



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

**Thursday, 9 April 1992  
Eighth Meeting**

### *MINUTES*

Senators Present: Appleton, Bennett, Briggs-Bunting, Chipman, Cramer, Dahlgren, Downing, Eberwein, Eckart, Edgerton, Eisenhower, Fish, Frankie, Gamboa, Garcia, Goslin, Griggs, Grossman, Hartzler, Hormozi, Hough, Hovanesian, Jackson, Kevern, Kleckner, Mabee, Mittelstaedt, Olson, Otto, Peterson, Pierson, Rush, Schultz, Shepherd, Stano, Witt, Wood, Workman.

Senators Absent: Abiko, Benson, Braunstein, Campbell, Cowlshaw, DeCarlo, Gerulaitis, Gunsberg, Halsted Hansen-Smith, Heintz, Kheir, Kim, McKay, Pine Porter, Reddy, Richards, Russell, Stamps, Stevens, Urice, Wisz, Zenas.

#### Summary of Actions

1. Minutes of 12 March 1992 (Kevern; Hough). Approved.
2. Motion to amend the UCUI proposal by substituting the word "ethnic" for "cultural" throughout (Workman; Downing). Approved.
3. Motion from UCUI to establish a graduation requirement in American cultural diversity (Appleton; Hough). Approved as amended.
4. Motion from the Graduate Council to change designations for certain degrees offered by the School of Education and Human Services (Dahlgren; Pine). Approved.
5. Procedural motion to table a motion (Chipman; Olson). Approved.
6. Motion from the Steering Committee to establish a University Finance and Budget Committee (Hough; Otto). Tabled.
7. Motion from the Steering Committee to staff standing committees (Briggs- Bunting; Kevern). Approved with the exception of the Research Committee.
8. Report from the Research Committee on projected reallocation of committee resources and library collection development concerns (Goslin).
9. Special resolution from the Steering Committee to welcome incoming President Packard (Rush; Kevern and Briggs-Bunting).
10. Special resolution from the Steering Committee to thank Interim President DeCarlo (Edgerton; Olson).
11. Conversation on possible privatization of the University BookCenter (Kleckner and Bledsoe).

Anticipating a lengthy agenda, Mr. Kleckner summoned the Senate to order at 3:14 p.m., immediately directing attention to the minutes of 12 March 1992. These, duly moved by Mr. Kevern and seconded by Mr. Hough, were approved without discussion or dissent.

The first item of old business was the second reading of a proposal from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to establish a new graduation requirement in American cultural diversity. Mr. Appleton, chair of the sponsoring committee, declined opportunity to comment, thus opening the floor to general discussion. Ms. Garcia rose to call attention to a problem just presented to her that morning by a student, Alicia Cunningham-Sampson, who edits *UMOJA*, Oakland's new African-American newsletter. On Tuesday, Ms. Sampson received a threatening letter addressed to "Niggers" by an otherwise unidentified "White America." Although Ms. Garcia had originally requested that the Senate Secretary make copies of this vile document for distribution at this meeting, she had reconsidered that action on the advice of Vice President Bledsoe to avoid interference with a criminal investigation. Instead, she read the letter aloud to alert her colleagues to the ugly reality of racial hostility on our campus. In addition, she mentioned a pile of similarly disturbing racist material that Ms. Bledsoe had shared with her. As chair of the University Committee on Human Relations, Ms. Garcia passionately appealed to her colleagues to pass this legislation and then move forward to initiate further action that would be "real" (even perhaps Racism 101). She concluded by reminding the Senate that "This is a beginning, not an ending."

Mr. Workman, respecting what had been said, wondered whether the proposition should be reworded to substitute the adjective "ethnic" for "cultural" in the opening sentence. He read "cultural" as a more inclusive term that included class and gender, thereby perhaps diluting the impact of ethnic concerns. Mr. Appleton perceived no real shading of denotation, but Ms. Allen (also a member of UCUI) agreed with Mr. Workman's judgment. Mr. Appleton said such a modification would be fine, and Mr. Kleckner suggested returning to that matter as a friendly amendment if it still seemed pertinent after other issues had been aired.

Mr. Fish declared himself still unsatisfied that a course focused on ethnic and cultural diversity could be the best approach to the actual problem of racism. He wondered whether the most appropriate courses would meet UCUI's specifications. Mr. Appleton responded that UCUI's language was sufficiently open to incorporate courses in many fields that treat ethnic perspectives, not necessarily in a historical framework. He stated that his committee had searched for the most effective approach to racism, not necessarily the most direct one. His committee has been heartened by various examples of instructors getting good results in terms of awakening student awareness of racism while working within their own disciplines.

