



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

SENATE

**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE**

Thursday, 13 February 1992  
Fifth Meeting

***MINUTES***

Senators Present: Abiko, Appleton, Bennett, Benson, Braunstein, Campbell, Chipman, Cowlshaw, Dahlgren, DeCarlo, Eberwein, Eckart, Edgerton, Frankie, Gamboa, Garcia, Griggs, Grossman, Hough, Kleckner, Mabee, McKay, Olson, Pierson, Schultz, Shepherd, Stano, Urice. Senators Absent: Briggs-Bunting, Cramer, Downing, Eisenhower, Fish, Gerulaitis, Goslin, Gunsberg, Halsted, Hansen-Smith, Hartzer, Heintz, Hormozi, Hovanesian, Jackson, Kevern, Kheir, Kim, Mittelstaedt, Otto, Peterson, Pine, Porter, Reddy, Richards, Rush, Russell, Stamps, Stevens, Wisz, Witt, Wood, Workman, Zenas.

Summary of Actions

1. Minutes of 16 January 1992 (Garcia, Braunstein) Approved.
2. Motion from the Academic and Career Advising Committee to accept its "Statement on the Academic Advising System" (Mabee; Hough). First Reading.
3. Conversation on possible establishment of a Senate Budget Committee (Hough).

Trusting that nobody would call the quorum while so many senators busied themselves elsewhere (many in connection with the visit of a presidential candidate), Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m. He extended special welcome to a distinguished ex-senator, George Matthews, who responded modestly to applause by admitting that "I'm here by mistake." He had thought the candidate's Faculty Forum began at 3 rather than 4, a time the Senate had to accommodate by moving expeditiously on an abbreviated agenda. With timing tight, members of this body forbore to quibble with the minutes of 16 January, which were approved without discussion (Moved, Ms. Garcia; seconded, Mr. Braunstein). [Note: the current secretary gratefully acknowledges her debt to Mr. Matthews, her predecessor, for setting stylistic and tonal standards for keepers of these records.]

No old business demanded attention, though the first item of "new" business looked familiar to those who attended the January meeting, at which members of the Academic and Career Advising Committee reported on a document last year's committee had developed as a role and mission statement for advisers. On the basis of the discussion that ensued and subsequent conferral with the Steering Committee, Professors Mabee and Cioch offered a revised version. Senator Mabee presented their case in the form of a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Hough.

MOVED that the Senate accept the committee's "Statement on the Academic Advising System at Oakland University.

She then read the revised statement (see below) aloud and offered to entertain questions. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that the statement applies to the total advising operation: faculty members (some more extensively engaged than others) as well as professional advisers. Ms. Garcia declared herself pleased with the changes, which satisfactorily answered her concerns. She favored approval. Mr. Dahlgren proposed adding the word "other" in both paragraphs before professional academic advisers" as a reminder that faculty members are professionally committed to this activity also. Mr. Kleckner suggested treating this as a friendly amendment, and the committee representatives seemed disposed to accept it in that light. Ms. Eckart then suggested another revision, this one modifying the second sentence in the Role and Mission paragraph to read "whereby students are assisted in discovering possibilities, identifying and assessing alternatives, and weighing the consequences of decisions." Since this was only the first reading of the motion, Mr. Kleckner suggested letting the framers consider these stylistic suggestions rather than having the Senate debate language in detail. Ms. Mabee reported that she had consulted with Senator Grossman on the revision and had found him disposed to add the word "career" to the second paragraph in order to ensure parallelism with the first. Mr. Kleckner concluded deliberations by pointing out that this is a good illustration of why we allow two readings to our motions. He deferred further discussion to the March meeting, before which committee sponsors would have time to reflect on suggested revisions and report back to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Kleckner then introduced the other item of new business, noting that a new Senate tradition had emerged in his absence. This would be the second conversation on a topic of general interest. He then invited Mr. Hough to conduct the conversation on behalf of the Steering Committee to find out what ideas people had about the possibility of establishing a new Senate committee. Mr. Hough began by mentioning recent campus discussions about whether this body is looking at all the issues it should and particularly whether it should not attempt to engage itself in the budget process. Admittedly, the Academic Policy and Planning Committee gets to look at the completed budget, but it makes sense that members of the academic community who wish to participate in budget preparation do so at an earlier stage. He considered timely involvement especially important at times like this when fiscal shortfalls may necessitate major changes, including significant reductions. Drawing an analogy to family budget conferences in hard times, he indicated that people have to know what is coming in, what the overall needs are, and what alternatives exist before they can make informed decisions. He likened the proposed Senate committee to the Congressional Budget Office and anticipated that it would engage in all stages of budget formulation. Although it would be hard to establish a committee in time to participate fully in this year's budget deliberations, he thought one could be on track for the following year.

