



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE.

13 February 1986
Sixth Meeting
Rooms 128-130
Oakland Center

MINUTES

Senators present: Appleton, Barclay, Barthel, Bertocci, Bingham, Blankenship, Blatt, Boganey, Burke, Chapman-Moore, Chipman, Copenhaver, Dahlgren, Downing, Eberwein, Evarts, Faber, Feingold, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hartman, Herman, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Hough, Ketchum Khapoya, Kleckner, Lindell, Metzner, Moore, Rozek, Russell, Straughen, Strauss, Swartz, Terry, Tripp, Willoughby, Witt.

Senators absent: Barnard, Cardimen, Cass, Champagne, Chatterjee, Clatworthy, Diltz, Edgerton, Frankie, Garcia, Hamilton, Heubel, Hightower, Liboff, Monahan, Pettengill, Pine, Reddy, Righter, Schimmelman, Srodawa, Wilson

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 16 January 1986 (Tripp; Chipman). Approved.
2. Motion to defer application of the new general education system for certain transfer students (Edgerton; Hildebrand). Replaced by substitute motion (Appleton; Bertocci). Approved.
3. Motion to amend the constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences (Copenhaver; Grossman). First reading.
4. Motion from the School of Economic and Management to change the name of the school (Horwitz; Barclay). Approved.
5. Motion to waive a second reading for the proposal above (Chipman; Willoughby). Approved.
6. Motion to revise policy on catalog applicability (Eberwein; Gerulaitis). First Reading.
7. Motion to fill a committee vacancy (Downing; Hough). Approved.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m., noting a chalkboard statement welcoming new members and demarcating a healthful (non-smoking) side of the room. The only new member known to the presiding officer was Mr. Faber, appointed by the University Congress to replace Mr. Carbone, and he was duly welcomed. Mr. Kleckner then called attention to the minutes of 16 January. Approval having been moved by Ms. Tripp and seconded by Mr. Chipman, no changes or corrections were offered from the floor and the minutes were accepted as presented.

As a sobering prelude to the meeting, Mr. Kleckner called attention to the problem of catalog deadlines, which force this body to confront complex issues in a hurried manner. As many of

these issues have ramifications extending to a great variety of campus offices, each with something to contribute to the final motion, they tend to send ripples through the system and to complicate the Senate agenda with ever-evolving motions and substitute motions. He intended to ask the Steering Committee to address this problem by reviewing the calendar of activities to find ways of bringing business before this body in a more timely manner. Meanwhile, he turned over the floor to Ms. Eberwein to clarify to her colleagues what they should make of the succession of documents they had received from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction (UCUI) with respect to the catalog applicability motion about to be presented for its first reading. She advised them to disregard the agenda motion and commentary and the various informative handouts that had been reaching them by campus mail and to substitute the packet of material distributed at this meeting. Advice received late from several quarters had led to last-minute revision of the motion and to preparation of improved background materials. The new packet would either supersede or duplicate anything sent before. Apologizing for the confusion, Mr. Kleckner then proceeded to the first major item of business, the motion from the General Education Committee to defer for a year the application of the new general education system for certain transfer students (Mr. Edgerton; Ms. Hildebrand).

In the absence of Mr. Edgerton, who was ill, Mr. Appleton rose to illustrate the point just made by presenting a substitute motion, which was seconded by Mr. Bertocci:

MOVED that students who have earned more than 30 accepted transfer credits at Michigan community colleges may choose to meet the earlier general education requirement as presented in the 1984-85 undergraduate catalog, provided they enrolled in the community colleges before the fall of 1984 and enroll at Oakland University before the fall of 1987.

He ascribed this changed language to discussion at last month's Advising Network meeting at which interpretive questions arose about the language we have been using this year and preserved in the January motion. Inquiries emerged about what happens with specific categories of students, and the answers proved "clearly not clear." Linguistic ambiguities have resulted in the problems that necessarily arise when policy gets interpreted differently in various administrative and advising offices. The substitute motion attempts to resolve those ambiguities. It also restores the preposition "before" in preference to "by" in the interests of consistency for all likely audiences including those transfer students who have already had their transcripts evaluated during this academic year. Except for that modification, no attempt had been made to change the meaning of the original motion but only to achieve clarity.