Ms. Briggs-Bunting then spoke up as one fully aware of Ms. Garcia's concern and dismayed by the latest incident. Nonetheless, she cautioned her colleagues about reacting against "what some idiot is writing" by enacting legislation that had not been fully considered. She advised taking time to make sure we know what we really want to do and can do it effectively. Ms. Garcia argued that it would be "tragic" to reject this proposal in hopes of something better "in the sweet by and by." She appraised the equivalent of three weeks of one course as "better than nothing at all." Ms. Bledsoe eloquently supported Ms. Garcia's position, reminding senators of the urgent problem we face. She pointed to national evidence of racial polarization among college students and declared herself painfully aware of academic attempts to cope with racism in some sort of euphemistic fashion. She, too, would welcome stronger legislation but supported this for the present.

Mr. Kleckner then recalled attention to Mr. Workman's friendly amendment, substituting the word "ethnic" for "cultural" in the motion's initial sentence. Ms. Wood objected to the change, preferring the openness of "cultural," which could also encompass gay/lesbian concerns. Mr.

Kleckner asked the intent of the framers. How broadly did they conceive their proposal? If the amendment struck the framers as substantially restricting meaning, then he thought it best to bring the amendment to a vote. Mr. Appleton replied that the sense of the committee had been to focus on ethnic interrelationships, though other issues might enter in. He found himself agreeing with Mr. Workman that "ethnic" would clarify meaning. In that case, Mr. Kleckner thought the amendment would have a definite narrowing effect. He thought the change should be handled through a motion. Mr. Hough suggested that any such emendation be carried through the proposal as a whole, both the motion and its accompanying statement. So advised, Mr. Workman (seconded by Mr. Downing) offered an amendment to substitute "ethnic" for "cultural" throughout. Ms. Briggs-Bunting shared Ms. Wood's concern about sexual bias and suggested expanding the motion to include ethnicity and culture. Mr. Chipman supported the Workman amendment. Ms. Otto reminded people of the limited possibilities of what could be accomplished in three weeks. The best to be hoped is that students may gain some understanding, that their academic experience will open doors to Acceptance and further learning. She thought that cultural issues could open the same sorts of awareness as ethnic ones. Following this discussion, the chair called for a vote on the amendment, which passed without dissent. A subsequent vote on the amended motion also gained unanimous support. The Senate thereby approved the following legislation:

**MOVED** that all Oakland-University students must acquaint themselves with American ethnic diversity by taking at least one course designated as exploring the implications of the disciplines for ethnic perspectives and interrelationships. Courses will acquire this designation through departmental application to a subcommittee of UCUI, demonstrating that at least the equivalent of three weeks of the course deal with these subjects. These courses may be in any rubric and may also be used to meet general education, major, minor, distribution, concentration, elective credit or other degree requirements. This requirement is to be implemented when UCUI has approved a sufficient number of courses to meet student need.

Recognizing the university's attempt to deal with a very difficult issue, Mr. Kleckner observed that it is hard to modify attitudes and mind-sets. He hoped this action marked a meaningful beginning but reminded the Senate that we need to keep thinking very seriously about this concern.

After this discussion, the Senate turned with relief to the second reading of a proposal from the Graduate Council to change the designations of certain degrees offered by the School of Education and Human Services:

**MOVED** that the M.A.T. degree offered by the School of Education and Human Services in the areas of Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership; Early Childhood, and Special Education be designated as M.Ed.

This motion won unanimous support without discussion, thus completing the old business on the agenda.

Next came the first reading of a Steering Committee motion to establish a new standing committee of the Senate (Moved, Mr. Hough; seconded, Ms. Otto):

**MOVED** that the Senate establish a University Finance and Budget Committee

with charge and membership specifications as follows.

Charge:

1. To seek actively and to receive information bearing on the university budget process and to advise the Senate on matters pertaining to the university budget;
2. To seek and receive information bearing on programs of the Office of Development and to advise the University Senate on matters pertaining to the university's development efforts;
3. To engage in and report on such comparative budget studies as will best support the budget making process at the university.

Membership: Six faculty, one of them the chair of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (or designee); one administrative-professional (AP), who is appointed by the Executive Committee of the AP Assembly; one student, appointed by the University Student Congress; and the Vice President for Finance and Administration and the Vice President for Development and External Affairs (or designees), both of whom shall be *ex officio* and voting.

