



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 8 December 1988
Fourth Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Abiko, Appleton, Barthel, Beehler, Bhatt, Brown, Cardimen, Cass, Champagne, Chipman, Christina, Coffey, Dahlgren, Downing, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Eliezer, Frankie, Garcia, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hartman, Haskell, Herman, Hildebrand, Hough, Karasch, Ketchum, Kleckner, Larabell, Lauer, Martek, Maschke, Miller, Muir, Olson, Pillow, Pine, Rosen, Sevilla, Sherman, L. Stamps, R. Stamps, Stern, Theisen, Tracy, Tripp, Wedekind, Williamson, Witt.

Senators Absent: Braun, Burke, Fish, Horwitz, Jackson, Lindell, Millwood, Pettengill, Reddy, Riley, Schimmelman, Wilson.

Summary of Actions

1. Minutes of 20 October (Stern; Tripp). Approved.
2. Motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee to revise policies on probation and dismissal (Dahlgren; Chipman). Approved.
3. Motion from the Steering Committee to establish a new standing committee on Human Relations (Hough; Downing). First reading.
4. Amendment to 3 above, modifying a sentence on membership to read "It is expected that minorities, including blacks; women; and students will be represented" (Garcia; Stern). First reading.
5. Amendment to 3 above, providing for four student seats (Williamson; Stern). First reading.
6. Amendment to 3 above, modifying term of student membership from two years to one semester (L. Stamps, Gerulaitis). Withdrawn in favor of 7 below.
7. Amendment to change the term of student office from two years to "not more than two years" (Tripp, Gerulaitis). First reading.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m., apologizing for the odd assemblage of tables in the room. He explained that the persons responsible for moving furniture found it impossible to form the desired U-shape without turning some senators' backs to the chair. When asked for their responses to the existing situation, a few members reported satisfaction while more complained. Mr. Kleckner said he would try to achieve a better room arrangement for the next gathering. On that note, he turned to the business at hand: consideration of the minutes of 20 October--the open forum on race relations. No discussion ensued, and the minutes were approved (Moved, Mr. Stern; seconded, Ms. Tripp). The November minutes, which had reached most senators that very day, were deferred for attention in January.

Probation and Dismissal Policy

The only item of old business was a proposal from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee to replace the several existing policies on probation and dismissal with one new policy (Messrs. Dahlgren and Chipman). Although Mr. Kloosterman was available to respond to questions about this rather complex motion, none were raised. The Senate approved the motion with unanimous support. Thus, the following language becomes university policy.

MOVED that the following probation and dismissal policy be adopted to apply to all undergraduate, second degree, and post-baccalaureate students at Oakland University, effective fall 1990.

PROBATION AND DISMISSAL POLICY

1. Students with a cumulative GPA of 2.00 or above or without an established cumulative GPA are considered to be in good academic standing. See 4. below.
2. Students in good academic standing will be placed on probation at the end of a semester when their cumulative GPA is below 2.00. They will be allowed to remain at Oakland University on probationary status for at least one semester.
3. At the end of a probationary semester, students will be:
 - a. returned to good academic standing if their cumulative GPA is 2.00 or higher,
 - b. dismissed from the University if their cumulative GPA is below the minimum required GPA based on the total number of Oakland University and transfer credits earned (see the table below), or
 - c. continued on probation if a. and b. do not apply. For example, if at the end of a probationary semester, a student has accumulated 46 credits and has a cumulative GPA of 1.77, then that student will be allowed to remain at Oakland University on probation.

OU and Transfer Credit Earned	Minimum Required GPA
0-16	1.49
17-32	1.61
33-48	1.73
49-64	1.85
65-80	1.97
81+	2.00

4. In order to establish a cumulative GPA a student must receive a numerical grade in at least one course at Oakland University, and in the computation of the cumulative GPA, only those courses at Oakland University for which a student has received numerical grades are used. If a course has been repeated, the assigned credits for the course are only counted once in the total number of credits attempted and only the most recent numerical grade received is used. The "Honor Points" for each course are computed by multiplying the numerical grade received by the number of credits assigned to the course. The cumulative GPA is determined by dividing the sum of the Honor Points for all courses receiving numerical grades by the total number of credits attempted in courses receiving numerical grades at

Oakland University.

