



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 18 March 1993
Fifth Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Abiko, Andersen, Bennett, Benson, Braunstein, Chipman, Cramer, Dahlgren, Downing, Eberwein, Eckart, Edgerton, Fish, Frankie, Gamboa, L. Gerulaitis, R. Gerulaitis, Goslin, Grossman, Halsted, Hamilton, Hormozi, Horwitz, Hough, Jackson, Kevern, Masters, McKay, Mittelstaedt, Olson, Otto, Packard, Pine, Reddy, Rush, Schultz, Stamps, Urice, Witt, Workman, Zenas.

Senators Absent: Appleton, Burdick, Cowlshaw, Dunphy, Hansen-Smith, Hartzler, Hovanesian, Kheir, Kim, Mabee, Moore, Peterson, Pierson, Pipan, Porter, Shepherd, Stano, Stevens, Wilczynski, Wood, Yates.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 18 February 1993. Approved.
2. Motion from UCUI to establish a university-wide system of baccalaureate program reviews (Otto; L. Gerulaitis). Approved.
3. Motion from the Campus Development and Environment Committee to replace the University Smoking Policy (Rush; Stamps). First Reading.
4. Motion from the Steering Committee regarding the future of the Honors College (Edgerton; Hough). First Reading.
5. Special resolution from the Steering Committee regarding the International Studies academic program (Eberwein; Urice). Approved.

Mr. Horwitz called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m. with apologies for his slightly belated appearance. He then directed attention to the minutes of 18 February, which elicited no comment and were therefore declared to be approved. The first order of business concerned the sole item of old business: a motion from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to establish a university-wide system of baccalaureate program reviews (Moved, Ms. Otto; seconded, Mr. Gerulaitis):

MOVED that the Senate approve a university-wide system of baccalaureate program reviews as detailed in the [statement](#) on UNIVERSITY-WIDE BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM REVIEWS (distributed with the February agenda).

The chair identified Professor Eberwein ("male version") as spokesman for the sponsoring committee. When nobody raised questions or commentary, Mr. Horwitz called for a vote. The measure passed without dissent and will be implemented by the Office of Academic Affairs and the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction.

That action cleared the way for review of the first item of new business, the proposal from the Campus Development and Environment Committee to modify the university's smoking policy. Ms. Rush, seconded by Mr. Stamps, introduced the motion:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President that the Oakland University Smoking Policy of January 1, 1987 be replaced with the following policy:

1. Smoking is prohibited in all enclosed areas of Oakland University, except as provided below. The University shall take appropriate action to publicize and enforce this policy.
2. Smoking is permitted in the following areas, provided such areas are clearly separated from public areas such as corridors and lounges and are kept closed during smoking use.
 - a. Private residences (i.e., houses or apartments under the University's control, such as married student housing, other rental housing on campus, Meadow Brook Hall housing the President's residence, and student rooms in the residence halls).
 - b. Spaces specifically designated by the President or designee at the time of use for such purposes as special or private functions, research, or performances where smoking is part of the performance.

After filling in a bit of history about the Steering Committee's charge to the Campus Development and Environment Committee to reconsider current policy in light of concerns raised by members of the campus community, Ms. Rush yielded the floor to Professor Brieger, that committee's chair. Mr. Brieger invited questions and immediately heard from Mr. Fish, who asked whether the proposed wording would forbid smoking in faculty offices. It does. Mr. Olson then raised several questions relating to special circumstances that exist in Vandenberg Hall where the School of Health Sciences has its offices. It shares that facility with residence hall and food service facilities. Allowing that special considerations extend to the residential facilities, he inquired about the status of two bathrooms used by Marriott employees. Reporting that his conversations with Marriott personnel demonstrated little objection to a smoking ban and general corporate support for smoke-free work environments, he asked how the policy would apply to all the special circumstances in Vandenberg Hall and where its non-resident occupants could light up their cigarettes. Mr. Brieger responded that the policy applies to all internal spaces that are not--private residences. It does not apply to the outside of buildings, despite Mr. Olson's preference for forbidding smoking at building entries, docks where food is unloaded, or even picnic benches under his office window.

