



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Seventh Meeting

Minutes

April 4, 1996

Members present: Andrews, Buffard-O'Shea, Connellan, Dahlgren, Downing,, Fliedner, Garfinkle, Hahn, Hansen, Haskell, Hildebrand, Hovanesian, Jackson, Jarksi, Kazarian, Keane, Liboff, Lilliston, Long, Meehan, Meuser, Miller, Moore, Nesbary, Olson, Otto, Pipan, Polis, Reynolds, Rice, Riley, Rozek, Russi, Sahu, Sevilla, Slywka, Speer, Tower

Members absent: Benson, Briggs-Bunting, Bryant, Caradonna, Christina, Cole, Dillon, Finucane, Frankie, Gilroy, Gordon, Graham, Kheir, Kleckner, Moran, Papazian, Perry, Reddy, Rohde, Schochetman Schwartz, Talbert, Wharton

Summary of actions;

1. Approval of March 14, 1996 Senate minutes, as corrected. (Andrews, Moran)
2. Motion to recommend to the President and the Board the establishment of a program in Software Engineering leading to the Master of Science degree. (Mr. Dahlgren, Mr. Andrews) Second reading. Approved.
3. Motion to recommend to the President and the Board the establishment of a program leading to a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Applied Mathematical Sciences. (Mr. Dahlgren, Mr. Downing) Second reading. Approved.
4. Motion that, during the term for which they are appointed, no member of a Senate Committee shall receive any money, award, or anything of value as a result of an action or recommendation of a Senate committee of which they are a member. (Mr. Andrews, Ms. Jackson) First reading.
- 5 Motion to staff Senate standing committees. (Ms. Jackson, Mr. Andrews). Procedural motion. Approved.

Welcoming the assembled body, Mr. Russi called the meeting to order at 3:10 or thereabouts. The March 14th Senate minutes were approved (moved Mr. Andrews, seconded Ms. Jackson) with a few changes. Mr. Connellan and Liboff noted that they were indeed present and Mr. McKay advised that his statement should have been included in the minutes.

Turning to information items. Mr. Russi called the Senate's attention to a report from University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction on CLEP. He noted that when the Senate revised the CLEP guidelines it requested UCUI to review the effect of those changes in five years and to report back to the Senate. This report fulfills that Senate mandate. Any comments or questions regarding the report should be addressed to UCUI.

Old Business

The first two items of old business were approved with dispatch with no additional discussion.

Approved were motions that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board the establishment of a program in Software Engineering leading to the Master of Science degree and the establishment of a program leading to a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Applied Mathematical Sciences.

New Business

The first item of new business was a motion from the Steering Committee. Mr. Andrews

MOVED that, during the term for which they are appointed, no member of a Senate Committee shall receive any money, award, or anything of value as a result of an action or recommendation of a Senate committee of which they are a member.

Following a second by Mr. Dahlgren, Mr. Olson opened the discussion by commenting that the School of Health Sciences has had members on that committee who have been given research awards. He added that this policy would preclude those who do research from serving on the committee. Mr. Andrews replied that the restriction is less than one might think. The Research Excellence Award is given in restricted areas, the cycle for the award is known ahead of time and faculty could plan accordingly. The Steering Committee regularly has more volunteers for that committee than there are vacancies. He added that the Teaching and Learning Committee has always had the restriction that individuals who are serving on the committee cannot be considered for the Teaching Excellence award. Mr. Olson countered that he is not talking about the Research Excellence Award but rather awards to do research projects. Mr. Andrews pointed out that Research Committee members are currently barred from applying for research funds from the Committee and that this policy has been in effect for 12 or so years. Mr. Olson stated that people from his unit have received funds while on the committee, leading someone to wonder, sotto voce, if we should have them give it back. Noting that this restriction appears on the guidelines the Research Committee sends out each year, Mr. Andrews admitted he is at a loss to explain how this might have happened. Ms. Otto wondered if the restrictions would apply to only to research fellowships and not the conference grants or small grants. Senate policy would restrict people on the Committee from applying for any funds, Mr. Andrews responded. He added he was unaware of whether the Research Committee guidelines have any restrictions on summer fellowships. Conference monies are not awarded to an individual but to establish a conference and so the restriction would not apply. Mr. Downing commented that Mr. Olson's concerns are primarily directed at research fellowship awards which are historically the most active part of the Research Committee's activities. It may not be a formal prohibition, but it has been a longstanding tradition that, once one has received a summer fellowship, they would not reapply for a period of time, around 6 year period. The concern that

this policy would preclude individuals from serving on the committee might be alleviated with the phasing of the awards, the 6 year moratorium and the turnover on the committee.

Ms. Jackson commented that the concern is about the perception of impropriety when it comes to the awarding of funds. If the perception exists that the best way of getting funding is to serve on the committee, it will cloud the results, whatever the merits of the case. If we know that people who serve on committees that award money cannot themselves be recipients, it avoids the appearance of evil. We need to avoid situations where people who are involved in awarding money are also potential recipients—that's just not conscionable, she argued. Mr. Connellan questioned the wording of the motion and suggested deleting the final phrase "of which they are a member". He also asked whether the motion was intended to cover all awards rather than just monetary awards and Mr. Andrews replied yes. Ms. Schartman asked how this would affect the Assessment Committee which normally awards funds to departments. Would a department be excluded from consideration if a member of that department were on the committee? She also wondered about the possibility where a faculty member is doing assessment research which includes a stipend. Mr. Andrews replied that the prohibition applies to individuals on committees receiving individual awards. Since all schools are represented on Assessment and funds are granted to departments, the restriction would not apply. However, the policy will prohibit making an individual award to someone who is sitting on that committee.

Mr. Downing expressed concern about the ambiguity of the phrase 'anything of value' and asked how that was being defined. The rationale for including this phrase, Mr. Andrews explained, is to extend the coverage to include non-monetary awards and to cover any and all future possibilities. He hypothesized a Parking Committee with the responsibility of allocating parking spaces on campus. You wouldn't want the people on that committee to assign the best spaces to themselves, he argued. Taking a theoretical example to the opposite extreme, Mr. Downing pointed out that there is an intrinsic value to the academic community when one serves on a committee, and in which case we are in a self defeating mood. Ms. Jackson suggested that a wise person would get their friends on the committee and then ask them to advocate on their behalf. Mr. Andrews summarized that the problem with the existing policy is that it only applies to monetary funds. A situation developed where the award was not primarily financial and where there was a possible conflict of interest. Rather than revisiting this every time a situation arises involving conflicts of interest, this proposed policy is intended to cover all potentialities.

Ms. Jackson concluded the business of this year's Senate by presenting the traditional procedural motion from the Steering Committee to staff Senate standing committees with the names presented in the agenda. Following Mr. Andrew's second, a few correction and changes were noted, namely Michelle Piskulich will chair the Senate Planning Review Committee, the typo in David Shantz's name was corrected as was the status of Ms. Moore as Professor of Chemistry. The motion was approved.

Mr. Russi then called for any good and welfare items and hearing none, entertained a motion to adjourn.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

apr6min

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

SENATE

Home Page