



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 12 April 1984
Seventh Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Barthel, Bertocci, Boganey, Boulos, Brown, Burke, Bledsoe, Chagnon-Royce, Chapman-Moore, Chipman, Copenhaver, Downing, Easterly, J. Eberwein R. Eberwein, Edgerton, Evarts, Feeman. Frankie, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hamilton, Hammerle, Hartman, Howes, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lindell, McCabe, McClory, Moore, Pine, Russell, Sakai, Schimmelman, Shichi, Splete, Titus, Tomboulian, Tracy, Witt, Workman,
Senators Absent: Appleton, Boddy, Champagne, Christina, Coppola, Eliezer, Federlein, Heubel, Horwitz, Hough, Maloney, Moorhouse, Scherer, Schwartz, Sevilla, Snider-Feldmesser, Stevens.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

1. Minutes of 8 March 1984. Moved, Mr. Eberwein; seconded, Mr. Edgerton. Approved.
2. Motion from the Steering Committee modifying the charge and membership specifications for the APPC. Moved, Mr. Downing; seconded, Mr. Moore. Approved, as doubly amended
3. Amendment to increase faculty representation on the APPC from six to seven. Moved, Ms. Scherer; seconded, Ms. Titus. Approved.
4. Amendment to restore the Vice President for Academic Affairs to membership on the APPC. Moved, Ms. Bledsoe; seconded, Mr. Feeman. Approved,
5. Amendment to raise student representation on the APPC from two to four. Moved, Mr. McClory; seconded, Mr. Bertocci. Defeated.
6. Amendment to remove the Director of Computer and Information Systems from the APPC. Moved, Mr. Eberwein; seconded, Mr. McCabe. Defeated.
7. Amendment to shift the Administrative-Professional representative on the APPC from voting to non-voting status. Moved, Ms. Gerulaitis; seconded, Ms. Titus. Defeated.
8. Motion from the Steering Committee modifying the charge and membership specifications for UCUI. Moved, Mr. Splete; seconded, Ms. Titus. Approved as doubly amended.
9. Amendment to raise student representation on UCUI from two to four members. Moved, Mr. McClory; seconded, Mr. Boganey. Defeated,
10. Amendment to revise charge #1 to UCUI by adding the phrase "except for general education requirements" after "undergraduate education" in line 2. Moved, Mr. Appleton; seconded, Mr. Copenhaver. Approved.
11. Amendment to revise charge i#2 to UCUI. Moved, Mr. Appleton; seconded Mr. Bertocci. Approved.
12. Motion from the Steering Committee modifying the charge to the General Education Committee. Moved, Ms. Eberwein; seconded, Mr. Moore. Approved as amended.
13. Amendment to add the. Associate Provost of Undergraduate Studies as an *ex officio*, non-voting member of the General Studies Committee. Moved, Hr. Copenhaver; seconded, Mr.

Chipman. Approved.

14. Motion from the faculty of the Center for Health Sciences to establish a School of Health Sciences, Moved, Mr. Russell; seconded, Mr. Downing. First Reading.

15. Motion from the Graduate Council to establish a Master of Science program in Exercise Science. Moved, Mr. Feeman; seconded, Mr. Pine. First Reading, 16. Motion from the Steering Committee nominating certain faculty members Senate standing committees. Moved, Mr. Edgerton; seconded, Ms. Boulos. Approved.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m., calling for consideration of the minutes of the previous meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Eberwein, seconded by Mr. Edgerton, the minutes were approved without discussion.

Attention turned at once to various items of old business, all involving changes in charge and/or membership of Senate standing committees: APPC, UCUI and General Education. As a prelude to discussion of these complex topics, Mr. Kleckner briefed his fellow-Senators on the anticipated Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies who, should the motions on the floor carry, would be joining the APPC, chairing UCUI, and working with the General Education Committee. The position will be initiated in some fashion next year?probably on a half-time basis until funding can be liberated to support a full-time officer. The Provost sees this change, not as an addition to his staff, but as a resuscitation of a position that previously existed in the Provost's office but has disappeared in the last few years as a consequence of administrative realignments and budgetary transfers. This will be a staff rather than line position. The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies will be responsible for coordinating increasing interaction of Senate committees involved with undergraduate curricula and policies, coordinating reviews of undergraduate programs, providing administrative support for the general education program, supervising the undergraduate catalog, guiding proposals through the governance system, and generally serving as a provostial liaison with academic units. This position is prompted in substantial measure by the success of Mr. Feeman's work in guiding and facilitating graduate-level activities and is intended to provide parallel services at the undergraduate level.

Amendments modifying membership specifications for the APPC dominated discussion of the motion to approve new charges and membership specifications for that body. Senators attempted to ensure faculty dominance of that body while maintaining its representative quality and attempting to limit it to an efficient size. The first amendment, increasing faculty membership from six to seven passed by voice vote without discussion (Moved, Ms. Scherer; seconded, Ms. Titus).