Mr. Horwitz then asked for clarification: If someone chooses to go outdoors to smoke, may s/he do so? Yes, indeed; there are no restrictions outside buildings. Ms. Schultz wondered about ventilation problems, inquiring whether sidestream smoke would penetrate beyond designated smoking areas. This question renewed inquiry about classification of private offices as different from private residences. Mr. Fish doubted that smoke from faculty offices would circulate through the ventilation system, though Mr. Gamboa assured him that it would unless the university invests in separate venting systems. Mr. Olson objected that offices in Vandenberg Hall would still be subjected to pollution because residence hall rooms are exempted from the general ban. Ms. Packard added that the university rents several separate buildings on campus that, qualifying as private residences, also fall beyond the proposed policy. Seeing no further inquiries, Mr. Horwitz declared discussion over for the time being.

The Senate will return to this topic in April.

The second item of new business concerned arrangements for the Honors College. Mr. Edgerton, seconded by Mr. Hough, introduced the following motion for the Steering Committee:

MOVED that the Senate

- a) endorses the "Proposal for a University based Honors College" presented by its *ad hoc* Committee on the Honors College; b) urges the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President to implement the Committee's recommendations; and
- c) recommends that the Honors College be administered directly by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Mr. Edgerton introduced discussion by explaining that the initiative taken by the College of Arts and Sciences to move the Honors College outside its area of administrative responsibility had prompted the Senate Steering Committee to establish an *ad hoc* committee charged to consider governance provisions for a university-wide Honors College and ways of augmenting faculty and student involvement in it across the university. Mr. Chipman then reported on behalf of the Senate Planning Review Committee that he and his colleagues were currently examining three separate reports on the future of the Honors College, while Mr. Eberwein added that the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction was similarly employed. So, according to Mr. McKay, was the Senate@Budget Review Committee. All three expect to present recommendations to the Senate at its April conclave; although Mr. McKay warned that the Budget committee might request postponement of the Senate's second reading unless more adequate information about resource needs arrived in timely fashion. Doubting that the Honors College really functions as cheaply as represented, he found the proposal currently before the Senate somewhat lacking in fiscal detail.- Professor Kevin Murphy-.-who chaired the *ad hoc* committee that developed the proposal, confirmed its accuracy, noting that it covered all non-personnel costs. When Mr. McKay pointed out that there were classes being taught, Messrs. Downing and Horwitz confirmed that those would continue unchanged. Mr. Horwitz asked how the Senate's two new committees planned to interact: Would each report independently to the Senate, or the Senate Budget Review Committee through the Senate Planning Review Committee? Mr. Chipman responded that his committee has developed guidelines on its interactions with other groups and offered to make those guidelines available to anyone interested. On that note, Mr. Horwitz declared an end to the first reading of this motion.

With no private resolutions introduced for the good of the order, the chair called upon Professor Peter Bertocci to comment on the interim report circulated by the *ad hoc* Committee on International Programs, which he chairs. Mr. Bertocci summarized the work of his task force, indicating that the Steering Committee formed it in response to the College's move to transfer part of the current Center for International Programs out of Arts and Sciences into the Office of Academic Affairs. Its charge was to consider interim administrative arrangements while taking advantage of this opportunity to rethink developments and possibilities. His group is now circulating a questionnaire to gather data on faculty interests. They will draw upon that data and other information to make recommendations on long-term prospects as well as what should happen this summer. He expected that his committee's report would be submitted toward the end of May. Ms. Gerulaitis then launched discussion by asking about the composition of the *ad hoc* Committee. As chair of a department heavily engaged in

international studies, she wondered why nobody from the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures had been appointed. Mr. Bertocci thought the Steering Committee's intent had been to draw into this activity persons from parts of the university not traditionally associated with these programs. In any case, he considered Professor Coppola a member of the Modern Language department even though his administrative title in the current Center may obscure his academic origins. Ms. Gerulaitis urged the committee to distinguish carefully in section 2.b. of its interim report between language-based programs, which should continue to operate out of the Department of Modern Languages, and English-based programs, which could be housed elsewhere. Mr. Bertocci assured her that he has always honored that traditional distinction even though he has never fully understood it. When someone asked whether he was speaking for the record, he responded "I don't really care whether we're on the record so long as we're on the level." Mr. Chipman, still representing the Senate Planning Review Committee, announced "with some trepidation" that he expected to present his committee's recommendations on the Center for International Programs at the Senate's April meeting even though the ad hoc Committee will not have formal recommendations on the floor by that date. He also urged UCUI and the General Education Committee to prepare statements. Mr. Horwitz, noting an exponential increase in committee interactions, hoped that everyone would act expeditiously.

