



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

First meeting
Thursday, 22 September, 1994

Minutes

Senators present: Abiko, Andrews, Ari, Benson, Bertocci, Bhatt, Bricker, Briggs-Bunting, Brown, Capps, Chipman, Downing, J. Eberwein, Fish, Frankie, R. Gerulaitis, Hansen, Hildebrand, Hough, Khattree, Moran, Otto, Pipan, Polis, Rickstad, Rooney, Rush, Russi, Schmitz, Sevilla, Stano, Taam, Thomas, Wedekind, Zenas.

Senators absent: Braunstein, Buffard-O'Shea, Christina, Dahlgren, Garcia, Hormozi, Hovanesian, Kheir, Liboff, Marks, Mittelstaedt, Muir, Olson, Packard, Reddy, Rozek, Schwartz, Selahowski, Shepherd, Stevens

Summary of Actions:

1. Election of Linda Benson to replace Jerry Grossman on the Senate Steering Committee.
2. Procedural motion to fill vacancies on Senate Standing Committees (Hough, Gerulaitis) Approved
3. Motion to move item 4 to a second reading (Briggs-Bunting, Rush) Approved.
4. Motion to change the membership of the Academic Conduct Committee. (Fish, Eberwein) Approved.
5. Reports from the Senate Budget Review Committee (Callawaert), Senate Planning Review Committee (Chipman) and Academic Conduct Committee (Lepkowski).

A. Information Items

Mr. Russi welcomed the audience to the 1st meeting of the 1994-5 University Senate and began with a number of announcements. He noted that copies of the memo listing the Senate meeting dates were available on the table at the front of the room and asked senators to make any needed corrections on the sign-in sheet. He added that he wanted to try a different seating arrangement with two rows of chairs in a horse-shoe shape around the front table to improve eye-to-eye communication but the set-up crew obviously didn't quite understand what was wanted. Microphones have been added to improve the acoustics and he requested senators to state their names if they have comments, particularly since this is the first meeting. He proceeded to introduce Linda Hildebrand and Catherine Rush who have been appointed Secretary and Parliamentarian respectively. Also he noted a correction on the agenda; in item 1 Catherine Rush and not Jill Dunphy is a continuing member of the Senate Steering Committee.

Mr. Russi then proceeded to update the Senate on a number of information items. A study of

the Honors College was completed and forwarded to the VPAA's office last year. After reviewing the report and consulting with relevant personnel, Mr. Russi drew up his own recommendations. These recommendations have been forwarded to the Senate Planning Review Committee and the Senate Budget Committee; once these committees have completed their reviews he will bring a proposal about the Honors College back to the Senate. Also, the Center for International Programs completed a self-study last year under the excellent guidance of Mr. Bertocci. Mr. Russi plans to meet with the Center faculty and to recommend that an external consultant be brought in to review the work that has been done and to advise us on how best to proceed. As for the Strategic plan, after the development of the draft plan last year and two hearings, the plan and all the comments from the hearings were forwarded to President Packard. The President has reviewed all the materials and met with the Board of Trustees to discuss the plan. She is now drafting a report which may be ready for the October Senate meeting.

Steering Committee Election.

There being no old business the Senate turned its attention to the first item of new business, the election of a replacement for Mr. Grossman on the Senate Steering Committee. Mr. Russi turned the floor over to Mr. Brown, chair of the Elections Committee, who opened the floor for nominations. Ms. Benson was nominated and indicated her willingness to run, Ms. Gerulaitis moved that the nominations be closed, Ms. Briggs-Bunting seconded and the Senate quickly affirmed Ms. Benson's election to the Steering Committee. Before relinquishing the floor, Mr. Brown commented that the only way to get off the Senate Elections Committee was to retire and, since one of their members has recently done so, a replacement is needed. Any Senators willing to serve on the committee were asked to indicate their interest. The Senate Steering Committee will endeavor to find a replacement.

The second agenda item involved the usual procedural motion from the Steering Committee to fill vacancies on Senate standing committees. Mr. Hough moved that the following persons be confirmed as elected to Senate committees for the terms specified: Suzanne Skowronski, Assistant Professor of Nursing to replace Patricia Ketchum, Assistant Professor of Nursing on the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction for 1994-5 and William Macauley, Associate Professor of Political Science, to replace Brian Murphy, Associate Professor of English, as chair of the Human Relations Committee for 1994-5. Ms. Gerulaitis seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Academic Conduct Committee membership change.