Committee on Human Relations

With this work accomplished, the Senate turned its attention to the solitary item of new business: a motion from the Steering Committee to establish a new standing committee of the Senate that would focus on issues of human relations (Moved, Mr. Hough; seconded, Mr. Downing).

MOVED that the Senate establish a standing committee to be known as the University Senate Committee on Human Relations, with charge and membership as described below.

Although universities often consider themselves as idealized communities, they are seldom independent of, and are rarely immune from, deficiencies that exist in the larger societies to which they belong. Consequently, a university should be continually alert to those social problems that can impede its educational goals. Such a set of problems involves those that derive from racial bias, intolerance, stereotyping, and other like manifestations of human beings' inability to deal constructively with those natural differences that exist among them. It is essential that Oakland University maintain continuous and systematic efforts to minimize the negative effects these particular deficiencies have upon the educational experience it seeks to provide, and it is the task of the University Senate Committee on Human Relations to give strong impetus to these efforts.

To that end, the Committee on Human Relations is charged:

- a. to monitor the total educational climate at Oakland University, and to select for its particular attention those issues that are most directly related to instances of under-representation of various community groups wherever they may occur in all of the academic programs of the university,
- b. to set priorities for possible improvements and develop biennial agendas of tasks to accomplish,
- c. to assist university units in establishing priorities, developing approaches to achieve them, and evaluating their success in meeting their objectives.

In further pursuit of this goal, the committee is also charged:

- a. to consult with, and to advise the President of the University, the Senior Vice President for University Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the President of the University Congress how they might best use their senior leadership positions to promote an educational climate that treats diversity constructively,
- b. to recommend to, and cooperate with, Senate and other committees whose actions define the formal Oakland educational experience,
- c. to promote dialogue, and otherwise to heighten awareness among the larger groups of faculty, administrators, students, and other university personnel about how their individual actions contribute to the environment in which learning takes place, and
- d. to maintain the committee's accountability, and that of the parties with whom

the committee is charged to work, by reporting in open meeting to the University Senate on a biennial basis concerning the tasks that the committee has undertaken and the results that have been obtained.

Membership: Eleven members consisting of five faculty members (one of whom shall be chair) nominated by the Steering Committee; two members nominated by the Senior Vice President for University Affairs; two members nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; and two members nominated by the President of the University Congress. It is expected that both minorities and women will be represented. All members will be subject to confirmation by the University Senate. The term for non-student members will be three academic years, and the term for student members will be two academic years.

Mr. Hough, urging adoption of this motion, mentioned that it was the product of efforts by the Ad hoc Committee on Racial Relations and had been formulated on the basis of advice received at October's Senate meeting. He then yielded the floor to Mr. Chipman, who explained how parts of the motion responded to concerns raised by his committee. Questions about focus, whether the committee should concern itself exclusively with race relations or address a broader charge, were resolved in the statement of basic rationale preceding specific charges to the committee. Questions about the committee's responsibilities and powers were addressed in the first three charges. Questions about its interactions with existing officers and groups prompted the remaining set of four charges. And, naturally, questions about membership led to the membership specifications advanced in the motion. He pointed out that this committee is constituted on a people-based model. It has been deliberately designed as a small committee with members nominated and elected on the basis of their willingness to make its charge a top priority for a sustained time. He referred to the agenda commentary on this motion for elaboration on its distinctiveness among Senate committees.

Ms. Beehler launched discussion by inquiring who the six members might be who are not specifically identified as faculty. Would all of them be students? Mr. Kleckner responded that there were no restrictions on the two persons he might name or those nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs. There are no restrictions on the choices made by the President of the University Congress either; though, were he a betting man, he would wager on their being students.