Ms. Eberwein then indicated that the Steering Committee felt strongly that a distinction should be made between the academic component of International Studies, which has always been centrally important to Oakland University's baccalaureate traditions and must, therefore, be maintained uninterrupted, and related programs (such as foreign exchanges, institutional partnerships, and study-abroad activity) that might well profit from new positioning within the university. Lest the academic component of International Studies fall hostage to well-intended attempts to improve conditions for related projects, she asked the Senate to underscore its concern for the well-being of these distinctive academic programs by endorsing the following special resolution:

RESOLVED that the Senate affirms the centrality of International Studies to the Oakland University undergraduate experience and calls upon the College of Arts and Sciences to continue its current academic programs in International Studies until the university community has had adequate time to consider the educational implications of any administrative realignments.

Dean Urice enthusiastically seconded this resolution, urging senators to think of change in terms of opportunity. Although the College proposes to release itself from administrative responsibility for many international arrangements, which would then be conducted through the Academic Affairs Office, he assured his colleagues that the College of Arts and Sciences remains strongly committed to supporting its full array of general education courses in International Studies while maintaining degree programs. He professed himself delighted to find how seriously the university community has thought about this issue as well as the Honors College. So assured, the Senate voted unanimously to support the resolution.

Next came updates on various administrative searches now approaching completion. Mr. Pine reported that Eleanor Smith has withdrawn her candidacy to become Vice President for Academic Affairs. Three candidates remain, however, and the search should end with the next Board meeting. Mr. Olson then reported that the search for a Vice President for Administration and Finance had attracted a host of highly qualified candidates. His committee is now whittling the pool to a group of eight for whom campus visits will be scheduled. Mr. Goslin announced

that the reopened search for a Vice President for University Relations will be carried out with help from a search firm experienced in finding development officers. That firm's representative will meet soon with President Packard. Mr. Jackson expected that finalists for the position of Dean of the School of Engineering and Computer Science would visit campus before the end of the winter semester, and Mr. Horwitz reported on behalf of the committee seeking a new Dean of Nursing that their efforts have reached essentially the same point. He judged both decanal searches well timed in terms of opportunity for finalists to meet the incoming Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The chair then called upon Mr. Chipman, still wearing his Planning Review Committee hat, to report on the fate of the Center for the Arts. Mr. Chipman announced that the Center, housed for some years in the College of Arts and Sciences, has been dissolved. Its functions have been taken over by other offices, chiefly-the Department of Music, Theatre, and Dance. The Senate Planning Review Committee, charged to study the establishment and dismantling of any academic administrative units, has fulfilled its charge by reviewing this matter. While attention focused on the arts, Mr. Urice proudly reported that Oakland University's student thespians had advanced to the national finals of the American College Theatre Festival for their brilliant performance of Cloud Nine. They are among the top six of eight hundred participating dramatic groups. Community members are invited to celebrate this triumph (as well as relief from tax headaches) at a special benefit performance the evening of April 15. Applause greeting this joyful news prompted Mr. Stamps to invite similar recognition for the university's athletes, especially the Women's Swim Team now celebrating its unprecedented fourth successive national championship. Mr. Horwitz, recognizing that men have now been relegated to secondary status, asked for one-handed claps in honor of the Men's Swim Team with its impressive second-place national finish.