Mr. Hough reported that the Steering Committee had modified the previous month's draft version in response to community suggestions and now presented a revised motion with new commentary. The intent was to avoid setting rigid specifications for the committee's actions but rather to leave its development open over its first year or so of operation. Professor Geltner, chair of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee, then recommended on behalf of her committee that the Senate not proceed with this motion. She pointed out that the APPC already engages in much of the work envisaged for the new committee, being charged to consider the impact of resource allocations on academic programs and to make recommendations regarding program initiation or discontinuance. The APPC reviews financial data from all divisions, not just Academic Affairs. It is willing to expand its responsibilities in this area, if the Senate so wishes. She thought it premature to establish an entirely new committee that might not be needed. She pointed to the Steering Committee's comment on the agenda regarding the arrival of a new president and recommended that the Senate delay action until the next academic year.

Mr. Chipman then declared his intent to move that the motion be tabled, though recognizing that such an action put him in disagreement with persons with whom he likes to agree. Not wanting to close off discussion, he asked the chair whether a move to table would have that effect. Mr. Kleckner thought that it would, as such a motion must be voted upon promptly. When he inquired of the parliamentarian about the rules for such action, Mr. Appleton agreed that a motion to table is not debatable. Mr. Gregory then added that a motion to table a motion for a specific time is debatable, eliciting a question from Mr. Chipman about "What period of time?" Mr. Chipman then explained that he preferred to bring such a motion forward for its first reading in the fall rather than in April and offered three reasons why it should be tabled:

- 1) process: He saw no benefit in moving ahead while so many provisions about the committee's functions and interactions remain sketchy.
- 2) communication: A committee formed to improve campus communication on budget issues should be developed as a result of full communication- on campus.

3) style and tone: Recognizing uncertainties about the university's future, he preferred to behave with confidence that matters like budgets will be openly and effectively resolved with full consultation.

He then offered a motion to table the original motion (seconded, Mr. Olson). The motion carried with a few dissenting voices. Mr. Kleckner pledged that the Steering Committee would lay the groundwork for bringing this matter back to the Senate in the appropriate way.

Had Senate precedent held firm, the next motion would have gone smoothly. Ms. Briggs-Bunting, seconded by Mr. Kevern, proposed acceptance of the Steering Committee's nominations to standing committees (detailed on the day's agenda). She announced a few changes before opening the floor to discussion. Mr. Lau's winter '93 sabbatical prevents him from taking the helm of the Teaching and Learning Committee; so that body, like the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee, awaits identification of a new chair. Two UCUI seats remain unfilled at this point; the School of Health Sciences and the School of Engineering and Computer Science have not as yet made recommendations. Ms. Otto noted that Joyce Eckart has been replacing Sharon Muir on the General Education Committee since this fall and will continue that service while Ms. Muir is on leave abroad next year. Mr. Kleckner remarked that he has always been a strong supporter of Oakland's faculty leave policy and would continue to be so, though it creates problems with committee staffing.

Mr. Goslin thanked the Steering Committee for responding favorably to a request from the present Research Committee that membership in that body be distributed with regard to diversity of academic bases: one-third from humanities and social science disciplines, one-third from the natural sciences, and the other third from the professional schools. As chair of that body, he had wished, however, to see more women among the membership and was disturbed to discover two persons from one department. He asked the Steering Committee to reconsider its recommendations. Ms. Briggs-Bunting said that the committee recognized its oversight and was trying to rectify omissions. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that the Graduate Council still has a seat to fill and would do so with careful attention to the Research Committee's concerns. Before the matter came to a vote, Mr. Downing asked whether the Senate would be voting on the Research Committee as well as the others or whether action on that matter would be postponed. Although he respected all the nominees as excellent candidates for such responsibility, he worried about setting a precedent for allowing two members to serve from one department. Ms. Briggs-Bunting suggested deferring action on that one committee and reworded her motion to ask the Senate's confirmation of nominations to all its other standing committees. This revision proved satisfactory to Mr. Kevern as well. The Senate then voted unanimously to confirm as specified the Steering Committee's slate of nominees to all committees other than Research.