Mr. Ketchum inquired what it meant "to monitor the total educational climate at Oakland University." What limitations did the authors intend on this broad charge? Mr. Chipman referred to the opening rationale for the motion, which establishes the context in which the remaining provisions should be read. He interpreted the phrase in question to mean that the committee might concern itself with the university's educational climate insofar as this is affected by existing deficiencies of racism, stereotyping, and similar attitudes and behavior that interfere with learning. Still concerned, Mr. Ketchum felt the charge excessively broad. He worried that it might encourage loose charges and investigations of specific units. Mr. Chipman advised paying close attention to the verbs in the motion, but that counsel simply brought Mr. Ketchum back to the infinitive "to monitor." Seeking guidance from the operation of other Senate committees, Ms. Gerulaitis pointed out that any such group would have to establish its own working guidelines. The Senate, however, always retains the power to rein in any of its standing committees whose behavior gets out of hand. Mr. Hough professed himself much encouraged by the first item 'Ic," which establishes a pattern of consultation with the academic

unit concerned with any problem, working out a response, and reporting to the Senate on achievements or continuing problems. Not yet trusting "to monitor," Mr. Ketchum suggested dispensing with the opening clause of the first "all and beginning with "to select." This change would focus on the committee's selectivity in tackling its broad charge and on its attempt to be constructive. Recognizing that "to monitor" might sound militaristic, Mr. Murphy proposed replacing that language with "to oversee" or something similar that would still retain the crucial idea that the committee's purview includes everything that impinges on the climate of learning. When Mr. Hough volunteered "to consider," Mr. Chipman agreed to consider that language change a friendly amendment. Mr. Downing, the seconder, declared himself delighted.

Mr. Christina raised another issue by expressing his surprise to find no reference to financial support for the committee's work. Mr. Chipman inquired whether he referred to a budget, a matter never touched upon in charges to other Senate committees. Mr. Christina thought something should be said about resources for the committee so that departments didn't wind up picking up costs.

Mr. Stern noted the absence of a student seat specifically designated for a member of the Association of Black Students and wondered whether Mr. Chipman's committee had considered establishing such a seat. It turned out that they had but, after extended thought, had decided not to reserve specific seats for any one group. All members would have to win Senate approval, however. If the Senate should neglect to notice a glaring void on the slate of nominees, he thought the university too deeply in trouble for a committee to remedy. Still, Ms. Garcia worried about a committee seriously involved with issues of race relations that had no guarantee that any black persons would be named to it. She felt that persons likely to be victims of racism should be represented directly on the committee. Mr. Chipman relied on the Senate's care in making sure that, every time someone is named to the committee, its total membership remain balanced to reflect the community. Mr. Kleckner directed attention to the sentence in the Membership paragraph that asserts "It is expected that both minorities and women will be represented." Mr. Christina noted that, if each of the worthies entitled to nominate committee members operates simultaneously and independently, gaps in representation could occur. Mr. Chipman held forth the likelihood of collaborative action, a behavior pattern that Mr. Kleckner assured his colleagues the Steering Committee considered inevitable. Mr. Stern expressed concern about the Senate's likely reaction to seeing all eleven names at once. He thought it best to build guidelines into the basic structure of the group rather than risk a long, loud meeting and uncomfortable debate.

Still, Ms. Beehler felt unsettled about the lack of specific response to Mr. Smith's statements at the October meeting concerning the exclusion of the ABS from the governance system. She insisted on the need for minorities to consider this their committee too. Mr. Chipman, who had consulted Mr. Smith, did not know his position on the matter. Mr. Pierson, however, reported that he had talked that morning with Mr. Smith, who had overcome his earlier unhappiness with the proposal and developed faith in the structure that exists. He was satisfied that those responsible for making nominations would see to it that black students be represented. Ms. Tripp cautioned that as soon as you specifically include one group, you specifically exclude others. To provide designated slots for each group that feels itself likely to be discriminated against would make a large committee. Mr. Barthel then suggested that the sentence pointed out by Mr. Kleckner could be extended. Mr. Christina liked to think that all of us represent our black colleagues. So did Ms. Garcia, but she asserted that blacks prefer to speak for themselves. She concurred with Mr. Barthel's proposal to include specific groups within the proposal.

