



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

March 3, 1964

Minutes

PRESENT: Messrs. APPLETON, BEARDSLEE, BROWN, M., CHERNO, CLARKE, GALLOWAY, HADEN, HAMMERLE, HETENYI, HEUBEL, HILDUM, HOOPES, HOWES, HUCKER, LEE, LOWY, MAHER, MATTHEWS, MCKAY, MOBLEY, O'DOWD, ROOSE, SIMMONS, SIMONS, STOUTENBURG, SUSSKIND, SWANSON, TAFOYA, TOMBOULIAN, VARNER, WILDER, WILLIAMSON

ABSENT: Messrs. BURDICK, COLLINS, EKLUND, OBEAR, SEIKEN, SELLS, STUBBLEFIELD.

GUESTS: Messrs. BURKE, QUAINANCE. ROSEMAN, and TIPLER.

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chancellor Varner.

Mr. Maher moved to adopt the minutes of February 26, 1964, as presented by the secretary. Seconded by Mr. Wilder. Approved.

Mr. Simons asked the chair whether a substantive motion could be made by a senator from the floor.

The parliamentarian ruled that the chair could recognize a senator for a substantive motion following "New Business."

The chair again extended an invitation to the faculty and staff to attend Senate meetings. However, he pointed out that a visitor must have the permission of the Senate to speak.

The chair asked if there was further discussion on Mr. Tomboulia's motion regarding the University catalog as a legal document. There were no additional comments.

Mr. Tomboulia moved the recommendation of the Committee on Instruction that "The Senate approved the 1963-65 University Catalog as a legal document and empowers the Committee on Instruction to make necessary emendations to the catalog in preparing subsequent editions consistent with the Senate's approved policy." Approved.

The chair asked if there was further discussion on Mr. Tomboulia's motion regarding the "I" (Incomplete) grade. There were no additional comments.

Mr. Tomboulia moved the recommendation of the Committee on Instruction that "The "I" (Incomplete) grade is a temporary grade that may be given only after the 13th week in a course where a student is

unable to complete the required work because of severe hardship. An "I" grade does not become official until approved by the Dean of the University. It is not to be considered a way whereby a student may avoid receiving a failing grade in a course. It must be removed by completing the required work before the deadline set by the instructor, but in no case later than the end of the next _ semester that the student is in residence, or a grade of 0.0 will be recorded. If more than three semesters intervene before the student resumes residence, then the "I" grade becomes an "N" grade." Approved.

The chair asked if there was further discussion on Mr. Haden's motion regarding Appointment and Tenure Policies. Mr. Brown asked, "Would all appointments that committed the University to tenure, whether the decision was positive or negative, be reviewed by the Tenure Review Committee?"

Dean O'Dowd stated that it was the intention of Paragraph "C" under Appointment Renewal Procedures to include a review of both positive and negative decisions.

Mr. Quaintance was recognized by the Senate to make the following statement: [\(See attachment A\)](#).

Mr. Haden moved the recommendation of the Faculty Affairs Committee that "The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the approval of the Rules of Tenure that constitute the first two pages of the attached document that is entitled Appointment and Tenure Policies. The Rules of Tenure require the approval of the Board of Trustees before they take effect." Approved.

Mr. Roose moved to amend the first sentence of Paragraph two of his original motion regarding new approaches to teaching. "When and if the curricular objectives of a plan are approved in principle by the Senate, a committed team shall work out curricular and administrative details in consultation with the Committee on Instruction and other appropriate groups and persons before putting the plan into operation." Seconded by Mr. Beardslee.

Mr. Chemo again indicated his concern for the appropriate checks that would be instituted to assure the inclusion of University courses or equivalents in any proposed new program.

Mr. Heubel stated the motion was to encourage the faculty to innovate in their teaching not to weaken a degree given by Oakland University.

Mr. Hetenyi moved the question on Mr. Roose's amendment. Seconded by Mr. Beardslee. Approved,

Mr. Hetenyi called the question on Mr. Roose's original motion as modified by the amendment. Seconded by Mr. Williamson.

