



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Sixth Meeting
Thursday, 16 March 1995

Minutes

Senators present: Abiko, Andrews, Ari, Barclay, Benson, Bertocci, Bhatt, Buffard-O'Shea, Cameron, Chipman, Christina, Cole, Dahlgren, Downing, Eberwein, Fish, Frankie, Gerulaitis, Gilroy, Hansen, Hildebrand, Hough, Hovanesian, Jarvis, Khatree, Liboff, Mabee, Marks, Moore, Moran, Moudgil, Muir, Olson, Otto, Pipan, Reynolds, Rozek, Rush, Russi, Schmitz, Selahowski, Stano, Stevens, Taam, Winter. Guests: Sahu, Billington

Senators absent: Bricker, Brown, Capps, Kheir, Kim, Polis, Reddy, Schwartz, Schott-Baer, Sevilla, Shepherd, Simon, Speer, Thomas, Wedekind

Summary of actions:

1. Motion to allow students to transfer community college credits at anytime (Eberwein, Downing) Second reading. Approved.
2. MS in PT program. (Dahlgren, Briggs-Bunting) Second reading. Approved
3. Establishment of a University wide Deans' list. (Stevens) First reading
4. Changes to Senate committee memberships charges.(Eberwein, Fish) Amended (Andrews, Moran) moved to second reading. Approved.
5. Senate Committee chair selection (Eberwein, Briggs-Bunting) First reading; moved to second reading. Approved.

Mr. Russi called the assembly to order at 3:11 p.m. and proceeded to brief the Senate on a number of items beginning with the status of various administrative searches:

-Dean of the School of Education and Human Services--the committee has identified four semi-finalists, the search is continuing and we expect to have interviews on campus in the next few weeks;

-Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences--committee is working hard and is at the stage of reviewing portfolios and dossiers;

-Dean of the School of Business Administration--committee has been formed and is discussing

whether to launch a search now or to wait. Factors involved in this decision are that the market is very competitive and there may be a shortage of individuals available now; the decision to start or wait will be made in a couple of weeks and the search will probably use the services of a consultant;

President--The committee has been selected as has search firm a the contract's been written. once it is all set there will probably be a memo from the chair of the Search Committee to to campus summarizing their activities and plans.

Other news included the appointment of David Doyle, a 1980 alumnus, as the new Trustee. He was formerly the chair of the Republican Party in Michigan and is very involved in politics. Given the current administration in Lansing it is hoped that N Doyle can help promote Oakland's concerns. Mr. Russi also announced that Mr. Wang is progressing and turned the floor over to Mr. McKay for additional details. Mr. McKay confirmed that Mr. Wang is improving and doing remarkably well. Those who wish contribute to the purchase of an Apple Powerbook for Mr. Wang may do so either by writing a check or through payroll deduction. He stated that this is going to be an excellent gift since Mr. Wang is very much into using computers and the Internet. The laptop also will enable him to get in touch with colleagues and friends as well do mathematics. Mr. McKay also commended the police department for their work in breaking the case. Mr. Downing urged fellow senators to support this project and Mt. Andrews mentioned a banner for Mr. Wang that everyone is encouraged to sign.

Turning to other matters, Mr. Russi summarized what's happening the state level regarding appropriations. The governor's proposal to fund higher education has two parts: one is for a 3% increase for all 15 institutions in Michigan; the second is that three institutions will receive a special allocation of \$16.4 million. To see how significant that is, the 3% increase will cost the state \$38 million dollars across all 15 schools, the special allocation \$16.4 million.

The special allocations are based on Carnegie classifications. He reminded the Senate that there was debate last year as to the classification OU was assigned and, had we been properly class as a doctoral institution, it would have added one million dollars to the OU budget. In 1993 the Carnegie Foundation issued a document classifying higher education institutions across the country based on academic mission. At that time in Michigan the, were 3 research, 2 doctoral and 10 comprehensive masters institutions. Last year the state chose to fund based on the categories. The doctoral institutions received 32% more than the comprehensive institutions and the research institutions received 64% more than the comprehensives. There was however a 5% cap. He cautioned the group to keep in mind that the Carnegie Foundation classification was never intended to be used as a budget allocation procedure but rather to define institutions based on academic mission. However, this year the state has taken this idea and provided special allocations (\$16.4) to the three institutions who had the lowest level of state appropriations in each of their Carnegie Classification categories (MSU, WMU and GVSU) with the intent of moving them to the median.

