



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E

Oakland University Senate

Second Meeting
Thursday, 12 November 1987

Minutes

Senators Present: Appleton, Barthel, Bhatt, Braun, Brown, Burke, Cass, Champagne, Chapman-Moore, Chipman, Coffey, Copenhaver, Dahlgren, Downing, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Eliezer, Faber, Fish, Frankie, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hart-Gonzalez, Hartman, Haskell, Higgins, Horwitz, Jackson, Karasch, Kiwicz, Kleckner, Lindell, Millwood, Olson, Pettengill, Pillow, Riley, Rosen, Schimmelman, Stern, Stillman, Tripp, Wedekind, Williamson, Wilson.

Senators Absent: Abiko, Bostick, Cardimen, Christina, Desmond, Herman, Hough, Ketchum, Lauer, Maschke, Moon, Muir, Pine, Reddy, Sherman, Stamps.

Summary of Business:

1. Minutes of 27 April and 20 May (Tripp; Stern). Approved.
2. Minutes of 17 September (Stern; Tripp). Approved.
3. Motion to shorten late-add periods (Rosen; Gerulaitis). First reading.
4. Amendment to change "20th calendar day" in motion above to "13th calendar day" (Stern; Hart-Gonzalez). First reading.
5. Motion to increase membership of the Academic Conduct Committee (Tripp; Downing). Approved.
6. Procedural motion to waive second reading of the motion above (Stern; Braun). Approved.
7. Motion to fill vacancies on Senate standing committees (Pettengill; Gerulaitis). Approved.
8. Motion to name two new faculty alternates to the Academic Conduct Committee (Wilson; Pettengill). Approved.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m., calling attention to a backlog of unconsidered minutes. Ms. Tripp, seconded by Mr. Stern, then moved approval of the minutes of 27 April and 20 May 1987, which were approved by those Senators whose memories extended backward to those dates from a prior academic year. The more recent historical record received similar validation from those recalling the meeting of 17 September; in this case, it was Mr. Stern who moved approval and Ms. Tripp who seconded the motion. No discussion attended these actions.

No old business lingered from September, so Mr. Kleckner immediately acknowledged Ms. Rosen as the designated mover of a proposal from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee to shorten late-add periods (Seconded, Ms. Gerulaitis):

MOVED that Senate legislation of 16 February 1978 establishing a four-week

period at the beginning of each semester during which courses may be added (two weeks during spring and summer terms) be repealed and replaced by the following (old language lined out):

A. That during fall and winter semesters the last date for adding a regular course be the end of the ~~fourth week of classes~~ 20th calendar day after the first day of classes,

B. That during spring and summer terms the last date for adding a regular course be the end of the ~~second week of instruction~~ 7th calendar day after the first day of classes,

C. That during fall and winter semesters all dates governing the adding, dropping, and grading of half-semester courses be patterned according to the spring/summer calendar.

Mr. Kleckner acknowledged that, although the APPC had deliberated on these issues in great detail, it had not formulated the actual language of the wording. It was the Steering Committee, specifically Mr. Hough, that should be credited with particular wording.

Mr. Stern, seconded by Ms. Hart-Gonzalez, quickly introduced an amendment intended to achieve parallelism in the percentage of time allowed for late-adds in regular semesters and in spring/summer sessions. Judging the latitude allowed in part A of the motion as excessively generous and that in part B as quite reasonable, he proposed changing "the 20th calendar day" to "the 14th calendar day." When Mr. Kleckner indicated that parallelism with B could more properly be achieved by "the 13th calendar day," Mr. Stern accepted that modification as a friendly amendment to his amendment. His concern was with the considerable amount of material that would normally be covered in the first three weeks of a semester and the academic disadvantage looming before a student who enters at the end of the allowed period and cannot catch up with the rest of the class.

Ms. Hart-Gonzalez pointed out that one reason for late adds, even in the case of students who have been showing up regularly from the start of the term, is that professors learn most belatedly what students, if any, have dropped their classes and thereby freed room for aspirants. She hoped a way could be developed to inform faculty quickly about such membership changes. Mr. Kleckner recognized the problem but thought an effort could be made, that--in fact--the computerized registration system already made such information available to departments.