Ms. Chapman-Moore reported that, in the past year, the Registrar's Office has been grandfathering students with more than thirty accepted transfer credits even though not all those credits came from Michigan community colleges. This motion would exclude such persons. She wondered what would happen to those already grandfathered on that basis. Mr. Appleton had conferred with the Registrar and established that a liberal policy would have to be followed for students who began this year. The new language, however, clarifies the intent to limit this privilege to authentic community college entrants. He could live comfortably with either a liberal or a restricted policy but wanted the Senate to make its intention clear. Mr. Kleckner noted that records of previous Senate discussions on the new general education system indicate that the issue that now seems so problematic had neither been anticipated nor addressed. Ms. Terry speculated about how counselors at community colleges would advise

students who started at their schools, went off to four-year institutions, and returned to the community colleges before applying to Oakland University. She hoped they would be alerted to the need to advise different categories of students differently. Ms. Chapman-Moore wanted to know whether we stood to gain enough by tightening this standard to make the change worthwhile. Ms. Eberwein thought that we would. The alternative would be to privilege even those students who took a single course at a Michigan community college before the magic date and then betook themselves elsewhere--contrary to anyone's intent in establishing a special transfer status for students from those community colleges that systematically prepare students for admission to Oakland University. The question being called, the substitute motion was approved by voice vote.

The first item of new business in the agenda was a motion from the College of Arts and Sciences to amend, its constitution with regard to the formation and dissolution of new standing committees (Moved, Mr. Copenhaver; Seconded, Mr. Grossman)

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that Article IV, v, of the Constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences be amended to read as follows:

Article IV. v. In addition to the standing committees provided for herein, the Assembly, in consultation with the Dean, shall establish such other standing committees as it deems necessary. Motions to establish standing committees must have two readings, on two separate meeting days, before the Assembly and require a two-thirds majority vote of all Assembly members for passage. Motions to abolish or to alter the composition or charge of any standing committee created by the Assembly under this provision must have two readings, on two separate meeting days, before the Assembly and require a two-thirds majority of all Assembly members for passage.

Article IV. vi. Same as present Article IV. v.

Trusting that his motion would prove the least complicated item on the agenda, Mr. Copenhaver justified it as a straightforward attempt to allow the College to conduct its ongoing committee business without going to the Board each time it might wish to add or delete a standing committee. Given its venerable history, however, the College still wishes to adopt a more conservative system of committee proliferation than now exists in academic units more recently founded. No discussion ensued, and the motion was held over for a second reading in March.

Congratulating Mr. Copenhaver on his efficiency in presenting his motion, Mr. Kleckner then turned over the floor to Mr. Horwitz, who (seconded Ms. Barclay) introduced a motion from the School of Economics and Management:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the name of the School of Economics and Management be changed to the School of Business Administration.

The Dean informed his Senate colleagues that this motion had welled up from the Assembly of his School (a body composed of student as well as faculty members), that it had been

thoroughly debated in that forum, and that it had been reviewed and blessed by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee. Tracing the history of his unit, he noted that the School of Economics and Management had originated in what was basically a department of Economics. Now, however, Economics majors constitute less than four percent of its majors and a distinctly modest percentage of its graduates. The economics faculty are substantially outnumbered by those in other areas. The mission of the School has evolved in a direction different than its title implies. Consequently, the current name causes confusion all the way from the Admissions Office to the Board of Advisers. Speaking on behalf of the APPC, Mr. Chipman endorsed the motion. His committee is satisfied that SEM consulted all appropriate constituencies. The overall effects of this name change are likely to be beneficial to the University, and the renaming threatens no harm to any other academic unit.

Mr. Khapoya introduced questioning by asking for the prevailing view of the Economics faculty. Would those worthies wish to stay within a School of Business Administration or to move to a more traditional home? Mr. Hough responded that there are good solid models for Economics departments in business schools as well as in other academic units. He thought that this motion made all the sense in the world and believed that he and his fellow-Economists, having thought through the question in lively debate, would be happy staying where they are. Mr. Horwitz had heard no talk of secession. Mr. Grossman then inquired whether students in the School of Business Administration would still be able to major in Economics and was assured by the Dean that there would be no change in curricular offerings. Students would still be able to pursue the B.S. in Economics in his school or the B.A. in the same discipline within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Mr. Grossman then queried whether Senate action would confirm the desired name-change or whether a constitutional amendment would be required. Mr. Kleckner said that, if the Senate should approve this motion, the proposal would then advance to the Board. If the Board approves, the change goes into effect. Mr. Chipman, seconded by Mr. Willoughby, then proposed that the Senate expedite this outcome by waiving a second reading, a process that would entail a two-thirds majority. When Mr. Grossman asked whether there was some sort of rush to accomplish this purpose in time for catalog deadlines, Mr. Kleckner acknowledged that there was, although Ms. Eberwein saw no greater urgency for this motion than several others on the floor. Agreeing overwhelmingly to forego a second reading the Senate then approved the main motion with unanimous support.