Next came a report from Mr. Goslin on behalf of the Research Committee, which had two concerns to bring before the Senate. He presented the first for information and possible Senate action. The Research Committee has decided that, starting in fall '92, it will eliminate funding it has provided to support special research seminars and special projects; in fall '93, it will also discontinue purchases of faculty books and offprints. The committee has unanimously agreed to modify its allocations so that all the money contractually reserved for funding research grants can be directed for that purpose. He and his associates have asked the university to make funding available from other sources to support these valuable activities according to a formula that would assure incremental increases to keep pace with rising costs. When he

invited discussion on this issue, Mr. Kleckner qualified what might have sounded like his support for this change. He had never heard the recommended formula before that day and would not support a precedent for automatic increases. If it is the will of the Senate that the Research Committee discontinue its support of these activities, he would look for money from other sources within the Division of Academic Affairs. He asked the Senate for advice. Mr. Edgerton hoped Ms. Geltner might have counsel from the APPC, but she had already left.

Mr. Olson said he was concerned that the Research Committee was adjusting its practices to fall in line with what the AAUP bargained for with the university. He thought that, if the AAUP wanted such changes, the union should push for this on its own. He did not think the Senate should be calling for new money for this worthy cause, at least not if it came from his school's budget. Mr. Kleckner doubted that it would but warned that funds would probably be shifted from flexible dollars he has already been directing toward research needs. Mr. Downing pointed out that there has been no change in contract language but simply in the committee's interpretation. He judged it important to think about what things the provost has been funding that might now be imperiled (help for foreign travel, for example, and to buy equipment). Ms. Otto agreed; she saw this as a major change calling for further discussion. She doubted the Senate's readiness to consider making so substantive a change and would prefer to see a formal motion in the fall. Mr. Kleckner noted that he had invited Mr. Goslin to report to the Senate with hope of this body's providing guidance to its committee. The Senate has not in the past legislated how a committee expends its resources.

Mr. Chipman welcomed Mr. Goslin's appearance and thought it desirable that the Research Committee keep in touch with the Senate about its work. He pointed out, however, that its mandate is not simply to award grants but to promote research and scholarship throughout the university. Mr. Goslin responded that he would be happy to report regularly but pointed out that the funds under consideration are specifically designated in the contract as meant for grants; no general fund money is involved. If the Senate feels the Research Committee's action is inappropriate in any way, his colleagues will reconsider their decisions. Ms. Briggs-Bunting observed that the university is not dealing these days with a budgetary shell game; when committee priorities change, there is no guarantee that abandoned projects will be rescued with anyone else's limited resources. Mr. Workman stressed the value of research seminars and special projects. Despite his appreciation of grants awarded to his colleagues (especially to junior faculty), he could not recommend discontinuance of support for other projects without assurance of alternative funding. Ms. Otto agreed that it would be unfortunate to withdraw support for scholarly activity of sorts not covered by grants. Mr. Grossman, however, reminded people that the recommended changes simply bring practice into conformity with the contract. Mr. Goslin promised to bring the Senate's advice back to the Research Committee for its consideration.

The second concern Mr. Goslin raised on behalf of the Research Committee concerned the possible impact of the library's new collection development plan. He reported that the committee had sent a memorandum to Dean Frankie urging an open budget process and advising reconsideration of some Provisions p of the plan in terms of their impact on research activities and the university's general academic mission. The committee worried about what seems to have been a top-down management decision and about problems posed for undergraduate students by the proposed electronic acquisition system. It also wondered about the origin of the formula used to determine changes in library allocations. Other concerns included doubts about the timeliness of access to scholarly materials as well as about the system's cost-effectiveness. He mentioned that faculty members in biology and mathematics

worry about the quality of reproduction in electronically transmitted materials and that faculty in general feel concerns about the ultimate cost of articles obtained through the new system and about the pressure departments feel to cut journals without being given adequate choice between volumes on the shelf and equivalents in other forms. He then presented four recommendations from the Research Committee to the dean:

- 1) that the library initiate detailed consultations with individual departments about meeting their research needs;
- 2) that other systems and options among electronic systems be explored before Oakland commits itself to CARL or UNCOVER;
- 3) that librarians consult widely on campus, especially with the Academic Computing Committee and the Office of Computer Information Service; and
- 4) that the dean address the need for free access to library facilities.

He concluded by expressing the Research Committee's willingness to work with the library staff. He assured the Senate that he and his colleagues are not trying to side-swipe this important process but rather attempting to make it more effective.