We are arguing that we that we should be considered a doctoral institution he continued. The criteria for doctoral is that we must confer 10 doctorate degrees per year in three disciplines. Since 1989, using an aggregate of any three years, we have exceeded that number. However we were not placed in the doctoral classification in the 1993 report because in 1989 we conferred only 6 doctorates. If the state is going to use the Carnegie classification as an allocation process they should look at the institution every year, and not every 7 years.

When Carnegie was contacted and asked to reevaluate, we received a letter from the President of the Carnegie Foundation which states clearly that, based on current information, we qualify as a doctoral institution. This letter should help us make the case in Lansing. What would it mean in practical terms? As a comprehensive institution we will receive approx. \$4100 per FYES; if we are recognized as a doctoral institution at the average level we would receive a little over \$5800 per fyes, an additional 15 million dollars. Even if we came in at the lowest level in the doctorate category, it would still be an additional 5 million dollars. He commented that we are waging the battle with vigor, talking to a lot of people and that we have a strong argument. We are in a unique position since no other institution can make the claim that they are miscategorized.

However, if Lansing doesn't buy that argument, we are prepared to posit another, namely that we are growing and are not being compensated for that growth. In 1990 our enrollment was slightly over 12,000, this year we are at 13,200, next year we expect 13,500 and the number 15,000 is thrown around if we look forward several years. If we take the higher education system average we are \$1600 below the system average. If the governor's recommendation are accepted, OU will be \$1800 below system average. We want to have our growth recognized and to have these inequities rectified. The Governor's Office has called and said a few positive things. However, we need support for this and Mr. Russi asked everyone to contact their representatives, influential friends and ask them to support our case.

Ms. Briggs-Bunting asked when a decision would be likely to occur, what is the window of opportunity. Mr. Russi replied that the House Appropriations Committee would be meeting the week after next and amendments might be made at that time. He added that the Senate seems more sympathetic and more likely to support us. We need to make our case since final budget decisions will occur sometime in June or July. There are 10 institutions who have formed a coalition to fight the special appropriation, saying the money should be distributed evenly across all institutions. That's fine with us--if the 10.4 million were redistributed it would mean a 4.77% increase for OU, around \$700,000.

Mr. Liboff asked what is being done to remedy the equipment shortfall in the new science building budget and could the legislature be approached for additional funding apart from capital outlay. Mr. Russi replied that special allocations are very difficult to obtain. We have already put in a request for an additional classroom/office building. Special allocations would probably go to help pay for unfunded mandates, such as bringing buildings up to ADA and fire code standards and perhaps also for some deferred maintenance. Mr. Liboff expressed distress at having a gorgeous building with inadequate equipment. Mr. Russi agreed, but noted that the equipment problem is one that exists across the higher education system. Mr. Liboff then questioned why efforts are going forward on behalf of the recreation building when the Science building needs additional funds. Mr. Russi replied that the university has embarked on an aggressive fund raising campaign of 1.5 million dollars, of which \$500,000 is committed, to supplement funds available for the Science Building. We are also applying for funds from the NIH, for a Kresge Grant, and have asked the Foundation Board for funds to alleviate the shortfall.

Returning to the question of Oakland's Carnegie classification, Mr. Hovanesian asked if there was anything in writing to justify our claim for doctoral status. Mr. Russi answered that the letter from the Carnegie Foundation could be cited and if anyone would like the full text of the presentations to the House Appropriations Committee they should contact Shirley at 370-

3500. Ms. Gerulaitis asked whom should we contact and Mr. Russi suggested the representatives and senators from this district. Ms. Briggs-Bunting also proposed asking alumni to write letters and Mr. Russi agreed, adding that a number of alumni have already been contacted and asked to support this proposal.