When Mr. Chipman requested specific language in the form of an amendment, she offered "It is expected that minorities, including blacks; women; and students will be represented" (Seconded, Mr. Stern). Mr. Stamps wondered whether that syntax classified women as minorities but was assured by Ms. Garcia that the punctuation would guard against that mistake. Ms. Beehler suggested adding the adverb "adequately" to the verb "represented" so that these goals might not all be subsumed in the election of a black woman student. Ms. Garcia preferred not to split hairs, given the small size of the entire committee. With no further discussion offered on that topic, Mr. Kleckner suggested moving back to debate on the main motion. The amendment will be voted upon at the January meeting.

When Ms. Beehler asked whether the committee was expected to bring a new charge before the Senate every two years, Mr. Chipman indicated that its responsibility was simply to report what it had set as its agenda for the previous two years and what it had accomplished to fulfill its immediate goals. Noting that the official charge to this body specifically targeted educational goals, Mr. Ketchum wondered whether anything would be deliberately excluded from its charge. Mr. Chipman responded that, for any Senate committee, the educational trigger should be the effective initiator of action. Nonetheless, he expected that the St. Clair group's report to President Champagne would incorporate reference to issues associated with race and human relations that, although not directly affecting the university's educational mission, still relate to complementary aspects of the administrative structure. This interchange led Mr. Ketchum to anticipate the probability of Oakland's eventually being beset with a number of confusingly overlapping committees. He inquired how people might actually know what this group's responsibilities are. Mr. Chipman pointed out that procedures already exist here for handling specific charges of racism. The Senate committee could refer complainants to other structures. Its essential responsibility would be to identify significant concerns and to guide people toward effective responses. Mr. Ketchum then mentioned the discussions at the St. Clair retreat about public safety and social issues, wondering where such matters would fit into this committee's work. Mr. Chipman thought it likely that the committee might want to look at causes of discomfort that result in students getting discouraged about Oakland and leaving the university before graduation. He agreed with Mr. Ketchum's conclusion from this discussion that the committee's educational focus need not exclude attention to other issues.

The last concern to draw significant attention involved terms of membership. Mr. Barthel assumed that the goal of continuity had inspired the recommendation of three-year terms for non-students and two-year terms for students but wondered about the differentiation between these two categories. Mr. Chipman explained that there is a practical issue to be considered about how long a time a student can reasonably be expected to give. All non-student seats, he pointed out, allow committee members to serve through a full two-year reporting cycle. When Ms. Tripp asked whether rolling membership could be anticipated (remembers initially elected for one, two, or three-year terms in order to allow for staggered replacements rather than the wholesale departure of all committee members), she was assured that the Steering Committee intended to build that system into its initial membership recommendations. That led Mr. Barthel to anticipate a parallel with the way Supreme Court vacancies get filled, with each departing member replaced with someone representing the same population sub-group. Mr. Eberwein inquired whether the Steering Committee would nominate the member who would serve as chair and was informed by Mr. Kleckner that this standard practice for Senate committees would prevail.

Seeking to ensure adequate student representation, Mr. Williamson proposed amending the motion to provide for five faculty positions and four student ones. This would be accomplished

in part by having three members nominated by the president of the University Congress. Mr. Stern seconded this amendment. Mr. Stamps opposed it on the grounds that Senate committees rely more heavily on faculty members than students. He noted that Congress has trouble enough filling the seats it already has on university committees. Ms. Tripp pointed out that there was no restriction in the original motion that would prevent the Vice President for Student Affairs from naming one or two students to committee positions.

