library but added that she didn't want them to worry unnecessarily. Although there are some problems with the library budget, nevertheless, the library budget has grown each year. Unfortunately the cost of journals has inflated at a greater rate and out paced the library increases. Journal subscriptions are requiring more and more of the library's budget every year at the expense of the book budget. And while everyone recognizes that disciplines vary in their reliance on books or journals, the library can't afford to have this disproportion continue to grow with more and more money being spent on journals and less and less on books.

The Library Dean and faculty are working with the Senate Library Committee to develop a plan for

dealing with this situation. One proposal under consideration is to drop those journals which cost the most per use and to reallocate the savings to the book budget. The Library Committee, which has a representative from all the academic units, has reviewed the proposal and each member has consulted with their colleagues. The Committee has recommended that the cancellation project be done in stages with \$100,000 being cut this year, much of it coming from reference print indexes which are now available in electronic format. Also, journals that cost more than \$75 per use would be canceled. Each department is being asked to review the list of potential cancellations and if they feel a specific title must be maintained, they can so indicate and also indicate then where the money should come from. The Library Committee also recommended that the most intensive work be deferred until the fall when additional cuts will be identified. Ms. Eberwein emphasized that this is not a matter of giving up access since articles will still be obtainable through a variety of means, it only means we are giving up ownership. The other alternative is to find a way to raise more money for the Library. She assured the Senate that there will be a great deal of consultation as the project progresses.

Mr. Willoughby asked how usage was determined. Ms. Eberwein replied that for the last several years, each journal has been bar coded and counted when shelvers reshelve the items. She added that this is why there are those large DO NOT RESHELVE signs posted all around the fourth floor. Also the library reviews all requests for copies and if a particular journal is requested frequently, a subscription to it may be added or reinstated. She commented that many times subscriptions are begun based on specific research interests of the time or of a particular faculty member and that those interests may change over time and yet the subscription may be continued although no one now is using the journal. Ms. Awbrey wondered if the usage study could ascertain differences between undergraduate and graduate usage, commenting that graduate students might be using more expensive journals. Ms. Eberwein responded that the Library and Library Committee are using the Policy on Information Ownership and Access that was approved a few years ago. This policy establishes a priority to support undergraduates and high enrollment graduate programs through building the permanent collection and supporting other programs and research through access. She recognized that there is a tension between undergraduate programs and the university's current trend toward establishing specialized graduate programs. But, she added, the priority is undergraduate use and encouraged her colleagues to get their students over there. She noted too, that the North Central Survey of students indicated that OU undergraduates are using the library less than their counterparts at other institutions.

Taking up the first item of old business, a motion to approve the members listed in the agenda to the Academic Computing Committee, Ms. Reynolds reported that Mr. Moore, who had been nominated to serve on this committee at the last meeting, has agreed to serve instead on the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee. So, in addition to approving the membership of the Academic Computing Committee, she added Mr. Moore's name in nomination to the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee. The motion was approved.

The next agenda item, a motion to change the general education requirements for second undergraduate degree students (informally known as U2s), was opened for discussion. Ms. Gilroy reported that of 144 U2s at Oakland, 51 were education majors. She gathered some information from other state institutions. At Wayne State, there is a two part general education component; they do not require U2's to complete the competency part (writing, math, computer literacy) but do require students to meet the component which includes the sciences, history, social sciences, foreign language, etc. although they are liberal in evaluating previous coursework. At Central Michigan, students must complete the general education requirements, even if the students had graduated from Central the first time. She reported that of 26 recent OU U2 graduates, some took no general ed classes and some took three or four.

Ms. Andersen, chair of the General Education Committee, stated that this came to the Committee's attention because the demands made upon U2 students seemed to create a serious inequity problem,

given the waiving of the general education requirements for MACRAO students. She indicated that they hadn't done much research since they thought it was pretty obvious. However, with all the discussion and concerns expressed so far, she stated that the Committee would be comfortable waiting to deal with the motion until the fall. Mr. Blume thought that if there is going to be further discussion perhaps the question should be raised as to whether or not Oakland wants second degree students. If so, the institution should be friendly and work toward making the second degree qualifications reasonable since the career literature indicates that there will be an increasing number of such students. Ms. Eberwein commented that many students are attracted to the STEP program (secondary education), that STEP was intended to be and remain a small program and added that we don't need to smooth the way for STEP students. She also found the wording of the motion contradictory--to complete the general education requirements (but no more than eight) and said she was shocked to find that the MACRAO agreement now applies to a larger group of people that it originally did. She averred that equality is not necessarily best achieved by lowering standards and that general education is a good experience.