Moving then to old business, discussion was then re-opened on the motion to amend the 62 credit limit to permit transfer of community college credit at any time with the regular restrictions still in force (62 credits at a 4-year college; 32 credits at OU and the last 8 credits must be taken at OU). Ms. Gilroy spoke on behalf of the motion, sharing some points brought up by Mr. Appleton regarding this proposal. One is that our current interpretation discriminates against women and non-traditional returning students, that students move around a lot, many have very mixed academic careers, some may have done 2 years at a 4-year institution (Harvard), then taken some community college classes and belatedly discover that OU will not consider the community college credits. She emphasized that the motion will not change what students take, noting that we currently allow students to take freshman classes in their senior year, that OU will still require 62 credits at a 4-year institution, that only the sequence will be affected. As for the quality of education, she presented an example of a student who took 62 credits at a community college, then 32 at Andrews and who brought in 94 credits and asked her colleagues to consider the quality of that experience with the women who had two years at Harvard with excellent grades and who could only transfer 62 credits. She also pointed out that we have many students who take the minimum of 32 credits and are awarded OU degrees, adding that 32 credits doesn't give us much chance to put our stamp on someone's education and concluded by encouraging a vote for the proposal.

Referring to the handout prepared by the History Department, Ms. Gerulaitis asked for clarification re the 62 credits and was reassured that we are changing only the timing, not the limit on 62 credits from a 2 year institution. However, Ms. Gilroy noted that OU is currently considering additional 2+2 programs in health sciences and nursing that may necessitate a slightly higher number of community college credits to transfer since the programs will require more than 124 credits for graduation. Mr. Downing pointed out that many programs are based on 124 credits for a degree and for them there would be no change in the 62 credit limit in schools where the graduation requirements are in the 132 credit range there could be some changes in the number of credits that would be accepted from a community college (e.g. half the credits needed for graduation). Ms. Gerulaitis wondered if there would be any incentive for community colleges apply to offer courses beyond the 200 level and Ms. Allen indicated she's not aware of any plans in that direction. Ms. Allen added that she sees here the opportunity for community college students to begin their careers earlier at OU, that it will provide them a way to take Oakland's courses without having a negative impact.

Mr. Liboff spoke to the question of continuity, the positive effects that result when students are here from day to day and year to year. He was also concerned that the arguments for this change relate to convenience, rather than quality and asked if the students and the institution will be well served by this change. He argued that we should be concerned with quality as well as convenience. Ms. Moore brought up two points of view based on her experience as an academic advisor and teacher. She said we should treat students with non-traditional backgrounds with humanity and with fairness. Also that she teaches courses built on 2 years of chemistry and math and finds that community college students do just as well in her courses. She commented that there are always weak students among OU students as well as transfers, and doesn't expect there to be much transferring back and forth. Ms. Muir expressed her puzzlement, saying she fails to understand why the timing affects the quality. If the quality is

acceptable before they come here, why isn't it afterwards?

Ms. Benson replied that students with upper division standing should be challenged by classes, that they should be pushed harder. She also expressed the opinion that community college students are not well prepared in writing and some of their other courses. Also that we should be concerned about the effect on the humanities and social sciences which rely on the survey courses to recruit majors. She opined that if we are to provide a strong 4 year major they need to take the courses here. Ms. Cole finds differences between courses taught by the OU English department and community colleges and is opposed to any change that would give students late in their careers the option of taking reading/writing/literature classes at the community college. Mr. Moran who taught previously at a community college, stated that courses there are wildly uneven in terms of quality, that reading and writing are not emphasized, that this would in effect have a negative impact on women and minorities because the overall value of the degree would be reduced, that we are watering down education and the prestige of an OU degree. Ms. Gilroy pointed out that her comments dealt with women and non-traditional students, not minorities. In modern languages, Ms. Buffard-O'Shea averred, methodology is crucial and students need to adapt to OU's methods. To ensure the continuity of their learning they need to take their classes here at OU rather than elsewhere.

Mr. Andrews asked for some clarification on two points; who distributed the blue sheet and is it true that students cannot transfer community college credits at other schools after reaching junior status. Mr. Sahu of UCUI claimed credit for the blue sheet and Ms. Benson replied that each college has different numbers after which they will not accept community college credits, that it doesn't appear that anyone else is doing this. Ms. Gilroy stated that we admit 3500 transfer students and approx. 65% actually attend OU and the rest go elsewhere. Transfer students choose campuses convenient to where they live or work. We have the advantage of our location. She added that WSU and CMU are more flexible and at a recent meeting of registrars, many of them were surprised that OU looked at transfers chronologically. For example, WSU doesn't look at transfers chronologically but does apply a limit to community college credits. She expressed her concern that OU can be faced with students with identical transcripts and one student will have 90 credits transfer and the other only 62 because of the sequence in which they took their classes. She also pointed out that students can get out of OU with only 32 credits at the 300-400 level, leaving 92 100-200 level credits they can take.