Mr. Fish then MOVED that the following changes in the membership of the Academic Conduct Committee be made :

Twelve faculty members of whom two shall serve as co-chairs; two students and an alternate; and the Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee), who shall be *ex-officio* and voting.

Ms. Eberwein seconded the motion. Mr. Fish noted that the comments on the agenda indicate the reasons for requesting this change. Basically the faculty on the Academic Conduct Committee are swamped; there can be as many as three hearings a week and the chair has to be at each hearing. With two chairs and more faculty to draw from, the work load can be divided up more equitably. He asked if it would be possible to move the motion to a second reading, noting that the sooner this is approved, the sooner the Committee can constitute itself with

additional personnel. Ms. Briggs-Bunting moved to waive the first reading and proceed to the second and final one; the motion was seconded by Ms. Rush and approved by the Senate.

Mr. Downing then asked if the Committee considered whether the need for appropriate consistency could be met with two chairs. Mr. Fish replied that they had considered it and thought it could be handled. Mr. Chipman expressed more concern about the consistency of penalties. Mr. Fish replied that they relied heavily on the advice of the Vice President for Student Affairs. Ms. Eberwein asked about the role of the administration's *ex-officio* member; will the VPSA or designee be part of the two panels and therefore face the same pressures as a single chair or will the VPSA appoint a designee to attend some of the meetings. Mr. Fish replied that obviously it is advisable to have the same person at all the hearings but there have been other individuals designated by the VPSA to participate in the hearings. Ms. Schmitz added that two individuals other than the VPSA have participated in conduct hearings and have thus acquired relevant experience. Mr. Bricker asked if there were sentencing guidelines in written form or whether they live in the collective memories of the Committee. Mr. Fish replied that it has been mainly an oral tradition but that it would be possible to codify their decisions and rationales. He added that the chairs are chosen from those who have had experience serving on the committee, thus ensuring continuity.

Mr. Lepkowski stated that he thought that sentences have been consistent over the past several years and that the problems he sees are how matters of truth are decided. There have been a few cases where errors and hung juries have occurred or where one group hears evidence on one day and another group on another day. However, once guilt is determined, he feels sentences are consistent. The Senate then voted to approve the changes. Mr. Fish asked how soon the new committee members could be appointed and Mr. Russi said the Steering Committee would be meeting on the 27th and will work on filling the vacancies then.

Committee reports.

Mr. Russi reminded the Senate that last year we began a tradition of inviting the Chairs of Senate Committees to give reports. He then introduced Mr. Callawaert of the Senate Budget Review Committee who summarized the year's activities. The Budget Committee reviewed materials presented in budget hearings, the budget requests of units and the recommendations of the Vice Presidents and developed a preliminary list of priorities. The SBRC also met several times with the Senate Planning Review Committee. Jointly the two Committees developed a list of budget priorities and then met with the VPAA and the President to discuss the recommendations. He added that the SBRC and SPRC agreed that highest priority should be given to additional faculty positions. In addition the SBRC looked at the financial implications of the proposed merger of the School of Nursing and the School of Health Sciences and presented its findings to the Senate as part of the deliberations. The Committee also reviewed the proposed masters program in physical therapy and is awaiting additional information before a recommendation can be made. The chairs of the SBRC and SPRC held two open hearings on the draft strategic plan and provided the steering committee with texts of the presentations. The Committee wrestled with the "off the top" category in the proposed budget and pondered its implications, e.g. a big money item or one that would benefit the university as a whole. Unfinished business included a comparison of OU with other peer institutions. He closed by stating that, although the Budget Committee is only advisory, he would like to see the results, specifically, what impact did the SBRC's recommendations have on the final budget.

Mr. Russi turned next to Mr. Lepkowski, chair of the Academic Conduct Committee. Mr.