Speaking for the APPC, Ms. Rosen stated that the length of time allotted in the original motion was meant to protect students in Monday night courses--especially in semesters like this one where classes begin mid-week before Labor Day and are then suspended for that occasion. Should the Stern amendment be adopted, she feared that these classes would not have met even once by the late-add deadline. This allowed Mr. Kleckner to point out the elegance of Steering Committee diction: Given the way the motion is formally written, the clock starts ticking on the first day of classes rather than of a week, thereby eliminating the problem Ms. Rosen apprehended. Even so, retorted Mr. Tracy (chair of the sponsoring committee), Monday night classes in the fall semester would only have met once before a student encountered the deadline. Difficulties might be anticipated when someone tries to add at that point, given the problem already explained of matching adds with drops. Stating that the APPC had not really

deliberated on spring/summer timing, he recognized the problem with parallelism. The wording of the Senate motion had not emerged from the APPC and probably would not have secured its blessing.

Mr. Stern then suggested an addendum to indicate that the clock keeps running until Monday night classes have met at least twice. He wished to avoid pressure on faculty members to accept late adds at any time. When Ms. Rosen pointed out that no professor is ever required to sign a late-add form, he wondered why such a policy existed at all. Mr. Eberwein pointed out that the Registrar can add students whether a faculty member wishes that to happen or not unless the class has already closed or a hold been put on registration. To this Mr. Bartalucci rejoined that "The Registrar can always add a student to any class; the Registrar doesn't."

Ms. Tripp attempted to alleviate problems by suggesting language to stipulate "after the 13th calendar day or, in case of evening classes, after the second meeting of the class." This diction would encompass snow emergencies as well as holidays. Mr. Kleckner thought that, if the Senate wished to move in this direction, it should not attempt to do so from the floor but in committee.

Mr. Dahlgren then threw his support toward the unamended main motion as introducing a modest adjustment in current policy. He thought that adjustment could be fine-tuned later, if experience should warrant. When Mr. Grossman inquired how big a late-add problem we currently face, Mr. Tracy replied that the APPC understood that some 15 to 20 students now add Monday night classes at the last possible moment. Mr. Grossman would welcome more detailed records on current practice, although Messrs. Tracy and Bartalucci foresaw some difficulty in gathering numbers.

Mr. Downing redirected discussion toward what he understood to be the original impetus behind the motion: a request from the Financial Aid office. Given current practices in distributing financial aid, that office experiences difficulties when students to whom awards have been made rearrange their schedules after the second week of classes when a sort of "snapshot" image is taken of aid allocations. Comings and goings of students complicate Financial Aid records and make it difficult to disburse funds equitably, thereby disadvantaging some students. Advice from that office had proven dominant with the APPC in its decision to settle upon a three-week timeframe for late adds. This explanation prompted Ms. Hart-Gonzalez to ask when students awarded financial aid received money for buying texts; those who purchased books belatedly seemed to her almost equally disadvantaged with those who arrived at the last minute. Mr. Kleckner assured his colleagues that book money comes as soon as the financial aid package is awarded. He explained that the problem comes when a student, having received aid, drops a course and forfeits that privilege by losing credits--then tries a late-add to save his or her aid.

Mr. Bartalucci pointed out that the current on-line registration system allows departments to print out class lists at any time so that a professor may know upon entering class how many students have already dropped. The heaviest action these days is not with late adding but penalty-free dropping. Mr. Kleckner then concluded deliberation on this motion and its amendment by recognizing the compromise nature of the proposal and inviting further committee discussion as well as additional Senate debate.

The next motion proved considerably less thorny. Ms. Tripp, seconded by Mr. Downing,

introduced a motion from the Academic Conduct Committee to increase its membership:

MOVED that the membership of the Academic Conduct Committee be modified by the addition of two (for a total of three) faculty alternates.

She elaborated on the scheduling problems faced by the committee she chairs, problems complicated by the practice of scheduling hearings around the timing of the accused student (s). It sometimes, even this semester, proves difficult to assemble enough members to conduct such a hearing. She did not anticipate that the additional alternates would be called upon very often but noted that all faculty persons participating must legally have been approved by the Senate. In order to save sanity, she implored action. When no discussion followed this plea, Ms. Tripp ventured to suggest waiving the second reading. Mr. Stern and Ms. Braun immediately put such a proposal on the floor. The Senate voted unanimously to waive the second reading and then exhibited equal enthusiasm for the main motion, which carried unopposed--thereby enlarging the Academic Conduct Committee for immediate action. Mr. Pettengill, seconded by Ms. Gerulaitis, then introduced a motion to fill vacancies on Senate standing committees. Mr. Kleckner identified this action as "a perpetual motion" in which only the names change.

