



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 5 December 1985  
Fourth Meeting  
Gold Rooms B and C, Oakland Center

### *MINUTES*

Senators Present: Appleton, Barclay, Barnard, Barthel, Bertocci, Bingham, Blankenship, Blatt, Boganey, Burke, Carbone, Cass, Chapman-Moore, Chipman, Copenhaver, Downing, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Edgerton, Feingold, Garcia, Grossman, Hamilton, Hartman, Herman, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Hough, Khapoya, Kleckner, Liboff, Lindell, Righter, Rozek, Russell, Schimmelman, Srodawa, Straughen, Strauss, Swartz, Terry, Tripp, Willoughby, Wilson, Witt.  
Senators Absent: Cardimen, Champagne, Chatterjee, Clatworthy, Diltz, Evarts, Frankie, Hart-Gonzalez, Hightower, Ketchum, McCabe, Metzner, Pettengill, Pine, Reddy, Taylor.

#### Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 14 November 1985 (Willoughby; Hildebrand). Approved as corrected.
2. Amendment moving implementation date to 1989-90 (Appleton; Hamilton). Replaced by substitute amendment (also Appleton; Hamilton) establishing a 1988-89 implementation date with provision for a two-year lead-time between renumbering of any course and application of this policy to it. Approved.
3. Substitute amendment (Tripp; Russell) on implementation date. Withdrawn by sponsors.
4. Motion to remand to UCU1 (Horwitz; Barthel). Defeated.
5. Amendment adding the words "certain specified" to line one (Willoughby; Terry).  
Withdrawn by sponsors.
6. Amendment to change the numbers within the main motion from 000-099 to 000-049 (Barthel; Copenhaver). Approved.
7. Motion regarding courses numbered between 000 and 099 (J. Eberwein; Chipman).  
Approved as twice amended.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:16 with a reminder to his colleagues about President Champagne's talk to Sigma Xi, scheduled for 4:30 in a nearby room. He had no desire to limit debate but encouraged expeditious consideration of the Issues confronting the body so that such Senators as wished to hear the President could do so. His call for approval of the minutes of 14 November 1985 (Moved, Mr. Willoughby; seconded, Ms. Hildebrand) immediately elicited a series of corrections. Mr. Willoughby indicated that a comment on page 6, which had been ascribed to Mr. Diltz, should be credited instead to himself. Ms. Hamilton followed with two corrections. On the fourth line of page 3, the sentence reading "She deplored the absence of Ms. Garcia, who could offer powerful evidence of student appreciation for being admitted from the start as full-scale college students" should be replaced by the following language: "She regretted the absence of Ms. Garcia, who could relay information about specific

students who had made considerable gains in writing ability during several semesters' work." Later in the same paragraph (page 3, line 15), the verb "admitted" should be replaced by "acknowledged. Thus perfected, the minutes were approved by voice vote.

Mr. Kleckner then turned over the floor to Mr. Carbone for a brief statement on behalf of the University Congress, which has been working on the issue of extended passing time between classes that Mr. Carbone had mentioned to the Senate at the November meeting. Mr. Carbone reported that Congress has developed two proposals for extending the working day slightly to provide more adequate time for traversing the campus and that its representatives have consulted with Messrs. Bunger and Kendall on possible contractual problems that might emerge from such extension. The Child Care Center has also been consulted, in line with Ms. Hart-Gonzalez's advice. The Congress, intent on adding extra minutes to the Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedule although not for Tuesdays and Thursdays, is still exploring the effect of such changes on particular types of classes. In reply to Mr. Kleckner's query about what Congress would do next, Mr. Carbone stated that Congress plans to advance both proposals to the Senate for its perusal and discussion. Meanwhile, Mr. Bartalucci will be studying the issue in depth. Mr. Carbone hoped that a decision could be made before the end of April, and Mr. Kleckner promised that the Senate would address the issue early in 1986.

Attention then turned to the principal order of business, the contentious issue of credit for pre-college courses (J. Eberwein; Chipman). Mr. Willoughby immediately announced his intention to introduce a new amendment, but Mr. Kleckner ruled that the Appleton amendment proffered at the November meeting must be acted upon first. This amendment, seconded by Ms. Hamilton, would move the implementation date to 1989-90. Ms. Tripp wondered whether there might not be a better way to proceed than waiting for nearly three years. She proposed an amendment (seconded by Mr. Russell) that would establish 1987-88 as the implementation date for students entering directly from high schools and would specify that those entering from community colleges could not get credit for a remedial-level course taken after 1987. She offered this as a substitute for the Appleton amendment with the thought that it allowed a much-needed phase-in time for community colleges while allowing prompt implementation of the new policy on our campus.