With one issue so happily resolved, attention turned to the third item of new business: a motion from UCUI to revise the University's 1982 policy on catalog applicability (Moved, Ms. Eberwein; Seconded, Ms. Gerulaitis). Ms. Eberwein proposed the motion from the substitute packet rather than the one on the original agenda:

MOVED that the catalog applicability policy for undergraduate students (1985-86 Undergraduate Catalog, p. 25) be modified to read:

General Rule: The graduation requirements for an undergraduate student shall be those stated in the university catalog extant at the time of graduation unless the student specifies an earlier catalog(s) under the following conditions:

Condition A: A student may graduate by satisfying all requirements in the catalog in effect at the time of a admission to a program of the university (matriculation), or

any subsequent catalog, provided that catalog is not more than six years old at the time of graduation, except for students who have changed their major from another Oakland University's school or college, or from un-decided status, or who have been readmitted to the university (such students should see Condition C below). In this connection, a change from pre-major to major standing does not constitute a change of major.

Condition B: A student may graduate by satisfying university requirements and general education requirements from an earlier catalog while satisfying requirements for the major itself from a later catalog as long as neither catalog is more than six years old at the time of graduation and neither predates the one in effect during the first semester or session of the student's matriculation at Oakland University.

Condition C: Some students enter majors from another Oakland University school or college or from undecided status. Any school or college may, at its option, limit such students to completing requirements for the major according to the catalog in effect at the time of such entry or to any subsequent catalog which the student selects. A student changing major must satisfy general education requirements associated with the new major. The catalog selected for this purpose cannot be more than six years old at the time of graduation and not predate the one in effect during the first semester or session of the student's matriculation at Oakland University. Spring or summer graduates may not elect a later catalog than the one in effect for the academic year in which they graduate (for these purposes, the academic year runs from fall semester through the summer session).

Concentrations and Minors: In addition to traditional programs of study, concentrations or minors in certain studies are also offered by many academic schools or departments within the university. Students intending to satisfy requirements for a concentration or minor must complete a written plan of work approved by the coordinator of that program. Satisfactory completion of that plan of work constitutes completion of the concentration or minor. (Completing a major after a minor in the same subject area has also been completed will result in awarding of the major only).

Ms. Eberwein provided some context for this motion by explaining that one of UCU's functions is to see that university-wide academic policies are carried out with substantial regularity by all units. (One of the ways this is done is by monitoring petitions of exception relating to such requirements to discern whether the various Committees on Instruction enforce policies equitably. 'When UCU carried out this monitoring function last year (for the first time), it discovered heartening consistency of judgment throughout the University on almost all issues but detected the likelihood of trouble developing this year, when general education requirements would change substantially. Questions raised by the University's legal counsel about the intent of the catalog applicability policy had already precipitated thinking about this issue, and UCU's annual report to the Senate last spring had alerted members of this body to anticipate some rethinking of the catalog applicability policy by way of separating general education requirements from those of the major. This fall, when first confronted with a general education program not tied to the major, academic advisers discovered that they were directing students in very different ways--with some requiring students who changed major to

complete all the requirements of the new general education program and others allowing them to stay with the old general education requirements for the new major even while requiring them to comply with the most recent catalog for the major. In an attempt to arrive at a consistent policy statement for the new catalog, UCUI established a subcommittee to try to formulate a policy that all academic units could implement harmoniously. The motion on the floor resulted.