Mr. Pettengill indicated that the names proposed by the Steering Committee had been arrived at in the usual ways--by use of faculty preference sheets and with attention to the representation of academic units. The motion passed unopposed with the result that Ronald Olson was elected to replace Sharon Bostick on the Academic Policy and Planning Committee for the 1987-88 academic year and Robert Payne elected to replace George Coon for the same period; Daniel Braunstein was elected to replace Pamela Hilbers on the General Education Committee for this fall semester and David Mascitelli to replace Bonnie Abiko on that body from 1987 to 1989; John Cowlshaw succeeded to the Arts and Sciences seat on the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction formerly held by David Downing for this academic year. Mr. Downing has become chair of UCUI and therefore no longer represents one academic unit.

Favorable action on the previous two motions encouraged Ms. Wilson and Mr. Pettengill to introduce yet another proposal from the Steering Committee, this one to add the two faculty alternates to the Academic Conduct Committee whose arrival had already been anticipated in a motion approved earlier. They nominated John Halpin and Floyd Willoughby to fill these new positions, and the nominations were confirmed with the Senate's customary courtesy.

Conclusion of the new business portion of the agenda freed the floor for Good and Welfare introductions of concerns for the good of the order. Ms. Tripp introduced this event with a question about nighttime lighting on campus. Teaching a night class in O'Dowd Hall, she has discovered that students must wend their way in darkness toward parking areas behind Varner Hall. Because hers is a small class and she feels concern about her students' safety, she sometimes finds herself driving them to their cars. Recent experience indicates to her that the stairs in front of O'Dowd Hall are inadequately lighted as well, thereby inviting accidents. Mr. Kleckner assured her that the problems she identified could certainly be investigated and promised to communicate with people in Campus Facilities and Operations. This accomplished, Mr. Williamson took advantage of Good and Welfare to inquire about the status of the emeritus proposal several times discussed by the Senate. Mr. Kleckner promised a news bulletin among his information items.

Next on the agenda came President Champagne, who used this opportunity to report further on the long-range planning issues he had touched upon in his September address to this body. He wished to identify a mechanism for such planning without adding yet another committee to the current roster and without competing with Mr. Appleton for faculty-staff membership.

The circumstances that compel prudent efforts at planning are serious ones and likely to be of long duration. No trend is discernible toward increased federal support of higher education, nor toward heightened state commitment. Thus, we face a period of fairly stable external support-- probably without the sudden losses experienced in the 1970s and early 1980s but also without impressive gains. Emergency planning efforts were required early in this decade just to help the institution make it through tough times, but more systematic long-term planning seems appropriate in the period ahead that will probably involve fewer dramatic swings. Michigan appears unable to revive formula funding, so Oakland will have to change its line of argumentation to justify fiscal requests. The President judged this year an appropriate time to initiate a University planning process to be known as Oakland 2000, recognizing that the turn of the century is almost here and will Senate correspond with our next NCA self-study. At this point, he considered it an advantage that University planners could avail themselves of the wealth of information now being amassed by this year's accreditation committees under Mr. Appleton's leadership.

Mr. Champagne asked the APPC to accept responsibility for adding this type of planning to its range of duties, thereby tying planning activity directly to the existing Senate governance system. He had met with its chair, Mr. Tracy, and expected to meet shortly with the full committee. It was his intention that the APPC look at the big questions facing Oakland University: what sort of graduate/undergraduate balance do we wish; should we expand our graduate efforts--and, if so, at what price; how are we to deal with continuing education; how can we continue attracting the same level of faculty we now have; how do we have a University planning process that is consistent with the plans and hopes of its constituent units; what program development can be encouraged; how does institutional fund-raising fit into the picture; how do we monitor enrollment; what caps on enrollments and programs may be justified to maintain Oakland University as a comprehensive institution; what guidelines do we envisage for general education; how are we to deal with the growing proportion of nontraditional students; what should be our recruiting stance, if any, outside this geographic area; and--overall--what should be our model for allocating very finite resources? He hoped to see a planning process develop that would prove both organic and dynamic so that it would be capable of change, and he thought it important that the planning system be firmly integrated into the existing governance system. Disavowing any attempt to launch a crash program, he declared his purpose to "operationalize the mission statement."