Lepkowski reported that the Committee began as though it were going to be a lulu of a year but actually finished with 8 fewer cases than in the previous year. A total of 18 cases involving 34 students were heard. Of the cases heard, 14 or 78% resulted in at least one guilty verdict; of the students charged, 25 or 74% were found guilty. He commented that while one does not rejoice in this figure, it nevertheless means that the Committee is dealing with well prepared cases. A broad spectrum of units (12) within the university brought cases forward, the wide distribution showing an awareness across all units on campus of the Committee's role. Unlike last year this year's Committee had a more even distribution of perfidy represented by the cases--33% cheating, 33% plagiarizing, 22% unauthorized collaboration and 11% forgery of documents, e.g. altered transcripts. Sanctions included 22 suspensions, 1 probation and 2 students who were expelled.

Since there have been some questions about how sanctions are determined he commented that generally, cheating on exams results in a 1 or 2 semester suspension. The expulsions included an grave case of plagiarism by a graduate student and a falsification of documents. Much depends on the student's attitude --if a student is remarkable unrepentant a stronger message is required.

The chair of the Committee, Mr. Lilliston, resigned in the middle of the year and Mr. Lepkowski assumed the chair's responsibilities (with faint heart he added) However there were hardly any cases after that. He expressed concern over the drop-off between fall and winter semesters and wondered if the turbulence in the committee may have affected faculty and discouraged them from bringing forth cases. He added that this situation bears watching to see if the committee has the same general confidence of the academic community that it normally has. Mr. Fish emphasized that Senators should keep their home departments informed of the importance of this committee and of the fact that faculty should not undertake the role of judge and jury in a case of student malfeasance. The committee is there to ensure that due process is observed and he urged his colleagues to use the committee. Mr. Russi added that an appeals process is available in that the students may appeal any decision to the Senate Steering Committee. He remarked that it is a good process, well defined and that it works.

Mr. Russi then called on Mr. Chipman, chair of the Senate Planning Review Committee. Mr. Chipman began by commenting that he welcomed the opportunity to inform the Senate about the SPRC's activities of the past year. The Committee met 23 times throughout the year--this included 6 joint meetings with the Senate Budget Planning Committee and individual meetings with Mr. Russi and President Packard. The Committee's report is detailed because, in the early years of this new process, he felt it important to document what was done and how it was done. Formal minutes were kept of all meetings as well as records of advisory memos and administration responses. The formal products of the Committees deliberations this year dealt with the proposed merger of the School of Nursing and the School of Health Sciences and the draft of the Strategic Plan. Also the committee was involved in the budget process by working with the SBRC to assign priorities for allocations. The SPRC will continue to work on the strategic plan as it progresses through the university governance and will also continue to interact and meet with the Senate Budget committee. A proposed algorithm on faculty allocations was developed last year by Mr. Russi and the committee will be working on that this year and will also be looking at the implications of the creation and implementation of the Office of Minority Equity.

Mr. Russi commented that these committees spend a lot of time and invest a great deal of

effort in their deliberations and commended them for their fine work and assured them that the work does count and does get attention. He expressed his thanks to the committees and noted that the Senate Steering Committee will analyze each annual report for items requiring response or action.

Good and Welfare:

Ms. Benson asked about the status of the search for a Dean of Nursing. Mr. Russi replied that an offer had been made and accepted and that the appointment would be going to the Board of Trustees. If all goes well, she should be on board as of Jan. 3, 1995. Mr. Sevilla mentioned a recent article about the new science building that specified a low bid of \$28 million dollars. Since the bid was lower than expected he wondered what sort of checking was being done to ensure that we get the building in the specifications. Mr. Russi responded that the State mandated the bid process and, assuming that the \$28 million figure is true, it's a windfall for the campus. Facility Planning is going over the paperwork, item by item, to ensure there are no omissions. He added that he anticipated this review would be completed in the next few weeks. Mr. Bricker asked what was the amount originally budgeted and Mr. Russi replied \$31 million. Ms. Hansen asked if there's a windfall, who decides what extra items might be included. Mr. Russi replied that the user group would be consulted. He added that any extra monies would be used to replace of desired items that were eliminated from the original plan. These items included renovation of Hannah Hall, an animal research facility and equipment. Mr. Andrews asked, if the building comes in under budget, does the state impose any restrictions. Mr. Russi replied yes, that the university cannot add back anything not in the original program.

There being no further comments a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Briggs-Bunting and the senate dispersed without further ado.

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

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page