Mr. Appleton then reported on his conversation that morning with Ms. Eberwein, who chairs UCUI and who had communicated her committee's reluctance to wait nearly three years for implementation. UCUI was willing to accept 1988-89 as a compromise date. This conversation set Mr. Appleton to thinking, and thinking led him to the discovery that there is a difference between introducing a new policy in general terms and actually applying it to particular courses. Neither his original amendment nor Ms. Tripp's would guard against the scenario he dreaded of a course's being reclassified at a late date with the effect of its being subject almost instantaneously to this proposed policy. Offering an example of a mathematics course that might be turned down for renumbering by UCUI in 1986 but then approved two years later so that its reclassification would immediately affect students entering either from high schools or other colleges, he feared the frustration of students and the wrath of counselors when they discovered that decisions they had made conscientiously on the basis of advice from Oakland University were no longer valid and that students would therefore sacrifice credit. To avoid this danger, he offered substitute language for his original amendment, changing the date from 1989-90 to 1988-89 and adding a sentence: "But any specific course which is newly assigned a 000-099 number shall continue to carry credit toward graduation for two years from the September following this action." Ms. Hamilton agreed to accept this change in the amendment she co-sponsored. Mr. Appleton indicated that he meant to reassure students and

counselors that we are acting in good faith even though a few students who remain an unusually long time in the academic pipeline might still be hurt. Ms. Tripp thought the same amendment could be appended to hers.

Discussion reflected a measure of confusion about the two overlapping substitute amendments. Mr. Horwitz called for clarification; he wanted to know whether the sponsors of the main motion and its amendments were talking about transfer courses from any collegiate institution or only from community colleges. Ms. Eberwein assured him that any and all were intended. Mr. Carbone then pointed out that language in the main motion referred to community college personnel and suggested striking the word "community." Mr. Kleckner anticipated that advisers and administrators here would use judicious pruning in order to inform all schools from which we get substantial numbers of students. Ms. Chapman-Moore wondered whether the Tripp amendment now included Mr. Appleton's last sentence. Ms. Tripp averred that it did. As Mr. Strauss pointed out, it was presented as "a very friendly amendment." Mr. Grossman, however, preferred the Appleton version in that it seemed to avoid the danger of varying the implementation date from student to student. He found it confusing to judge on the basis of the date when a student took a course and judged that the two-year lag-time in the Appleton amendment would take care of most people. It was Mr. Kleckner's understanding that 1987 would be the crucial date in either case. Noting that the Registrar's Office would face the problem envisaged by Mr. Grossman, not individual advisers, Ms. Chapman-Moore asked the Registrar whether it would present a problem for his staff to check when a student took a course. Mr. Bartalucci predicted a great amount of confusion and some errors if clerks were expected to check dates on a differential basis for different groups of students; he hoped for a few easily understood rules. Ms. Tripp suspected that varying the start-up time for implementation of policy with regard to specific courses would be likely to create more record problems than her suggestion of varying implementation of the overall policy on the basis of a student's point of origin.

Pronouncing himself too confused to vote on this issue, Mr. Barthel then wondered whether the Senate should not remand the matter to UCUI in order to avoid making some awful mistake. Mr. Kleckner tried to clarify the issue by pointing out that the two amendments on the floor both share a basic disposition to make sure the University signals changes in advance to persons who might be affected. Mr. Horwitz, worried about treating transfer students equitably and avoiding further delays in completing Advanced Standing Reports, expressed concern about a records difficulty; he joined Mr. Barthel in advising return to committee and offered that advice in the form of a motion (Horwitz; Barthel). When Ms. Garcia inquired whether Messrs. Horwitz and Barthel wanted the whole issue returned to committee?the main motion as well as its amendment and substitute amendments, Mr. Barthel pronounced in the affirmative. Mr. Kleckner interpreted the motion to refer to committee as meaning that the whole package would go back to UCUI, which could then modify as much or as little as it saw fit before returning a motion to the Senate for a second reading (if only slightly modified) or a first one (if drastically reconstructed); a Yes vote at this point would terminate the current discussion.

