OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Second Meeting
Thursday, October 19, 1989
Oakland Center, Gold Room C
3:10 P.M.

Minutes

SENATORS PRESENT: B. Abiko, S. Appleton, M. Arshagouni, K. Beehler, D. Braunstein, K. Berven, D. Bricker, F. Cardimen, P. Cass, J. Chipman, J. Cowlishaw, G. Dahlgren, G. Dillon, R. Eberwein, W. Fish, S. Frankie, W. Garcia, L. Gerulaitis, J. Grossman, B. Hamilton, P. Hartman, D. Herman, A. Hormozi, J. Hovanesian, K. Kleckner, K. Kulig, A. Liboff, A. Lindell, F. Mili, B. Murphy, R. Olson, R. Pettengill, G. Pine, F. Schieber, R. Schwartz, M. Sherman, L. Stamps, B. Theisen, R. Tracy, A. Tripp, G. Wedekind, T. Weng, H. Witt, C. Zenas

SENATORS ABSENT: V. Allen, P. Bertocci, J. Briggs-Bunting, J. Champagne, M. Coffey, J. Eckart, 1. Eliezer, R. Horwitz, K. Kazarian, V. Larabell, A. Meehan, D. Miller, V. Reddy, J. Rosen, K. Salomon, J. Schimmelman, J. Urice, R. Williamson, B. Winkler

I . Call to order at 3:18 p.m. by Provost Kleckner. P. Cass has accepted appointment as Secretary for Academic Year 1989-90.

II.   Minutes of first meeting: September 21, 1989. Motion to approve minutes as distributed. (W. Garcia, C. Chipman) Unanimously approved.

III. Old Business:
       None.

IV. New Business:

1. Motion from the Steering Committee to staff certain Senate standing committees (Ms. Stamps)

   I . **MOVED** that Beverly Geltner replace Robert Payne for a one year term (1989-1990) on the Academic Policy and Planning Committee.

   2 . **MOVED** that Chin Long Ko replace Jack Tsui for a two year term (1989-91) on the Research Committee. (L. Stamps, D. Bricker)

Procedural Motion: Debatable, amendable, and eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Resignations from positions requiring appointment of new members. Unanimously approved.

2. Motion from the Steering Committee to augment the membership of the Academic Computing Committee. Pettengill). (Mr.

> **MOVED** that two additional seats, ex officio and voting, be established on the Academic Computing Committee: a. b. The Executive Director of Computer and Information Services, and The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost or his designee. (R. Pettengill, A. Lindell)

First Reading: Eligible for discussion but not final vote at this meeting.

This issue comes to the Senate from the Academic Computing Committee following discussion in Steering Committee regarding the size and composition of the committee; neither size nor composition of the new committee were thought to be problematic by the Steering Committee. Question from the Senate regarding the number of faculty on the newly constituted committee and whether they are in the majority. Reiteration that the composition was not considered a problem by Steering Committee or Academic Computing Committee. Provost Kleckner notes that under the motion 13 members would be faculty; therefore, faculty are in the majority. J. Grossman amends IV, B, b. to drop word "his." Considered a friendly amendment.

W. Garcia asks whether there is any hurry to move on this motion or whether it can wait until a second reading. Agreement that the work of the committee would be facilitated by the augmentation as soon as possible. Moved to waive second reading (W. Garcia, A. Lindell). No further discussion. Approved with required 3/4 majority.   Main motion unanimously approved as amended.

3. Report from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (R. Tracy).

R. Tracy reports that about 1 1/2 years ago, APPC was asked by President Champagne to look at planning for OU for the year 2000. in proceeding, an environmental scan was completed (last year) revolving around OU unit responses to 13 specified issues. Synthesis of the data collected was accomplished by APPC and a preliminary synthesis document was returned to individual units for their response. Subsequently, meetings were held with each unit to gather unit responses to the preliminary synthesis document. APPC is currently in discussions to produce a draft of a preliminary consensus statement to be distributed to the university community around January 1, 1990. This document will also be open for discussion broadly across the university community. Following these discussions the planning document will be further considered and revised by APPC and then presented formally to the Senate. Ultimately, the report is to be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for review. If adopted by the Board, APPC hopes that the report will be used for future planning at Oakland university. This planning activity should be viewed as a process, to be repeated every three years or so to capture trends/changes in environmental scan and university community consensus.