In hopes of focusing deliberation on the principal policy issues associated with the motion, Ms. Eberwein urged thoughtful debate on the three main changes: 1) the introduction of a two-catalog policy; 2) the definition of a change of major as not including progression from pre-major to major status; and 3) an entirely new statement on minors and concentrations. In view of the legal entanglements associated with catalog language on such a matter, she asked her Senate colleagues to refrain from offering amendments but invited them instead to make suggestions for rewording either from the floor or in writing so that UCUI could bring a perfected motion to the March meeting, if needed. She then turned over the floor to Ms. Chapman-Moore, who chaired the subcommittee that formulated this legislation.

Ms. Chapman-Moore called attention to the background information in the packets concerning current practices in the various academic units and about her subcommittee's mode of procedure. She noted that they had met with academic advisers, representative, of the General Education Committee, and legal counsel. Reminding her colleagues that more than half of our students change majors (often more than once), she explained that the policy had been worded in a way that attempted to clarify their options. Current policy allows a student to choose to follow any catalog not older than six years old or else to use the most recent edition. This motion, by contrast, introduces a two-catalog policy that tries to give maximum flexibility to students changing majors by protecting them from needing what can sometimes amount to a whole new general education package. She then invited questions on the two-catalog aspect of the legislation.

Mr. Grossman tried to sort out the various conditions specified in the motion observing that A mentioned a change of major while B did not. He wondered whether all students, or only a limited group, could choose two catalogs. Ms. Chapman-Moore reviewed the conditions in which students might find themselves. Condition A states current policy but directs the student who changes major to Condition C. She interpreted Condition C to mean that a student could choose to follow the old general education requirements for that new major. When Mr. Grossman probed to find what would happen to the student who follows only Condition B, she responded that a student who change major could still follow a dual catalog option. Mr. Grossman then suggested writing in a reference to Condition C within Condition B to make the point literally clear. Mr. Hough suggested adding language from B to C to clarify the intent that the dual option of B apply to C as well. Mr. Copenhaver, who had not realized in advance that this language was intended for the catalog, proposed adding some if/then language or a chart with arrows to guide the student reader. Ms. Blankenship read A and C as if/then statements whereas B applied uniformly to the total student audience. Ms. Chapman-Moore, recognizing how tough an issue this is, in light of legal interpretive problems, trusted that an advisor would explain it differently to students. Mr. Kleckner warned that we need to be increasingly cognizant of the legal aspects of policy change that make issues like this so thorny. Explaining that he understood these categories to represent conditions in which students might fall, Mr. Downing pointed out that students usually have the options of B, although those who change majors can be held by the new academic unit to its current standards for the major but not for general education.

Ms. Tripp, as a departmental adviser, applauded the attempt to answer catalog applicability questions but wondered what the status of the College of Arts and Sciences distribution requirements might be under Condition C. Ms. Chapman-Moore thought that this package would be associated with the major, since it is not a University general education requirement. When Ms. Tripp asked whether the College would require a student transferring from another school to complete its distribution package if the person had finished general education courses in some previous incarnation, Mr. Appleton indicated that the student would be considered to have completed general education but would still be held to fulfillment of the College's distribution requirements.

While he had the floor, Mr. Appleton went on to express his complete agreement with the policy UCUI had put forward. He regarded it as eminently fair to students yet suspected that those same students would find the catalog language unintelligible because each condition statement dealt with both university and major requirements. His suggestion was to write the policy in sections: 1) general education and other university requirements; 2) major requirements and distribution requirements (if any); 3) concentrations and minors. Within each section, the policy's application to various subdivisions of students would be explained. A separate section would inform readers about conditions in which different policies might obtain. Mr. Hough, attempting to translate Mr. Appleton's statement back into the original document, advised that a sort of marginal gloss be developed, informing readers that "For students who do not change majors," Condition A exists ; " For all students", Condition B exists, while "For some students who change majors," Condition C comes into play. Mr. Appleton wanted the language to assert plainly that any student can follow two catalogs, whether changing major or not. Mr. Hough noted that Condition B, which applies to all students, establishes that point. Mr. Kleckner observed that Messrs. Hough and Appleton were arguing the merits of two organizational principles, a concern Mr. Willoughby thought the business of the sponsoring committee.