With questions invited from the floor, Mr. Williamson noted that the process envisaged by President Champagne would be an extremely important, burdensome, and time-consuming one. He thought it would justify extra support for faculty and student members of the APPC, who might easily find their service extending beyond the normal academic year. Such planning, he reasoned, is not the sort of thing one normally does on the side while teaching three classes. Mr. Champagne indicated his awareness of burdens and his willingness to provide necessary support staff.

Mr. Kleckner then resumed the floor to present a number of information items. First among these was the good news that the Board had just given its formal approval to the Library

construction project, which now awaits parallel state action. A contractor is ready to go to work, and a groundbreaking ceremony has been planned. Dean Frankie then took the opportunity to invite all members of the University community to the December 11 festivities, which will begin with a brief outdoor ceremony involving a distinguished platform party and then will move indoors for the sociable part of the revels. For historical interest, Mr. Kleckner reminded his colleagues that the Library project had started two decades earlier, in 1967.

He then discussed enrollment, noting that Mr. Beardslee's figures show us down approximately 160 students from last year. That puts us about level with figures from two years ago. Oakland has been adjusting entrance requirements to halt growth but finds it hard to manage enrollment in fine detail, especially since students who have left us enjoy a six-year period of eligibility for reentry without formal application. We are trying our best to hold at about the 9600 level. If we drop below that, budget problems loom from loss of tuition revenue, but, if we go much above it, the lack of formula funding hits us hard. He reported that the Admissions Office is still working to get a broader geographic distribution of students and to attract both FTIACs and graduate students; late-applying transfer students have become the enrollment swing group. Noting the current application crush for Elementary Education, he pointed out the difficulty entailed in projecting where students will move within the curriculum. Student aspirations correlate somewhat with career prospects--but quite imperfectly so.

As promised, he then reported on the current status of the emeritus proposal. It has been reviewed by the Board Committee on University Affairs, which appears capable of supporting a proposal in either of two alternate forms but not the specific one advanced by the Senate. Unclearness about the circumstances in which the recommendation of a faculty member for this honor would or would not come forward from the department is the problematic issue. Board members would like to see criteria for emeritus rank specified in a way that would make it clear why a particular faculty member might not be proposed by her or his colleagues. Or, failing that, they could live with the notion that emeritus status is purely a recognition of years of service, automatically awarded. The Senate proposal, however, includes a mechanism for advancing nominations and allowance for withholding them.

Ms. Braun, having served on the original committee which looked into this issue, said that her colleagues had been persuaded by Mr. Matthews' analogy with the Roman army to conclude that emeritus rank simply recognized years of service without disgrace. She saw no need for any unwieldy nominating process. Unless a colleague had done something "heinous," she saw no grounds for failure to nominate. But what, Mr. Kleckner wondered, was entailed in the word "heinous?" How might colleagues interpret such language? Ms. Braun indicated that the only reason to have departments forward names individually was to guard against any retiree's getting lost in the shuffle. Mr. Champagne inquired whether it could ever happen that a professor with sufficient years of service not be nominated. Ms. Braun thought it conceivable, although advancement should be essentially automatic. The Dean's role in the process is to screen for departmental glitches. Mr. Kleckner suggested referring to the Steering Committee ways of dealing with this issue. That would be the appropriate body to decide whether to remand the proposal to the originating committee or to seek Senate counsel directly; in either case the matter would return to the Senate before advancing to the Board.

By way of concluding items of information, he then announced the impending departures of two persons well known to the Senate--one of them a member. Ms. Stinson will leave Oakland at the end of November to become Director of Development at Wayne State University. Her

place on the Senate returns to Ms. Chapman-Moore. Cameron Brunet-Koch is leaving to become Dean of Students at West Shore Community College in Ludington. The Senate thanks these ladies for their service and wishes them well.

Upon motion by Mr. Horwitz, the Senate then adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

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

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