When Mr. Chipman wondered whether it was possible to split off substantive issues for immediate discussion, Mr. Kleckner suggested defeat of the referral motion and substitution of another. Mr. Bertocci pointed out that a motion to remand does not require the sponsoring committee to do anything other than reconsider implementation schedules. For the sake of UCUI, which needed Senate advice on the major issue at stake, Mr. Downing urged that discussion continue at this meeting; he objected to the prospect of reintroducing the matter

only to encounter successive referrals in some never-ending cycle. When Mr. Grossman asked whether the Senate could return at that point to the main motion, Parliamentarian Khapoya ruled that the body must first vote on the motion to refer to committee. Ms. Garcia speculated that it might be possible to pass the Horwitz-Barthel motion and then raise another motion to open discussion of the principal matter. Mentioning that a favorable vote on the referral motion would dispatch the Senate's official business for the day, Mr. Kleckner held out the possibility that his colleagues might then choose what to do with the remaining time suddenly conferred upon them. With a voice vote on the referral motion giving no clear result, a show of hands demonstrated its defeat (15 ayes; 21 nays).

Its determination to cope with the central issues thus demonstrated, the Senate returned to discussion, with much parliamentary jockeying. Mr. Grossman moved to table the Tripp and Appleton amendments. Mr. Kleckner, however, ruled it inappropriate to vote on the main motion with amendments pending. Mr. Grossman suggested that, after a discussion conducted on rules that would preclude Introduction of amendments. Senators could vote to remove the existing amendments from the table. Declaring himself reluctant to act on the main motion with amendments tabled, Mr. Appleton suggested that the body turn itself into a committee of the whole. He didn't find the implications of the amendments especially obscure or likely to create great trouble. In his judgment, the Tripp amendment had the advantage of attending to students who prepared for their Oakland University work by different routes but the disadvantage of creating record-keeping difficulties and disparities among students. He considered his own amendment easier to implement and reminded his auditors that its provisions would always ensure two years' advance warning on any course. Unusual individual hardships could be bandied by the familiar petition method. With the amendments presenting no insuperable obstacles to understanding, he advised the Senate to declare itself a committee of the whole. Mr. Bertocci found the Grossman proposal unnecessary, pointing out that even if an amendment should pass, Senators could always change it at any point prior to voting on the main motion. To facilitate progress, Ms. Tripp then withdrew her substitute amendment and declared herself happy with Mr. Appleton's acceptance of the 1988-89 date; Mr. Russell accepted her withdrawal of their motion.

That action left the Appleton amendment on the floor. Ms. Chapman-Moore asked clarification on what would happen when a student at Oakland University should take a 000-number course prior to 1988 and found that it would count for graduation credit; it would do the same for a transfer student taking such a course elsewhere prior to the fall 1988 semester. Mr. Appleton explained that, for two years from the time any course first appeared in the catalog bearing such a number, any student who took that course or its equivalent anywhere would gain graduation credit. The student would or would not acquire credit purely on the basis of the date when she or he took the course. He thought this provision a helpful one, given the frequency with which course numbers change. In the event anticipated by Ms. Chapman-Moore of a student's losing expected credit on the basis of this policy, he advised petitioning. Mr. Downing reminded his fellow-Senators that there is no essential difference in this area between the Appleton amendment and the original proposal; all motions on the floor assume the existence of a time flag to alert students to changes. Liking the principle that the time a student takes a course should determine its effect, he supported the amendment. When Mr. Barthel asked whether the University might wind up snatching credit after 1988 for a course that carried credit back when the student took it, Mr. Kleckner assured him that no such injustice would occur. Mr. Appleton thought a misapprehension could arise only if a student depended on an ancient catalog; he advised flagging these courses in each semester's Schedule of Classes. The question having been called on the Appleton amendment, it was approved

without dissent.

Ms. Garcia then launched debate on the main motion, thus amended, by speaking eloquently about what she identified as "a double dilemma followed by a paradox." Explaining that both the Mathematical Sciences and the Rhetoric, Communications, and Journalism departments face dilemmas, she distinguished between their variant natures. Mathematics, she noted, is linear, logical, and quantifiable; it is easily classified by cut-off points, and therefore professors who teach it can readily discern pre-college levels of work and feel pain when compelled to confer college credit for what they universally recognize as remedial courses. To teachers of writing, she maintained, the matter seems very different. Writing is holistic, recursive, and non-quantifiable except in its tiniest mechanical unit. Thus, she and her colleagues cannot make sharp distinctions between college and pre-college writing. They would like to facilitate the mathematicians' urge to meet their own needs but called for awareness on the part of the University community for the dilemma rhetoricians face when confronted with blanket legislation in this area. The paradox to which she referred earlier comes from the introduction of legislation that would be effective university-wide on the basis of course numbers and is especially complicated by the ironic situation that the only courses now so numbered are offered by her department rather than by Mathematics. Affirming that what we now have in Rhetoric is already excellent, she thought it unnecessary to make changes in pursuit of excellence and spotted a further dilemma in the potential dismantling of an excellent program in the name of academic values. She recognized that Western Michigan University, Michigan State University, and several other well-regarded institutions withhold graduation credit for developmental courses but pointed out that the University of Michigan and several other respected schools do award such credit?the University of Michigan having modeled its program on ours. In the event of the UCUI motion's approval, she alerted the Senate that her colleagues would initiate action to renumber their 000-numbered courses to the 100 level. Deploing rigidity on an issue that called for flexibility, she worried about solving one problem by creating two.