Mr. Andrews commented that 32 seems a rather low number, that students usually take more than that. He's concerned that repealing the restriction on the 62 credit limit might result in more people who are graduating with just 32 credits. Mr. Sahu averred that if he thought the proposal would dilute the quality of education he would not support it. He pointed out that we are defining quality in many different ways but that only 32 credits are required for graduation and only 8 in residence and that is not being changed. The concern here is sequence versus quality. If you accept courses from a community college you shouldn't later say that they're not good enough. As for us becoming nothing but an upper level institution, if we want to be a four year institution we should work towards that goal. However, since we do have a lot of transfer students now he emphasized that we should be fair and treat students equally. Once we have the students here we hope they won't want to go elsewhere.

Mr. Headley expressed concern over the stereotyping of community colleges and the idea that they provide inferior education. He challenged the group to build contacts at the community colleges, that these concerns should become the opportunity for dialogue on the quality of

education. Referring to the competition mentioned on the history departments handout, he stated that the competition includes many other schools in the Detroit metro area, that CMU and WSU are aggressively moving into our market area. WSU is even constructing a new building at the OCC Orchard Ridge campus. He stressed the importance of being user friendly, something the change in sequencing will allow and which will make recruiting easier. He concluded with another example of an individual disadvantaged by the current restriction. Mr. Olson spoke of lost opportunities, that in Health Sciences they are trying to get community college students to transfer to Oakland and their program by offering OU courses at the community college. It's silly, he said, to invite the students to take OU classes and then refuse to give them credit for some of their community college credits.

Stating that he intended to vote for this motion, Mr. Chipman thought it would be useful for UCUI to report back to the Senate in three years about the results of this change. He expressed his frustration at having to deal with difficult issues where much of the information is anecdotal and speculative, remarking that we talk about the quality of the degree we award, and, parenthetically asking, by the way, gang, what is it? Mr. Moran asked how many transfer students are accepted into the PT program. Only a few, Mr. Olson replied, but that is because of the large pool of well qualified candidates and because preference is given to OU students. He added that there is no difference in the ability of transfer and community college students to complete their program. Mr. McKay pointed out that OCC credits are half as expensive as OU's and that OU is not funded as much as WSU, and worries that OU will become a junior/senior/graduate institution and we will need to find the money to do that. He remarked however, that we need to maintain good relationships with the community colleges since they provide so many of our students.

Mr. Liboff stated that students choose colleges based on their perceptions of the schools; to the extent that OU diminishes its quality we are doing our students a disservice. What bothers him most is that the original reason for community colleges was to provide a transition time for unsure students. He doesn't think the quality of community colleges is up to OU's level, adding that quality varies from institution to institution and from program to program at the community colleges. When we look at a syllabus and determine whether or not the class matches an OU offering, we are not looking at quality. If we allow the undergraduate experience to deteriorate we will not be serving our students well. Is it a matter of convenience or will it add to the quality of the education he again asked.

Ms. Gilroy opined that our policy is forcing us to become an upper level institution; community colleges know that if students want to get a degree from OU they must take all their lower level classes at the community college. Transfers make up over half of our population and many of those students are non-traditional ones. The classes are being taken anyway and we are talking about what we do with them when they get here. She reiterated that students must still have 62 credits from a 4 year institution, that all this policy does is allow more flexibility in the sequencing. Ms. Elvekrog pointed out that worrying about the quality of community college courses is a separate issue; that we have already said we would accept 62 community college credits and all that is being proposed is to build in some flexibility as to when those courses may be taken. Mr. Headley remarked that transfer students do very well at OU; that over half the students who graduate with honors are transfers. We can't generalize community colleges as substandard and asked, in our own shop, can we say that every class is top-notch? He has products of OU at home and while they are very complementary of the education they are receiving, they have not said that every class was perfect, they told the truth.

Mr. Downing stated that he does believe in the quality of the institution and that we are all rooted in the values of an OU education. However, we are in a lock step situation that doesn't give us a chance to get students here early. Because of the nature of the sequencing, students stay at the community college until they have earned the 62 credits. He'd like them to be free to come here early because he thinks we'll hook them and they'll stay here.