From a student perspective, Ms. Stamps thought it unrealistic to imagine anyone's being able to schedule classes around a committee for so long a period. Judging it best to try to attract especially qualified students for one semester at a time, she proposed an amendment establishing a single semester as the term of student membership (seconded, Ms. Gerulaitis). Ms. Tripp, preferring not to build in limitations, suggested that student terms be characterized flexibly as "not exceeding two years." Although she had not intended to propose this language as an amendment, a murmur of assent throughout the room and the professed willingness of the sponsor and seconder of the previous amendment to withdraw their proposal in favor of her language led her to offer this suggestion as a formal amendment. Mr. Kleckner raised a cautionary note about the problem senators might anticipate in keeping track of when a student actually drops off a committee. He noted that there has been difficulty in maintaining continuity of student membership on Senate committees, a problem exacerbated by the Congress calendar that differs from the academic one. The goal, he advised, was simply to assure a student presence on this important committee. Mr. Grossman advocated retaining the two-year term as normal for students' thus building in the assumption of long-term commitment; members could be replaced at any time a vacancy occurred. Ms. Martek, however, reiterated Ms. Stamps's point about the difficulty of recruiting students for so long a period. She pointed out that some of the best qualified students would probably be within two years of graduation.

When Mr. Christina inquired why the drafters of the main motion chose to deviate from the traditional Senate practice of establishing two-year terms for all non-student members, Mr. Chipman explained that he and his associates hoped to achieve additional stability for this group; they were especially interested in ensuring that each non-student member would be fully involved with one full two-year cycle of committee work. Ms. Coffey noted that the majority of members would hold firm for any one cycle. Mr. Kleckner suggested that other Senate committees might eventually emulate this plan to avoid the current problem of excessive membership turnover in the midst of intensive work on one issue.

Concluding debate on this one item of new business, senators had no suggestions to offer for the good of the order and therefore turned their attention to the provost's information items. Mr. Kleckner followed through on the work of the November meeting by announcing that three copies of the Guidelines for Campus Development (formerly and more conventionally known as the Campus Master Plan) have been placed on library reserve for the use of anyone who wishes to study them. The charts and maps that had graced the Senate chamber last month will soon be returned from Ann Arbor to form a library display that members of the community may examine from December into the early part of the winter semester. He encouraged people to submit their suggestions and comments to himself, President Champagne, or Mr. Tucker. Pointing out that these guidelines are meant to function as a living document to help with decisions about campus planning, he ventured the hope that it would soon be consulted for advice on siting the new science building.

He went on to advise people about the probable effects of current library construction. Realizing that professors and students have an understandable curiosity about when collections will be moved into the new wings, he alerted them to anticipate discombobulation at some point in the winter semester. Ms. Frankie, Dean of the Library, reported that the contractor now projects the move for sometime between February 15 and the Ides of March. The building as a whole should be shut down for only one full week (ideally the winter break), when major parts of the collection will be moved. The transfer of empire will also involve times before and after that closure. She explained that we will be using a split library until September, with an internal corridor connecting the two wings while the existing library undergoes renovation. The north wing will house government documents, interlibrary loan services, and half of the collections; while the south wing will house reference works, the circulation area, the searching area, and the other half of the collections. She promised lots of signs and staff members arrayed in specially designed tee-shirts to guide the lost. Mr. Kleckner, marveling at how all this could take place on the basis of the current status of construction, advised his colleagues to stay tuned.

Mr. Tracy, chair of the Academic Planning and Policy Committee, then took the floor to present a brief report on the APPC strategic planning process. Circulating draft copies of his committee's "Planning Assumptions," he mentioned that deans would be distributing copies of this document to their faculties. The APPC has scheduled a January 11 open forum to discuss these assumptions. He identified the members of the APPC planning subcommittee and invited interested persons to offer them suggestions either orally or in writing. After widespread community consultation, his group plans to reformulate its assumptions for circulation in late January. They are asking individual academic units to initiate their own planning activities. Announcing the schedule his committee plans to follow over the next months, Mr. Tracy concluded his report by alerting senators to expect the full APPC proposal sometime in the fall. On that note, Mr. Kleckner welcomed Mr. Olson's motion for adjournment at 4:25 p.m.

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

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