Mr. Russell rejoined that the solution to the rhetoricians' dilemma is to change RHT numbers upward. He wondered how, if writing progress is really so vaguely discernible, our faculty can possibly administer its writing proficiency requirement. Ms. Garcia reminded him that the purpose of a writing course is not to learn about writing but to produce it. Ms. Eberwein mentioned that other persons who teach writing see the issue somewhat differently. The member of the English Department who established the first writing center at Oakland University remembers having attempted to achieve for its students the very policy that UCUI now proposes. Expressing appreciation for Ms. Garcia's comments, Mr. Downing commented that it was precisely because of the dilemmas she identified that UCUI chose not to classify any specific courses but simply recommended in principle the designation of a particular body of courses. Provision is made for moving courses in or out of that category, with action to be initiated by departments. The Senate is asked to approve a nomenclature, leaving specific course decisions to appropriate committees. Ms. Garcia preferred that this decision be left to individual departments and expressed frustration at her department's vulnerability to the actions of committees on which they seldom have opportunities to serve.

Mr. Willoughby, seconded by Ms. Terry, then proposed an amendment to add to the notion's first line the words "certain specified" between "that" and "course numbers." When Mr. Kleckner asked whether he was trying to denote a specific subset of courses, he replied in the affirmative. Worrying about discrepancies between two quite different sets of courses, he wanted to prevent a university-wide committee from usurping a department's power to

determine the nature of its own courses. Mr. Kleckner doubted that the amendment as offered would accomplish this purpose without modifying the second paragraph of the main motion, which establishes UCUI's authority over renumberings in and out of 000-level courses. Mr. Willoughby said he had been acting on the assumption that that paragraph could not be changed, that UCUI approved all courses. Mr. Kleckner agreed that UCUI does have a general surveillance role but pointed out that the second paragraph gives it specific powers in this new area. Mr. Willoughby explained that his amendment would allow 000-level mathematics courses to be offered for a diminished sort of credit while allowing those with the RHT rubric to carry credit as before. He offered to withdraw his amendment if assured that departments could recommend renumbering courses in an upward direction. Mr. Downing mentioned that such provision exists in the original motion.

Noting that the Willoughby amendment would not achieve its stated purpose, Mr. Grossman thought that the intention of the proposers would be to strike the whole second paragraph. Thus advised, Mr. Willoughby inquired whether, if he were to revise his amendment to delete the offending paragraph, the Rhetoric, Communications, and Journalism Department would still have to petition UCUI for numbering changes. In that case, according to Mr. Kleckner, the line of authority would stop with the Arts and Sciences Committee on Instruction. Seeking to understand the amendment actually on the floor, Mr. Copenhaver asked what numbers between 000 and 099 are not certain and specified. Mr. Appleton suggested that the second paragraph be retained but modified by changing the preposition "in" to "into," thus establishing that ? courses now above 100 would have to be approved by UCUI for downward classification while those placed in the 000 level would need only departmental and committee on instruction approval to bless their ascent. Thus modified, the Willoughby-Terry amendment would make UCUI's involvement unidimensional. Mr. Eberwein recurred, however, to that committee's comment in its report on the possibility of its initiating action to reclassify 100-level courses downward if advised to do so on the basis of a university-wide skills study. He wondered whether the amendment as it seemed to be taking shape would preclude UCUI from acting on upward reclassifications of courses and was advised by Mr. Kleckner that it would.

Mr. Grossman opposed the amendment, seeing it as working at cross-purposes to ambitions for university-wide academic excellence. Mr. Eberwein concurred. Speaking as chair of UCUI, Ms. Eberwein declared that she would find it hard to chair a committee with only partial responsibility and authority in this policy area; she pointed out parallels between UCUI's role in delineating the range of college-level work and that of the Graduate Council in maintaining distinctions between undergraduate and graduate study. Mr. Willoughby's assertion that he simply intended to assure that decisions would be made by the most knowledgeable persons was then interpreted by Mr. Chipman as applying with equal validity to personnel and other matters in which university-wide committees play a well established role. He supported the chair of UCUI. Mr. Willoughby, rejecting the Introduction of other issues, argued that there should be room within a university committee to respect several departments' views. Reasoning that some functions are properly handled at a university level, Mr. Copenhaver mentioned the General Education Committee and the Graduate Council as parallel bodies to UCUI; both make university-level decisions on courses. He judged that the decision as to whether a course is college-level or not should be handled by UCUI, which (if acting prudently and wisely) would pay serious attention to what a department told it about its courses. He defined a university as a collection of expertise?not a pile.