"(1) Faculty teams shall be encouraged to formulate undergraduate educational programs consistent with the aims of liberal education and utilizing as much or as little of our current curriculum as desirable. Such programs should be conceived to operate within a student-faculty ratio of 20-1 and to involve no more than 200 students, to be recruited from incoming freshmen and/or students currently enrolled. (2) When and if the curricular objectives of a of a plan are approved in principle by the Senate, a committed team shall work out curricular and administrative details in consultation with the Committee on Instruction and other appropriate groups and persons before putting the plan into operation. Administrative details should include plans, if needed, for adjusting graduation requirements for students under the plan and guaranteeing student readmission to the standard University curriculum without hardship, if the plan

should prove unworkable." Approved.

The chair asked for discussion on Mr. Mobley's motion regarding the appropriateness of requiring external testing at this time in our history. After considerable discussion, it was moved by Mr. Hucker to table this motion. Seconded by Mr. Hetenyi. Approved.

Mr. Wilder asked that the Admissions Committee consider ways to identify students who are interested in attending Oakland University as well as being academically qualified. It is his feeling that some students attending this institution are doing it while not really wanting to be here.

Mr. Manor moved the recommendation of the Committee on Instruction to change two sections of the procedure on Major Standing as follows: Paragraph (3) "When a student drops below 2.0 in major courses, the advisors reports him to the department chairman, and the student is placed on departmental probation. The Academic Standing Committee is also notified." Paragraph (4) "If the student is not removed from probation after one further semester's work in major courses, he is liable to be dropped from major standing at the discretion of the department chairman." Seconded by Mr. Simons.

Mr. Hetenyi moved to amend the motion by adding another new section to the procedure on Major Standing as follows: "Acceptance for Major Standing for all teaching majors must first be approved by the major department and subsequently by an authorized representative of the Teacher Education Program." Seconded by Mr. Susskind. Approved. Final action on the motion and amendment to be taken at a subsequent meeting.

The chair then recognized Mr. Simons. Mr. Simons stated that in view of the Report of the Athletic Policy Committee, November 18, 1963, and the Report of the Chancellor, January 7, 1964, supporting that Committee, I make the following motion on athletics:

"The Academic Senate, in accordance with the document Michigan State University Oakland Organization, Fall 1961, Article II, par (1) sec (b) iii, et. seq., will determine athletic policy at Oakland University.

The Academic Senate will establish a permanent Committee on Athletic Policy.

Voting members of the Athletic Policy Committee will be limited to three, including the chairman, to be selected from the tenured full-time teaching faculty. (Full-time teaching faculty for purposes of this Committee is defined as (1) having no official administrative duties at Oakland University and (2) teaching a full course load however currently defined.)

The Athletic Policy Committee will be the only group responsible for recommending changes in athletic policy at Oakland University. All proposals pursuant to altering the present athletic policy must be moved through or by the Athletic Policy Committee. All hearings of the Athletic Policy Committee will be in open session." Seconded by Mr. Maher.

"The Chancellor's Athletic Policy Committee investigated the subject over a long period of time. Its recommendations seemed to be ignored by those currently supporting intercollegiate athletics. Therefore I feel it is in the best interests of all concerned, i.e., faculty, staff, students, administration, that a specific committee be designated to reevaluate athletic policy whenever called for.

So long as there are no intercollegiate athletics at Oakland there will be a vociferous group, no matter how large or small, arguing for the inclusion of such a program at the University. They need a place to make all their arguments heard and to propose changes through the Academic Senate. At the same time those who are opposed to the change in policy must also have a similar official University forum to defend their view. In either case the current mechanisms for such forum are vague and amorphous.

The Chancellor has accepted the current policy and its recommendation that the Academic Senate take on the responsibility for making changes therein. I would argue that the Student Affairs Committee is not the proper Senate body to handle the continuing problem. Although that committee is not overburdened with work it would soon be handling only questions and proposals on athletics and little else.

Athletic policy will be changing as the character of the University changes and the Athletic Policy Committee could direct full attention to the investigation of various programs carried out at universities which have also instituted, altered or dropped athletics. It seems to me to be a full function for a standing committee of the Academic Senate."

It was ruled by the chair to send Mr. Simons' motion to the Steering Committee for referral to the appropriate Senate Committee (Student Affairs Committee).