In response to a query about the U2 students, who they are, from what institutions did they get their first degree, Ms. Gilroy replied that admissions is a separate system so she couldn't access information about their prior educational background. Mr Willoughby agreed that general education is a valuable and necessary part of an undergraduate degree. However, the question as he sees it is how much should we require the second time around. Mr. Olson responded that many students come to OU with degrees that don't match the gen ed areas Oakland requires and so need to take courses in the areas that were lacking. Ms. Andersen pointed out that even an OU graduate coming back for a second degree may have to take additional general education classes since the requirements are different now. She added that she is uncomfortable requiring additional gen ed classes from students who have satisfied U of M or MSU's general education requirements.

The Provost commented that we should also get input from the advisors and Mr. Simon added that it would be useful to know if students are actually deciding to go elsewhere because of the general education. In reply to Mr. Connellan's query about what general education courses U2 students take, Ms. Gilroy answered that it varies but that the courses generally are chosen with the advice of a counselor. Mr. Connellan pointed out that some students may take more general education classes than are required and thus the data available doesn't indicate how many courses were really required for the degree. Mr. Downing wondered how many petitions of exception are submitted by U2's regarding general education. Ms. Gilroy responded that, during the period she surveyed (1997-98), none were submitted but there have been petitions in the past. Ms. Woods opined that the requirement doesn't seem to her likely to scare off students but that fully completing the general education requirements may present older students with more hoops than they expected. Since students would be working with an advisor to identify the most important general education areas, she felt that there was a good case for limiting the requirement to 8 credits. At this point, Mr. Connellan moved to postpone further discussion and action on the motion until the first meeting of the fall semester. Ms. Eberwein suggested that the first meeting of the fall might not permit enough time for committee discussion. Mr. Connellan agreed and amended his motion to postpone discussion and action until the fall term. Ms. Rush seconded the motion and the Senate proceeded to approve it.

The Provost then turned to the next agenda item, a motion to establish an admissions policy for home schooled students and, as the initial item of discussion, a motion to amend the proposed policy by deleting mention of the age restriction. Mr. Connery, chair of the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee, expressed his support for the amendment. He stated that University's legal office found the age restriction inequitable since it isn't required of other students. Mr. Willoughby noted that the age requirement seemed a good idea and asked if Oakland is prepared to deal with an 11 or 12 year old applicant. Mr. Connery countered by wondering how different a 12 year old home schooled applicant would be compared to a public or parochial student for whom the age restriction would not apply. Mr.

Willoughby commented that the situation was unlikely to happen in a public school setting. Home schooling doesn't necessarily make you get through any faster, noted Mr. Olson. Mr. Bertocci noted that we are requiring home schooled students to take the ACT in order to be admitted and opined that very few students of 11 or 12 would be able to achieve an acceptable score. Mr. Connellan stated his belief that we are not very likely to get many applicants under 16 and explained that he offered the amendment in order to stave off legal action for the one or two who might apply. Mr. Bertocci pointed out that we could also solve the age problem by imposing age limits across the board. Ms. Woods stated that admitting anyone under 16 would be an exceptional case and that she felt the age limit across the board might be a good idea. Ms. Alber spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that Ms. Gerrits had recommended no age restriction. There are some special high school students under 16 taking courses but not as matriculants. Mr. Keane pointed that Johns Hopkins set up a program providing for enrollment of young students of exceptional academic talent and found that there are a number of eighth graders who can perform quite well on the ACTs and SATs. He also noted that, if students complete all their courses at a high school and if they are admitted, they can attend college classes with the local district paying their costs. The motion to amend the proposed policy by dropping the age restriction was then voted upon and approved.

Returning to discussion of the main motion, Ms. Alber moved to amend the motion by substituting the following text the first sentence in 3a (change is underlined)

3. Home schooled students who do not receive sufficiently high scores on the ACT or GED have one of the following options:
  - a. They may complete two semesters at a community college, carrying at least 24 hours of transferable credit, with a minimum of a 2.50 cumulative GPA. Then they may reapply to the university, using their performance in those courses as a credible demonstration of college level ability.