Ms. Tripp pointed out that the discussion, as it was tending, obscured the basic fact that Rhetoric faculty have acknowledged including some pre-college work in their program. She

noted that the department already classifies its courses by its numbering system. Recognizing the difficulty of accommodating the needs of two different faculties, Mr. Barthel wondered whether it might make sense to establish a smaller range of course numbers (000 to 049) for mathematics courses and leaving the 050 to 099 range for writing. Mr. Kleckner didn't think it mattered what one labeled a boundary. Ms. Chapman-Moore, however, worried that two such categories might pose advising difficulties; she noted that it is easier to classify courses for students by the first digit of the course number than by subsequent ones. Mr. Copenhaver thought the problem could be gotten around by removing the 0; he would consider the suggestion seriously if offered as a motion. So encouraged, Mr. Barthel (seconded by Mr. Copenhaver) offered an amendment to change the numbers wherever they appeared in the main motion from 000-099 to 000-049. With Mr. Bertocci calling out a point of order to the effect that there was already an amendment on the floor, Mr. Willoughby and Ms. Terry withdrew their amendment in favor of the new one.

Turning attention to the Barthel-Copenhaver amendment, Mr. Eberwein observed that it failed to address the question he had raised previously about possible UCUI actions in the wake of a university-wide skill study. He pointed out that UCUI would retain authority to act on course levels, although Mr. Copenhaver thought that absolutism on UCUI's part would be made unlikely by the fact that recommendations would have to reach it through committees on instruction. Mr. Downing concurred with Mr. Eberwein's judgment that UCUI might indeed find itself responding to recommendations reaching it from some university-level task force. Thinking that there must be a cleaner way to accomplish various groups' purposes, Mr. Edgerton wondered why the rhetoricians didn't just renumber all their current 000-level courses by replacing the first 0 with a 1. Ms. Garcia feared that such a change would create problems with their current numbering system, a prospect Mr. Kleckner advised them to avoid. Mr. Chipman supported the Barthel amendment as a way of getting away from some of the difficulties perceived on the Senate floor. He reasoned that the purpose of the main motion is to create a new category, not to get involved with decisions on courses. He wanted to ensure the University's ability to offer certain kinds of work without devaluing its courses. Mr. Downing noted, however, that it would be necessary to do something with the current 16-credit policy, if the amendment should be approved. Hoping that Mr. Barthel might incorporate into his motion a reference to the 16-credit issue, Ms. Garcia applauded his amendment as a very fine solution, a collegial approach to resolving dilemmas. The question being called, the Barthel amendment carried by voice vote, thereby replacing the numbers 000-099 throughout the document with 000-049.

Reverting to the main motion, now doubly amended, Ms. Hamilton noted the tendency of faculty outside her department to focus attention on minor editorial flaws as hallmarks of weak writing, when Rhetoric professors evaluate writing performance by more subtle and complex measures. Ms. Tripp, however, assumed on the basis of statements at the previous Senate meeting that Rhetoric is now offering pre-college work. Ms. Chapman-Moore wished to clarify an earlier comment. During UCUI discussions of this issue, it had been her understanding that courses taken by students here or elsewhere before the Implementation date (now 1988) would be counted for credit when that student applied for graduation. She wanted assurance that this protection would still apply and received that assurance from both Mr. Downing and Mr. Appleton. Mr. Kleckner reminded his fellow-Senators that the motion, as now amended, affects no existing courses. Ms. Garcia then called for approval of the main motion as a suitable answer to the needs of the University as a whole. She commended those persons who had put such care into preparing and polishing the motion. The Senate then approved the twice amended motion by voice vote, without dissent:

**MOVED** that course numbers 000 to 049 be designated for skill development courses specially designed to aid incoming, students who have significant deficiencies in their academic background to prepare for courses numbered 100 and above. Credits earned in these courses may not be presented to satisfy minimal graduation requirements in any academic program. These courses are included in the student's GPA.

Any changes involving the numbering of courses in the range 000 to 049 are subject to the approval of the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction.

This policy is to be implemented in the 1988-89 academic year, with the University using the intervening time to inform area high school and college personnel of the new policy. But any specific course which is newly assigned a 000-049 number shall continue to carry credit toward graduation for two years from the September following this action.

Fatigued by the demands of a marathon meeting, the Senate then adjourned by general agreement at 5 p.m.

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

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