Mr. Bertocci then inquired whom UCUI hoped to help through this policy revision and how. Ms. Chapman-Moore explained that an effort was being made to assist that vast host of undergraduates who change majors. Another group to be assisted would be those who advance from pre-major to major status . Except for the language about concentrations and minors, everything else in the motion simply restates current policy. Mr. Russell then spoke up for his school, which makes extensive use of pre-major curricula, to indicate that his colleagues have no quarrel with the policy as now presented. Expressing concurrence with the motion's intent, Mr. Boganey hoped language would be clarified to help students recognize that Condition A applies to those students who do not change majors, that Condition B exists for everyone and that Condition C may affect those who change majors.

Mr. Grossman wondered why Condition B specified that a student may use an earlier catalog for general education requirements and a later one for the major. He suggested revising the language to affirm a two-catalog policy in the other direction also for such students as might want to follow the major from an early catalog and a more recent general education program. Ms. Eberwein, recognizing that improvements in general education might make a revised program more attractive than its predecessor, welcomed his suggestion and thought that a one/another distinction could replace the current earlier/later. Searching his memory of previous UCUI service back when that committee had grappled earlier with this issue, Mr. Kleckner recalled great variety of concerns for timeliness among academic units: some units can live contentedly with the same curriculum for fifteen years while others want changes implemented universally tomorrow. This reflection prompted Ms. Bingham to inquire what

would happen when the faculty in a program needed to impose changes. Ms. Eberwein noted that Condition C applies to cases where a school chooses to require a current catalog at the time of a student's change of major. Those who do not change major can always follow Conditions A or B. Mr. Burke then inquired when a change of major occurs. According to Ms. Chapman-Moore, that Rubicon is passed when the official change-of-major form is approved. When Mr. Burke then probed to find out what the University regards as a student's original choice of major, Mr. Kleckner indicated that it is whatever the person originally put down on the admission form--even if only undecided. When Ms. Terry inquired why the policy still states that a student can follow the catalog extant at the time of graduation, wondering whether anyone actually does so, Mr. Kleckner reported that some, indeed, do. At any rate, the final catalog serves as a starting point for the Registrar and is the easiest document from which to work.

There comments exhausted for the nonce Senate concerns about the two-catalog policy and changes of major, freeing attention for the proposed policy statement on concentrations and minors. Mr. Chipman introduced a recurring theme in the discussion by inquiring how much paperwork this system would entail in a year. Ms. Chapman-Moore confessed that nobody knew the answer yet; absence of records concerning these programs is part of the problem. She noted that written contracts already exist for HRD and BGS students and that the system has proven very successful for those units, allowing faculty members and advisers to get a handle on how many of these programs are sought by students. At long last, computer entry and monitoring of all this information has become possible, and she felt that the record system envisaged within this motion would provide helpful data for departments. It would also assist in graduation reviews of student records, especially in cases where coordinators change. She pointed out that problems often arise in cases where transfer course equivalencies have been worked out in conversation between a student and a program coordinator but do not appear on a formal record that anyone else could consult.

Program coordinators reacted to the proposal with contradictory judgments, with Mr. Grossman hailing the record system as an excellent idea and Mr. Bertocci distrusting it as a prelude to considerable paperwork for little gain. He wondered whether the putative coordination of information this proposal aimed at would ever work out and suggested that coordinators and advisers simply get in the habit of writing down and filing any bargain they might strike with students. Doubting that the system would guard against course changes or non-offering of courses the student and adviser might agree should be taken, he foresaw a lot of redundancy with little good effect. Ms. Chapman-Moore pointed out that many complications now arise every year, indicating that current informal advising mechanisms fail to work. She mentioned that a coordinator could work out a general plan of study with the student--not specifying particular courses. Mr. Copenhaver wondered whether Mr. Bertocci was satisfied with holding the student to a program already explicitly described in the catalog, in which case a separate written plan of work might seem redundant. Even so, Mr. Grossman argued, something is gained by requiring a student to confer with a program coordinator even if only to ratify the current catalog listing as their agreed-upon plan of work. As Mr. Horwitz pointed out, no statement in the proposed policy forces a student to fill out such a plan. Those who do not can still apply at graduation for a minor or concentration and have their records reviewed at that point.