Last spring's data suggest that OU is trying to do too much for too many and that this may negatively impact the quality of existing programs. However, Tracy states that no "cuts" will be recommended by the APPC in the final report. The plan should identify opportunities, challenges facing OU. Tracy encourages all to understand that planning is an ongoing process to be modified and changed as necessary. He expresses hope that reports from administration

regarding OU's progress on the plan each year or so would be part of the implementation process, notes that progress will be uneven from year to year.

Questions:

D. Bricker asks to hear about major issues APPC is seeing in the data. Tracy responds that in the preliminary synthesis document already some issues were predominant e.g., current distribution of students being maintained, desire to increase numbers of graduate students slightly, concerns about the impact of declining high school enrollments, and increased competition to recruit students. Some goals identified appear to be inconsistent. There is a clear need to prioritize, to carefully select opportunities. Provost Kleckner emphasizes that in some years we'll make a lot of progress, some years not so much. But, this sort of plan points the university in desired directions.

D. Braunstein asks about the database being shared. Tracy responds that APPC has already shared 150 pages of database widely. As part of future planning, the database will be kept current, with periodic reevaluation of various issues. Subsequently, data may be made increasingly accessible, for example, on personal computers. Attempts will be made to standardize the data. D. Braunstein notes having reviewed the 150 page document. He found himself left with many questions and found the results difficult to pull together. R Tracy responds that a new draft has been synthesized using unit feedback and discussion of the first synthesis document. He proposes five year intervals for data collection. R. Tracy requests that anyone with ideas about additional data to be compiled please interact with APPC.

A. Liboff states that changes at a university often relate to advocacy of certain program or changes, not only to the strengths of the university or to numbers. R. Tracy responds that many strengths of the university (and also variations in the speed of innovation in various units) were apparent in the data; and that APPC sees strategic planning as not relying on the spontaneous emergence of advocates for new ideas/programs.

Provost Kleckner thanks R. Tracy for the update on the APPC's planning activities, states that the process is a tricky one and notes that consensus building in the university community is very important.

Good and Welfare

1. R. Eberwein calls attention to problem of faculty being unable to book before October 23 Oakland Center rooms for the winter semester. Notes priority is given to student groups that generate dollars for booking rooms, not the case with faculty bookings. The issue is referred to Steering Committee.

2 . L. Gerulaitis asks the Steering Committee to look at the book renewal policy at Kresge Library (requiring physical bringing of the book to the OU Library after three to four renewals). Referred to Steering Committee.

3 . D. Bricker wishes to hear replies from Oakland University officials regarding our nonparticipation in Macomb Community College venture. Notes derogatory comments in the public press are going unanswered by the University. Provost Kleckner reminds Senate that an investigation is currently in progress regarding potential cooperative activities in Macomb

County. Meetings continue to discuss a wide range of possible activities from credit courses, to offering conferences on the Macomb campus. Bricker notes our fine record of serving Oakland and Macomb Counties and states there may be a time when we would want to respond. S. Appleton notes his own comments regarding sensitive issues being quoted incorrectly and sees a healthy reluctance to engage in discussion on complex issues that can be misinterpreted. Bricker notes there are no doubt many good reasons for our hesitation, but we don't want too much mud slinging.

Provost Kleckner states that we are talking with Macomb people. Pragmatic geographical considerations (travel time, etc.) are paramount to interest in Macomb Community College's 4-year venture. How Oakland can best serve the population there remains under consideration.

V. Move to adjourn at 4:00 p.m

Respectfully submitted,
Penny Cass, Secretary

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page