Mr. Chipman then inquired about the Senate's history in this area. He recalled that this body had some sort of budget committee at some point and wondered both how it operated and why it was discontinued. His hope that Mr. Matthews could illumine this history met with disappointment, as the veteran senator "couldn't possibly remember." Neither could Mr. Kleckner recall any committee that ever tracked with the entire process including Board deliberations, as Mr. Hough suggested. Mr. Braunstein thought it would be helpful to hear from the provost about the timetable currently used with the budget. Mr. Kleckner replied that he couldn't identify any reliably repeating pattern for handling the university's resources. The only constant is the governor's budget recommendation in mid-winter (recently delivered for this year). Legislative bodies begin working from that point but seldom have a bill before either house before late April. Until then, there is a lot of guessing. Afterward, comes the fine-tuning. Sometimes appropriation decisions wait until well into the next fiscal year. Despite delays in

Lansing, he indicated that Oakland University's leaders are trying to move ahead our own budget processes this year, dealing with tuition questions earlier than in the past. Interim President DeCarlo has been expediting this activity, although his successor may act differently. In years when there has been reasonable expectation of some new resources beyond what is necessary to cover inflation, deans have been asked to list their priorities for new spending. This year will not be that sort. Governor Engler has proposed no increase for higher education, despite contractual obligations and rising costs. The only place we have been able to invest new resources lately is the library, which we absolutely must strengthen. Although we face a belt-tightening situation for the next several years, he saw no reason to delay beginning the budget process. He offered no encouragement about the likelihood of better news from Lansing next year. Mr. Cowlshaw thought there were some important budgetary issues not tied to Lansing, among them that of spring/summer course funding. He wondered whether Mr. Hough envisaged the new committee having input on such matters. Mr. Hough certainly did. He also mentioned the need for faculty vigilance as Oakland fashions alliances with external private sources of funding on which we will inevitably grow more dependent. Mr. Dahlgren suggested that careful analysis of current budgets by a Senate committee might provide useful direction for work on subsequent versions. Mr. Hough agreed, noting that the committee could raise issues for faculty scrutiny.

Mr. DeCarlo then came forward to react to what he had been hearing. Regretting the absence of a larger constituency to deal with this important topic, he said he had no problem with adding a new source of input into budgetary deliberations. He needed all the help he could get but could not speak for his successor. Aware that there would be overlaps between the projected committee and others, including a Board subcommittee, he mentioned the need for confidentiality in certain matters. He said he had been seeking a way to get community input on critical issues the university faces and has talked with the Vice President for Finance and Administration about how to go about it. All he asked is that the community work in a coordinated, cooperative, non-adversarial fashion. He reiterated Mr. Kleckner's report about the projected zero increase and noted that we face difficult decisions. How do we distribute reduced resources in equitable ways? Although he considered budget issues open, he cautioned against anyone's jumping to conclusions on the basis of early proposals that might never be adopted. Reminding senators that the Board makes final budget decisions, he pointed out that we cannot do everything in a few short months. Although change is difficult, he judged it necessary. When Mr. Hough asked whether the interim president saw a Senate committee as a useful instrument for such activities, Mr. DeCarlo responded that he did; although people should also talk with whoever comes as our new president. He mentioned that his conversations with campus leaders elsewhere in the state show us in better shape than many other Michigan universities, some of them talking about massive program cuts and tuition/fee increases. Mr. Kleckner then drew the discussion to a close by posing a question to the Senate: would it be that body's pleasure to continue this conversation next month, by which time the Steering Committee should be able to bring in a proposed committee structure? He felt that the Steering Committee would benefit from further discussion, as did Mr. Edgerton, one of its members. Mr. Edgerton reminded his Senate colleagues of the multiple impacts that must be considered when we launch new programs. Mr. Kleckner then closed the meeting with a pledge to bring further material to the 12 March meeting.

On that note, Mr. Stano and Ms. Benson called for adjournment at 3:58, just in time for the Faculty Forum.

Respectfully submitted:

Jane D. Eberwein  
Secretary to the University Senate

\*\*\*\*\*

## **INSTITUTIONAL STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC ADVISING OAKLAND UNIVERSITY**

### Role and Mission

The role and mission of academic advising at Oakland University is to advise and counsel students as they seek to develop academic, career and life goals. This is a continuous process of discovery, clarification and evaluation, whereby the advisor assists students in discovering possibilities, identifying and assessing alternatives and weighing the consequences of decisions.

### Guidelines

In the interest of promoting the intellectual and emotional growth of students, the primary goals of academic advising at Oakland University include:

- support for the exploration of intellectual interests;
- assistance in the development of self-awareness;
- reinforcement of self-direction;
- promotion of intellectual skill development
- clarification of academic and life goals
- development of academic plans
- facilitation of progress toward graduation through the interpretation of institutional policies and program requirements;
- promotion of awareness of available educational resources;
- advocacy of student issues and concerns within the academic decision making process.

*Back to*  
**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY**  
**S E N A T E**  
*Home Page*