Mr. Stevens remarked that he's on his way to Kent State so what we do is up to us but, he added, he's been here four years and we delude ourselves about the Oakland experience. What the hell is it, he asked. Have we ever asked a student what it is? Is it because we do research?. He pointed out that many of the same people teach here and at community colleges and also do research. The community colleges do collect data and their data doesn't indicate that their students are inferior, in fact, they do just as well. We need to begin to think of students as partners in a learning process; a person purchases an educational experience and we need to think of them as a customer. Don't give me that stuff about the quality of teaching, he declared, because we don't measure it. Instead we rely on teaching evaluations which don't measure the quality of the instruction or how well we are facilitating the learning experience. So many students want to come here and we need to work at ways of retaining them. Only 22% of SBA hopefuls graduate. In 1991 we had business students, today only 1600. We need to think about the future and becoming more user friendly.

Mr. Stevens continued. What is the undergraduate experience. Most of our students are non-traditional yet we have difficulty getting offices to stay open after 5 and to remain during lunch. This is not a traditional campus he emphasized. Our students are paying their own way and we are not meeting their needs and we have competition that will. Faculty were unwilling to teach at the Macomb University Center and now Walsh College has 1400 business students at the Center. He posed the question--where do our students come from and underscored the fact that we need to become more user friendly. We have fine programs here but the foundation is undergraduate education and the 62 credit limit has hindered us in working with the community colleges. OU is perceived as aloof, elitist and that we don't give a damn. We are almost the only state university in Michigan (excepting SEHS) that does almost all of its instruction on campus. We must delude ourselves into thinking we are something that we aren't. There's nothing wrong with convenience he concluded, students do care about their wallets, the size of the classes and the support systems. Aren't those rational reasons for making a decision, he queried.

Ms. Benson emphasized the history department's concern is for excellence in our students education and said they don't want to be dismissive of them. The history department welcomes non-traditional students. Her concern is that upper level students should be taking challenging courses, that they should be pushing themselves harder and not taking low level classes at the community college. Mr. Christina called the question, Mr. Russi called for a vote and the motion was approved.

Turning to the next motion on the agenda, Mr. Rissi opened discussion of the proposed Master of Science Program in Physical Therapy. Mr. McKay reminded the Senate that the Senate Budget Review Committee strongly endorsed this proposal, adding that it's a winner for us. Mr. Liboff also expressed his support, noting the strong track record of physical therapy. The motion was put to the vote and approved.

Moving next to new business, Ms. Benson

Moved that Oakland University establish a university-wide undergraduate Deans' list honoring students who have taken a minimum academic load of 12 credit hours per term and who have earned GPA's of at least 3.6 in each of consecutive fall winter semesters.

Following Mr. Stevens second, Ms. Benson commented that the Academic Standards and Honors Committee is bringing forth this proposal which has been in the works for several years. Ms. Gilroy noted that there is no specification as to whether the 12 credit hours had to be numerically graded or whether pass/fail courses would count. She also questioned whether this proposal is intended to replace the current procedures where letters of commendation are sent to students with 3.0 or higher GPA's and academic honors are bestowed on students with 3.6 or higher GPA'S. Ms. Schmidt, a member of the Academic Standing and Honors Committee, stated that there had been much discussion regarding numerically graded credits and the decision was made to include p grades but pass fail/classes would not be included. The commendations would continue. Mr. Liboff noted that there is no way of distinguishing between schools, that some schools have higher GPA averages than others and wondered if any thought had been given to normalizing the grades, e.g. by rewarding the top 10% of students in each school.

Responding to Mr. Liboff's query about equity across the university, Ms. Eberwein mentioned that a formula that would take that into consideration had been discussed but the formula was complicated and difficult to figure out. What do you mean by academic unit she asked. Do you mean schools or departments? She added that the Steering Committee was relieved to see the simplicity of this proposal. Also that in a fall/winter sequence the chances are that most people are representing not just their majors but are in a mix of general education and cognate courses as well as major courses. Mr. Liboff asked if there was any way of getting GPA averages per school and Ms. Gilroy indicated that would be possible.