Mr. Simons asked for a time limit to be placed on this motion to be returned to the Senate for additional discussion and final action.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55.

ACADEMIC SENATE March 3, 1964

ATTACHMENT A.

Mr. Quaintance's Statement;

"I believe that the proposed Appointment and Tenure policies unnecessarily constrict the development of this institution in at least two ways:

First of all, they tend to eliminate the rank of Instructor as a trial period of full-time and sustained apprenticeship, during which a man has a chance to prove not only that he can get a PH.D., but that he can contribute to his discipline in the publication of scholarly work and to his colleagues and the university in the assumption of extracurricular duties, committee responsibilities, the development of new programs, etc. And I thought that there should be this triple responsibility for an Instructor to prove his attainment of the Assistant-Professor rank, that he should prove himself not only to the outside world by getting the PH. D., but to his colleagues by reaching a level of competence in his own discipline that made scholarly publication natural to him, and had shown that he could work into the Oakland community and contribute to it in ways that others could not, perhaps. I said that I had been told in a blase offhand manner that the Instructor's rank is vanishing all over the country in all disciplines, that in this respect, if in noother, the Humanities are thinking as big as the Sciences, etc. I have as yet heard no facts or figures on this

judgment, no comparisons to institutions like ours, no comparisons to the kind of institution we'd like Oakland to become. I think many of us would welcome such comparisons. Why are we settling for an essentially three-rank academic structure? What are we likely to be giving up?

Then I went on to my second point. My second fear is even more sensitive than this to discuss. I fear that by speeding up the process whereby Assistant Professors are retained on tenure or discarded, Oakland may be settling, more than it needs to, for the perpetuation of the present faculty. I thought that this perpetuation of the present faculty might prove to be constricting to us, and that we should not make more concessions to time in this matter than were forced upon us.

(I'll go on with this point in a minute, but parenthetically I add now a second thought. In the discussion that followed my remarks, such faculty members as Mr. Hetenyi pointed out that a man might be kept for up to six years as Assistant Professor. This seems ample time, I agree, but I would point out in rebuttal that in effect each Assistant Professor is decided upon in a much shorter time than those six years. We don't ride out the six years as we might.)

I went on to list five reasons for my second fear, concerning Assistant Professors, First, most of us work best under tension, and the optimistic hope that we might coast by the age of forty into port and a full professorship is not likely to elicit from most of us the kind of active, creative pursuit of our duties here (and enlargement of our duties here) that uncertainty would promote. I asked if Oakland, of all places, could afford to forsake that creative tension. I'm as ambitious as the next man, older than most Assistant Professors, older than some Associate Professors. I'd like to catch up! But when I try to look beyond personal ambition, I ask myself how long Oakland can afford to go on rewarding Assistant Professors with tenure at the present rate, or the potentially more rapid rate projected by the proposed policies.

My second question under this second point was: Has youth all the answers? Has our young faculty all the subtlety and steadiness which a new institution needs?

My third question was: How are we to attract older, established scholars to Oakland (if we should find that we do want that steadiness and subtlety) if all our positions are filled from among our own members, if we have no associate or full professorships to offer to a man from the outside?

My fourth point was a particularly personal one. In Oakland's rush to reach early decisions about tenure and promotion, I have witnessed, with wonder and pain, during the past year and a half, Oakland's relinquishing of three men none of whom was dropped for not doing his job! three men each of whom was in his way irreplaceable, each providing a unique and vivid contribution to our total community. Here it seems that time was against us, that the leeway of more time to decide (leeway which the proposed policies will narrow) might have saved us three important members of our community,

My fifth question was to express anxiety about the shape of things to come. What shape will the ranks of the faculty assume? Apparently not that of a pyramid (unless it's narrow at the base an upside-down pyramid), but apparently a shape that is fat at the Associate-Professor rank. What is the thinking behind this choice? Is it a choice, or is it forced upon us by circumstances? Is, indeed, the university buying itself a faculty with tenure instead of encouraging its faculty with other rewards (for example, smaller classes which might lead to better teaching), or instead of strengthening itself by other means? Is tenure becoming more of a bargaining point than it ought to be?"

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page