Ms. Frankie replied that she considered these recommendations excellent ones and assured the Senate that the library staff is eager to proceed openly and with full consultation. The Library Council is attempting to communicate better by distributing its minutes to departments and publicizing its meetings. The Council remains the key policy group both for this issue and for North Central accreditation concerns. Mr. Liboff, identifying himself as an interested member of the faculty though not currently a senator, pointed out that scholarly use of a library involves more than retrieval of documents. He had been impressed in conversations with colleagues from a variety of disciplines to discover how many feel that other things are even more important. He found widespread agreement that researchers often consult books and articles in a rather random way rather than with a targeted list of materials. He therefore reasoned that the university needs to maintain a substantial browsing collection and hoped that the Library Council would consider that fact. Mr. Kleckner concluded the discussion by pointing out that the force behind projected change is cost. If Mr. Goslin's concern for "free access" to material meant cost-free, he anticipated enormous problems. He then thanked Mr. Goslin for sharing the Research Committee's thinking on these important matters.

Attention then turned to two special resolutions marking a major transition in university leadership. With great pleasure, Ms. Rush introduced a resolution welcoming Dr. Sandra Packard as our new president (seconded simultaneously by Mr. Kevern and Ms. Briggs-Bunting):

**WHEREAS** the Board of Trustees has completed the most open and inclusive presidential search in the history of Oakland University by appointing Dr. Sandra Packard as our next president;  
And whereas Dr. Packard brings to this position a strong background of academic leadership at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Bowling Green State University, and Miami University of Ohio;  
And whereas she has pledged herself to communicate openly with all university

constituencies in advancing the academic and fiscal fortunes of this institution; Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Senate enthusiastically welcomes Dr. Packard to membership in this body and looks forward to working with her for the well-being of Oakland University.

Ms. Garcia, having no quarrel either with "this fine resolution" or with the Senate's current chair, proffered a question: Had anyone ascertained Dr. Packard's thoughts about the possibility of her restoring the long-standing tradition by which the president of Oakland University used to preside over the Senate? Mr. Edgerton said that the Steering Committee would do so, though Mr. Kleckner pointed out that such a change would have to be accomplished formally by way of an amendment to the Senate constitution. The resolution won unanimous support.

Mr. Edgerton, seconded by Mr. Olson, then presented a second special resolution from the Steering Committee: this one a statement of thanks to Interim President DeCarlo.

**WHEREAS** John DeCarlo has served Oakland University during the 1991-92 academic year as our second Interim President;  
And whereas he has demonstrated repeatedly during that time his willingness to meet with the University Senate and to provide this body with information on current conditions and future prospects;  
And whereas he has worked energetically to assure that the university's affairs are in good order for our incoming president; Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Senate thanks Mr. DeCarlo for his services as Interim President.

That resolution also won immediate approval, Mr. Kleckner mentioned that Mr. DeCarlo had apologized in advance for his inability to attend this meeting. The Senate has appreciated his faithful participation.

Last on the agenda came a conversation on possible privatizing of the University BookCenter, an issue that had sparked many rumors. Mr. Kleckner placed this discussion in the context of previous Senate conversations on thorny matters of general university interest. He stressed the word "possible" to assure people that no firm decision had been made. He said he was presenting the matter to the Senate in the spirit of inquiry, bringing it forward for analysis and reflection. After providing some background, he meant to turn the conversation over to others more involved in the deliberations. As usual, funding turned out to be the heart of the matter. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that the university operates on limited sources of money that constitute the general fund, which supports all academic operations. In addition, we have a number of auxiliary enterprises such as residence halls, the Meadow Brooks, and food services. The auxiliary enterprises are not "necessary" for continued existence as a university. None of these auxiliary services now benefits from the general fund; they must pay their own way, indeed return funds through administrative fees to pay for the services and utilities they use. With these activities gradually cut off from the general fund, a dichotomy has emerged at the university between self-funding enterprises and those academic activities for which general fund resources have been conserved. One of these auxiliary enterprises is the Oakland Center, which has been significantly funded through bookstore profits. Unless considerable money continues to come in from the bookstore, the university will have to discontinue many uses of the building or find alternative funding sources. The BookCenter faces financial pressure as it finds itself increasingly constrained to look for sufficient profits (more readily made from tee-



shirts than textbooks), while competing with an off-campus vendor, to support the building. Posing the question "Do we have to do these things accomplished by auxiliary services that have functioned here?" Mr. Kleckner thought the answer was "not necessarily.., It would be prudent to look into possibilities of easing budget pressures by finding alternative ways to accomplish the same tasks. He recognized apprehension about change and worries about loss of what we have grown accustomed to but emphasized that there will be changes anyway: losses, alas, if we keep losing money. He expected other auxiliary enterprises to be reconsidered in the future in order to preserve the academic operation, which is the lifeblood of the university. Stressing that we are at an information-gathering stage of inquiry about the BookCenter's fate and that no firm decisions have been made, he invited Vice President Bledsoe to report to the Senate on how this issue is being approached within the Division of Student Affairs.