Forebodings of de facto three-catalog or x-catalog policy, began to trouble Senators, with Mr. Kleckner and Mr. Hough interpreting Mr. Bertocci's position as tending in that direction and Mr. Horwitz interpreting UCU's proposal as having the same tendency. Ms. Chapman-Moore

responded that her committee discussed this possibility but thought that an official three-catalog policy, directly incorporating minors and concentrations, would prove too cumbersome. They chose to reserve such programs within a separate policy area, allowing students to negotiate these arrangements without tying them to their other catalog choices. She observed that these academic programs resist easy classification within categories of university requirements or those of the major. Mr. Hough advised working this material into the basic catalog applicability policy so that it addresses all three programmatic components of a student's education: university requirements, major requirements, and minor or concentration requirements.

Diverse advising experiences prompted Senators to align themselves with various camps on this issue. Ms. Chapman-Moore cited BGS contracts as a successful model. Mr. Grossman, who has found himself disallowing about half the graduation requests he reviews for a minor in Mathematics, urged expansion of that contractual system to protect students against errors. Ms. Barclay, however, has discovered that minors with written contracts assume entitlement to places in classes already oversubscribed with majors. She, like Mr. Bertocci and Ms. Tripp, worried about the volume of paper that would be mounting in files; although Ms. Chapman-Moore anticipated that the record-keeping would be centralized in the Registrar's Office. The newly computerized student records system, she pointed out, offers vastly extended capabilities for tracking. Both Mr. Bertocci and Ms. Blankenship thought the proposed system likely to be advantageous for concentration advisers but simply burdensome for those counseling minors.

Mr. Grossman wondered whether the motion gave the coordinator power to approve a plan at variance with catalog specifications, and Ms. Chapman-Moore observed that, in practice, a coordinator already has royal rights. Mr. Bertocci commented that a department functions like God in such cases, although recognizing the BGS contract as a special case. Mr. Appleton, sympathetic to the view that a student should be allowed to choose for these purposes any pertinent catalog within six years, pointed out that the catalog itself could be used to introduce a contractual system for concentrations and minors whose sponsors might think such a system advantageous. He suggested that units introduce a statement within their catalog entries directing students to see an adviser to formulate an approved plan of study. Distrusting legislated local options as inherently confusing, he observed that nothing—even now—prevents a student and adviser from arriving at a written contract, he suggested that departments and concentration committees apply to their schools' committees on instruction for authority to introduce such contract requirements into the catalog without having to wait for Senate action.

In order to separate this contentious issue from broader policy questions, Mr. Horwitz (supported by Mr. Willoughby) advised that the motion be divided into two parts, and Mr. Kleckner agreed that it would be presented in that form on the March agenda. Ms. Chapman-Moore inquired whether, if UCU1 should revise its motion in response to that day's discussion, the new form would be presented for a first or second reading. Mr. Kleckner judged that, unless radically changed, it would be offered for second reading but pointed out that the Senate would have the option of delaying action if uncomfortable with the new language.

After such intensive deliberation on the catalog applicability issue, the Senate snapped into action on the next motion presented to it—immediately and unanimously approving Mr. Downing's motion (seconded by Mr. Hough) to appoint Ann Pogany to the Academic and Career Advising Committee for the duration of this academic year, replacing Mr. Willoughby. No private resolutions emerged for the good of the order.

Mr. Kleckner concluded the meeting with a sequence of brief information items. Three major searches are underway, two for deans and one for a director. Materials continue to flow in from candidates for the dean of the School of Engineering and Computer Science and the School of Health Sciences. Candidates are being interviewed for the position of Director of the Ken Morris Labor Studies Center, and a decision is likely soon. Strong academic qualifications characterize these applicants as well as experience in organized labor. The Center is now located within the School of Human and Educational Services.

Lansing news focuses on the budget for the coming fiscal year. Governor Blanchard has recommended an increase of approximately 5.4% for higher education, a smaller sum than had been expected. Recent experience with allocations rising during the legislative process engender cautious optimism that the final appropriation may be higher than the Governor's proposal although not up[to this year's level of increase. Whether modest tuition increases may be considered remains uncertain.

The development campaign has now raised approximately \$4.6-million and approaches its pre-announcement goal. A formal announcement should not be too distant. Some money that has been raised is specifically targeted; some is not. Library funding is assured; although minor questions must still be resolved regarding preliminary plans prior to actual architectural drawings. He hoped that digging might begin before the snow flies next fall. On that happy note, Mr. Willoughby called for adjournment, and Senators dispersed at 5:07 p.m.

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

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page