He then called upon Ms. Eberwein to report on Steering Committee plans to open discussion of Senate practices. She referred to Ms. Benson's suggestion at the December meeting that the Senate consider revising its constitution. Aware from painful past experience that constitutional revision is a cumbersome and sometimes menacing process, the Steering Committee chose not to expose the constitution to casual deliberation but met with Ms. Benson to discover the nature of her concerns and think about ways of alleviating them. One of her concerns was that Senate discussion seemed constrained rather than open, and she suggested that faculty members might feel intimidated by the presence of administrators. Might it be preferable to revise our governance structure to substitute a faculty Senate for the current university one? How about a faculty caucus within a University Senate? Would it be a good idea to elect the Senate's presiding officer rather than assign the chairmanship to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (whose title, in any case, appears in anachronistic form within the current constitution)? There are many models of governance structures whose operations we could study. Is it possible, on the other hand, that some people hesitate to speak when they know that their comments will be preserved for university archives? The Steering Committee takes such concerns seriously and has raised them in its interviews with candidates for Vice President for Academic Affairs, thereby alerting them to the possibility of changed governance arrangements that could be introduced most readily at a time of transition when modifications would not be perceived as reflections on any particular person. The Steering Committee wishes to draw upon the wisdom of senators now completing two years (at least) of service to think about ways of fostering more productive, open discussion of university issues--some of which might entail constitutional changes while others might better be handled in quite different ways, even beyond the Senate. For this purpose, part of the April Senate meeting will be set aside so that the group can function as a committee of the whole (informally and off the record) to share

suggestions and consider whether it would be a good idea to initiate a process of constitutional revision. When asked whether she wanted to add to this report, Ms. Benson expressed satisfaction with developments.

Mr. Horwitz then reminded people of another forum for talking about issues of profound general concern by transmitting Virginia Allen's news that there were still a few places available for the next day's Hilton Suites sessions on diversity and student retention. Last semester's discussions had proven fruitful.

Speaking of opportunities for collaborative consideration of Oakland University's destiny, Ms. Frankie then issued the first of what will no doubt be many reports she presents as chair of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. First, she invited President Packard to reaffirm publicly her commitment to the planning process. Ms. Packard explained how the set of goals she submitted to the Board mesh with the planning process rather than preempting it. They were designed to initiate this broad community process, which she considers exceedingly important to the university's future. She pledged to take the ultimate report as her guideline for future fund-raising activity and other efforts. Reporting that about 180 individuals are serving on task forces, she noted that they are a broad-based group which includes present and former trustees, faculty, students, alumni, administrative staff, and friends of Oakland University. Urging everyone to get involved, she reminded people that each task force will conduct at least one open hearing to hear the community's advice. Dean Frankie will report regularly in the Oakland Post for the Steering Committee. Once the Authorship Task Force creates a draft report, there will be several opportunities for interested persons to respond. She hoped that the process would conclude at about this time next year.

Ms. Frankie then displayed lists of task force membership and a projected schedule of Strategic Planning developments, paying particular attention to the ways in which the Senate is integrated into this activity through its committees and as a general deliberative body. Task forces are now compiling data and studying the university's environment. This is a point in their work when they especially welcome ideas from all interested parties. She expected task force reports to be submitted by the first of October, with a draft of the final report circulating a month later. If all goes as scheduled, the Board should receive the finished report in January 1994. The "Vision Statement" that provides a base for this activity is now being revised and should be published next week. This is not a new "Role and Mission Statement" but is important, nonetheless, for the planning process and for university decisions. It articulates overall dedication to excellence along with commitment to seek preeminence in a few carefully chosen areas. The intent is to be clear, realistic, and prepared for difficult decisions ahead. As a veteran of the Commission on University Excellence and the Academic Planning and Policy Committee while it developed its "Strategic Guidelines for Oakland University," Ms. Frankie emphasized that this process builds solidly on past planning efforts rather than ignoring them. She recognized how much loyal effort went into those studies and pointed out, for the benefit of skeptics, that there are signs that this new planning effort may prove more fruitful in terms of actual implementation. Reasons for hope include the leadership of a new president who is solidly committed to the process, along with direct participation by most members of the Board. This is the most comprehensive, democratic effort the university has undertaken in the decade of Dean Frankie's service here, and she urged everyone to give the process a chance by getting involved in open hearings, talking to task force members, and sharing ideas. All task force meetings will be open, not just the scheduled public forums. She indicated that the task forces are trying to work within existing governance structures while providing new opportunities for deliberation when needed. When Mr. Stamps expressed concern about the

low level of student inclusion in the process, with only seven students appointed to task forces, Ms. Frankie reported that she would be meeting with Congress to try to improve upon that situation.

With that report accomplished, Mr. Horwitz declared the day's business completed sooner than expected at 4:16 p.m., and Mr. Gerulaitis's call for adjournment brought the meeting to a close.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane D. Eberwein
Secretary to the University Senate ~

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page