Ms. Eberwein seconded the motion to amend. Mr. Connery explained that this change was proposed so that the standards for home-schooled students would parallel those currently in place for high school graduates. Mr. Olson asked if it was 24 or 26 credits. Lacking a catalog for reference, the Provost commented that the intent is that they be the same and with the Senate's concurrence, directed the secretary to insert the correct number of credits [it is 24] in the amendment. With no further discussion, the amendment was approved.

Speaking in favor of the main motion, Mr. Connery stated that the University Legal Office is strongly supportive of adopting a policy. Mr. Landau expressed his opposition to the motion, stating that he is uncomfortable with the policy of accepting students based only on ACT scores. He felt that students need the high school record and experience, the exposure to different teachers and teaching styles, that with high school graduates we have a whole host of information (GPA's, letters of recommendation) available about the student in addition to their transcripts. He did not feel that it is inappropriate to have a more stringent admission policy for someone without a high school diploma. The policy assumes that any student with an ACT of 20 can be accepted, noted Mr. Keane and added that this is a one dimensional way of looking at home-schooled students. Ms. Rush pointed out that with high school graduates, we have two scores, their GPA and ACT and so it is a one dimensional approach vs. a two dimensional one. Mr. Connery pointed out that OU's current admissions policy is minimal, that OU doesn't require ACT's, and so it is one dimensional for both. High school graduates need to present their GPA's, home schooled students their ACT scores. This discussion raises questions about whether or not our current admission policy meets our needs noted Mr. Blume.

Mr. Willoughby commented that other schools use on-site interviews and resumes as part of their admissions requirements. He felt that we are probably not going to have any problems except for some

parents who refuse to have their students get GED or ACT scores and stated that generally home schooled students are well-rounded and multi-dimensional. Mr. Keane still felt uncomfortable with only scores as the basis for admission and expressed a preference for added interviews. He also added that most home schooled students come into the public school system before the 12th grade so we would be dealing with a very small subset. The Provost commented that many of the questions raised concern the current OU admissions policy and thought it would be appropriate to have the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee review the policy. Ms. Alber stressed that the strength of this motion is included as item 4, the ongoing monitoring of the policy. Stating that home schooling is an accepted form of education by the state, Ms. Theisen expressed concern about placing an added burden on home schooled students. Mr. Simon asked if the same issue would apply with requiring a higher ACT score of the home schooled students that we do for high school graduates. But, pointed out Mr Connery, the ACT requirement isn't higher; it is the OU average. He added that since home schooled students cannot offer anything like a diploma, they must present some evidence of ability to do college level work and that the Home School Legal Defense Fund approves the ACT as a standard measure.

Speaking to the issue of equity, Mr. Landau asked what would prevent a high school graduate from presenting only an ACT score and not the GPA. Ms. Gilroy asked what would happen if a home schooled student presented a portfolio for writing placement. Ms. Andersen responded that they would review the portfolio, adding that the reviewer wouldn't even know it was submitted by a home schooled student. Mr. Downing stated that he feels much more comfortable with having a policy that includes monitoring its impact than he does with not having a policy at all. At that point he called the question, the motion was voted upon and approved.

Moving on to good and welfare items, Mr. Bertocci asked if there were any additional information available about the sign at Walton and Adams. The Provost read the following response from Mr. Brieger, former chair of the Campus Development and Environment Committee:

The CDC was presented with several sign options which we firmly rejected because they were not in a style consonant with our other campus signage. We recommended that "they" go back to the design firm which did the other signage which "they" did. It was our understanding that there would be some commercial ads on the sign. We did not see the final version of the sign, or the planned Pepsi ad. It is clear that we (CDEC) will need to be part of the approval process for the planned commercial portion of the signage to prevent such over-emphasis on the commercial part of the sign.

Mr. Landau commented that not only is the advertisement so very prominent, it is also very difficult to read the other part of the sign. Mr. Connellan advised that the sign was part of the agreement the university signed with the Palace of Auburn Hills and was approved by the Board of Trustees. The Provost added that the University's communications and marketing personnel are working with the Palace on developing policies regarding signage. With no other business to deal with, the 1997-1998 Senate adjourned at 4:25.

Submitted by Linda L. Hildebrand  
Secretary to the University Senate

[Return to Senate Home Page](#)