Ms. Bledsoe took this opportunity to inform the Senate about extremely difficult choices facing her as she attempts to meet budget reduction targets from a Student Affairs budget that is considerably smaller than that of the Academic Affairs division. She said that her colleagues had formulated a set of guiding policies to help in their decisions:

- 1) maintain academic programs
- 2) preserve employment
- 3) pay attention to impact on Affirmative Action
- 4) consider interrelationships with other divisions on campus
- 5) provide for continuation of services

She forcefully denied any idea that the BookCenter issue had arisen out of any criticism of the operation that has served us here. What has changed is not the quality of its service but new local competition and a pattern of change nationally toward operation of university bookstores by national vendors. Although she would much prefer not to have to face such choices, she recognized that Oakland may eventually face the prospect of actually eliminating some familiar services. Projected bookstore changes, however, would not necessitate actual discontinuance of service--unlike, for example, shutting down Health Services, which could not be replaced. She assured the Senate that, if anything is done, academic impacts will be considered and loyal employees protected. She then opened the floor for questions and comments.

Ms. Rush began by asking about the time-frame in which a decision about privatizing the bookstore would be made. Ms. Bledsoe said that the ultimate decision would be the Board's. Given budget reduction deadlines, she would want to have any new system operative by the start of the fall 1992 semester. Mr. Edgerton then asked how she was seeking input on academic implications of such a decision. Ms. Bledsoe regretted time limits ill proportioned to the magnitude of the problem. She had talked with the provost but had not had time for widespread consultation. Mr. Hough suggested looking at "the whole pot" by inviting an operation on the scale of Meier's Thrifty Acres to examine the potential of the Oakland Center as a whole. Ms. Bledsoe indicated that discussion had been limited to the bookstore, as Oakland still has five years to run on its food-service contract with Marriott. Her staff has not considered the whole building but has consulted nationally experienced firms about bookstore

possibilities. She pointed out that the Oakland Center is very complex in its funding; it relies on a combination of student fees, payments by outside users, and profits from auxiliary operations. It receives no payment for use by the Senate and other faculty bodies. Mr. Hough responded that the University of Washington has initiated radical changes in its bookstore operation. Anticipating that electronic information systems might change the picture decisively, he regretted that the Senate had no committee prepared to respond to questions like this and report to the Senate. Ms. Bledsoe looked forward to an atmosphere of improved communication and hoped for a vision that might assure us that we are making wise long-term decisions. She noted that it had been much more fun to think about allocating new resources in more prosperous days than to consider cutting back on operations as good as our BookCenter has always been.

Ms. Bledsoe then invited Jack Wilson to report on the information- gathering process. Mr. Wilson said that he and David Bixby (also present to respond to inquiries) had been looking at models of various kinds of bookstores on a number of campuses. They are seeking extensive information. More and more universities face such decisions, and there are precedents to examine. He added that his team is looking at the whole retail enterprise. Ms. Briggs-Bunting hoped that Ms. Bledsoe was not being pressured to meet an unrealistic deadline for such a significant decision. When Mr. Bennett worried about rising costs to students, Ms. Bledsoe assured him that her staff is giving close attention to that matter.

Mr. Kleckner said he would like to explore with the Steering Committee ways of invigorating such conversations by seeking advice of appropriate standing committees. He indicated that the university needs to plan years ahead rather than in short time-frames. Unfortunately, we cannot anticipate improved state funding over the next several years. Michigan's tax returns continue to fall behind generous revenue estimates; consequently, the projected deficit for this fiscal year keeps mounting. He reported that recent signals from Lansing suggest that higher education may escape what looks like a coming 2% executive rollback for everything else. The governor and legislature are stalemated over the budget, however, and their inaction gives us less and less time to deal with any rollback that may occur. He advised steeling ourselves to the fact that conditions will not get better in a hurry.

On that ominous note, Mr. Kleckner opened the floor for private resolutions for the good of the order, but none came forward. He then remarked that this appeared to be the year's final Senate meeting and looked forward to seeing the same group assemble in the fall for its second year of service. Wishing everyone a good spring and summer, he welcomed Ms. Briggs-Bunting's move to adjourn at 5:03 p.m.

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

*Back to*  
**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY**  
**SENATE**  
*Home Page*