Hearing no further discussion of that motion, Mr. Russi recognized Ms. Eberwein who moved to modify the membership and charges of various senate committees (full text of the motion with all the changes highlighted is in the agenda). Mr. Fish seconded the motion. Ms. Eberwein remarked that this began as a simple process to remedy the language changes needed resulting from the loss of the position of Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies. Several Senate committee specifications built in the assumption of this position, e.g. Chair of UCUI, member of General Education and the old APPC, now the Senate Planning Review Committee. Speaking from personal experience having carried out this role, she stated that serving on three Senate Committees is more than one person should be asked to do, especially if it is a faculty member with teaching responsibilities. it was clear that some revision was needed to put less pressure on faculty who were now filling this role.

However, Senate committees are interconnected in many ways and this one change led to others. She summarized some of the changes indicated by bold type in the agenda: the Asst. VP for Academic Affairs will serve on General Education and UCUI and act as a link between those two committees and the Academic Affairs office, language clarifying who handles petitions of exceptions was added, the chairs of UCUI and the Graduate Council were removed from the SPRC, reporting mechanisms between committees were clarified, UCUI asked for 3 year terms to ensure greater continuity, format of the charge to the Graduate Council was changed, language was added relating to the selection of chairs of Senate committees. She called special attention to the proposal to add an AP appointed by the AP Assembly to the Senate Budget

Review committee for a 3 year term. Since this agenda was prepared, the Steering Committee received a memo from the chair of that committee stating that she thinks current membership is adequate and does not need this additional person. Ms. Eberwein left the final decision up to the Senate.

Mr. Andrews addressed the membership of the SBRC and SPRC, stating that these are important committees, especially in light of the Strategic Plan and the need to monitor its progress and expressed his concern over the reduction in membership of the SPRC. He proposed an amendment to the motion to increase the number of faculty on both committees to six. Mr. Moran seconded the motion. Mr. Andrews noted that individuals would serve three year staggered terms with two seats open each year; also that the increase would provide for a more diverse membership on each committee. Mr. McKay of the Budget Committee expressed his approval for the amendment, noting that it takes awhile to learn the work of these committees. Mr. Stano, a former member of the Senate Budget Committee, also strongly endorsed the amendment, stating that the committee involves a tremendous learning curve and one needs time to really understand what is going on. Mr. McKay added that the establishment of regular meeting times on Wednesdays from 3-5 for both these committees should alleviate some of the difficulties in getting committee members together. The amendment was approved.

David Herman spoke in favor of adding an additional AP to the Budget Committee, stating that it is one of the few committees that doesn't have an designated AP representative and that there are 114 AP's in Academic Affairs. Mr. Dahlgren questioned the typography of the changes related to his title and was assured by Ms. Eberwein that the changes were correct. Mr. Bertocci, seconded by Mr. Olson, moved to advance the amended motion to a second reading. That motion was approved, followed by a unanimous vote approving the amended motion.

The last item of business was a motion to approve what is in fact, past practice, explained Ms. Eberwein as she

Moved that the Senate adopt a policy to the effect that, unless membership specifications for a committee specifically designate its chairperson, the Steering Committee will name the chair, whenever possible, from faculty members who have had experience on that committee.

Following Ms. Briggs-Bunting's second, Mr. Andrews expressed support for the policy but was concerned about how it might affect new membership on committees. He worried that a number of people might want to be on a particular committee, that continuing members would not want to chair and then that choices would be made for those who already had experience on that committee. He sees the need for turnover and participation on a wide scale. Ms. Eberwein remarked that problem does happen, that sometimes we don't get enough volunteers; she added that current chairs are asked for advice concerning who would be a good replacement and what projects/concern might the committee be dealing with in the coming year. She recognized the need for both continuity and new blood and said that they try to get people on a committee who can move into leadership positions. Mr. Andrews thought that the Steering Committee should be sensitive to this issue and not exclude someone because of lack of experience on a committee. Mr. McKay commented that the increased membership on the SERC would provide more flexibility in naming a chair. Mr. Downing then moved to proceed directly to a second reading, Ms. Rush seconded the motion, and the Senate approved. Mr.

Russi then called for a vote on the motion and the motion was approved with dispatch.

Mr. Russi immediately called for a motion to adjourn, Ms. Rush obliged and the Senate adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page