The second amendment, restoring the Vice President for Student Affairs to membership elicited somewhat more attention (Moved, Ms. Bledsoe; seconded, Mr. Feeman). Ms. Gerulaitis wondered whether this worthy would serve instead of or in addition to an Administrative Professional and discovered that Ms. Bledsoe intended an addition. The original rationale for having an AP on the APPC proved lost in history when Ms. Gerulaitis attempted to explore the issue. Mr. Kleckner recalled that the decision was made long ago for dimly remembered reasons probably associated with the need for a liaison on the committee who could anticipate and help prepare for the effects of new academic policies on various administrative offices. Mr. Feeman conjectured that a representative from the Business Office would have moved onto the APPC when the Academic Policy Committee merged with the now-defunct Budget Committee to form the APPC in the mid-70s. As seconder of the amendment,

Mr. Feeman then went on to indicate that he assumed the Vice President to have intended a non-voting seat and found that his guess was correct. He explained that his support for the amendment stemmed from the presence on the proposed committee of two representatives from the Business wing of the administration while Student affairs is offered none; he would really prefer one member from each of these administrative units. Mr. Kleckner justified the proposal on the basis of the strong financial implications of academic policy decisions and suggested that computer facilities now occupy a position analogous to the Library in terms of providing support for future academic developments. Ms. Bledsoe countered, however, that areas of concern for the APPC could have profound implications for admissions, advising, and other areas of Student Affairs responsibility. She, therefore, argued for restoration of her seat, and Mr. Feeman continued to support her. Mr. Barthel wondered why, if the Vice President for Student Affairs now serves on the APPC, any change in that arrangement had been recommended and was told by Mr. Kleckner that the Steering Committee had been concerned about overall committee size and had thought that the Vice President's contribution to the revised UCUI would be more significant, given that committee's assumption of many duties now handled by the APPC. Mr. McCabe asked clarification of the amendment to specify that this is an *ex officio*, non-voting seat, whereupon Mr. Kleckner ordered that understanding to be entered into the record. When Mr. Russell inquired whether the Vice President would serve on the APPC herself or send a designee, he found the Provost willing to restore current wording "(or designee)" after the title. This, as Mr. Grossman pointed out, again leaves the Director of Institutional Research the only administrator on the APPC not licensed to delegate a substitute. Following this discussion, the amendment passed without opposition.

Heartened by the restoration of one member to the APPC, Mr. McClory then proposed an amendment to restore two student members, thereby lifting the student delegation from two to four (Moved, Mr. McClory; seconded, Mr. Bertocci). He pointed out that average student representation on Senate committees figures out to about thirty percent, while the proposal on the floor would drop that proportion severely. He reiterated his conviction that the current University Congress is doing a creditable job in getting student representatives assigned to committees and actively involved. Noting that both the APPC and UCUI need full student representation because of their direct impact on students, he maintained that the very idea of a university assumes equal student/faculty involvement in academic decision-making. From that perspective, even four student members would be too few. Mr. Bertocci, identifying himself as one long committed to the principle of student representation in university governance, judged that the principle stands without regard for specific numbers in office. He upheld the students' right to serve but requested further information about the basis for their appointments. Aside from the Congress President, who serves *ex officio*, he found no evidence in the legislation about how the other one or three would be selected. He wondered whether Congress named them and, if so, on what basis. Specifically he inquired whether steps would be taken to ensure that these persons would represent a variety of academic programs and that they would be responsible participants. Mr. Boganey, who now coordinates such appointments for the Congress, explained that he has filled all student vacancies on Senate committees, drawing members from Congresspersons and from the many volunteers who answered a published call. He monitors responsible membership by requiring written reports from student members after meetings and by enforcing a Congress attendance policy specifying allowable numbers of excused and unexcused absences. He makes a conscious effort, in interviewing candidates for committee assignments, to place students in accordance with their interests. The amendment proved unusually controversial, requiring several votes by show of hands, it was defeated by a vote of nineteen Nays to eighteen Ayes.

Attempting to cut the committee down to manageable size, Mr. Eberwein then proposed an amendment to exclude the Director of Computer and Information Systems (or designee) from the APPC (Seconded, Hr. McCabe). He recognized the rationale for including that officer but thought the spirit of the proposal could be achieved by inviting the Director to particular meetings when his contributions would be most needed. When Mr. Grossman inquired whether non-voting members now generally attend most APPC meetings, he was assured by Messrs. Chipman and Russell that they do. Mr. Ketchum argued against the amendment on the grounds that, given the lead-time needed to effect changes in information systems, there is value in having this person available to the committee on a regular basis. A show of hands demonstrated that the amendment failed by a substantial majority.

Ms. Gerulaitis (seconded by Ms. Titus) then proposed an amendment to switch the Administrative Professional position on the APPC from voting to non-voting status. Ms. Chapman-Moore defended the current and proposed situation, arguing that a vote is appropriate for an AP since policy and procedural decisions often come down to administrative implementation; she valued AP perspective on academic issues. Mr. Chipman expressed concern that APs would be the only group on the Senate not to have a voting member of the APPC, though Ms. Gerulaitis thought such a distinction proper to a curriculum committee. Mr. Bertocci observed that the Senate seemed to be having trouble distinguishing which persons it needed on the APPC for informational purposes and which ones for decision-making; he felt uncomfortable about a series of *ad hoc* additions and subtractions when the central issue remained unexplored. Mr. Copenhaver supported the amendment, however, as one recognizing a clear distinction between the proper business of various groups; he maintained that faculty and students have a special interest in APPC decisions that should be reflected in committee organization. The amendment failed by a vote of eighteen Nays to sixteen Ayes.

Having wrestled at length with membership issues, the Senate offered no comment on proposed charges to the APPC and proceeded at once to a vote on the main motion, twice amended, which carried by voice vote:

MOVED that the Senate approve the following charge and membership specifications for the APPC.

Charge:

1. To recommend to the University Senate regarding academic policies and procedures relating to both graduate and undergraduate students;
 2. To recommend concerning any changes affecting the academic organization of the University (i.e. schools, centers);
 3. To receive reports on proposed new programs, program revisions, and reviews from UCUI, the General Education Committee, and the Graduate Council and to advise these bodies on the impact of program innovations or revisions on the University as a whole;
 4. To work with the President and the Provost in the development and updating of University academic plans, goals, objectives, role; and mission;
 5. To review proposals for introduction or revision of any academic graduate degrees and to make appropriate recommendations to the Senate;
 6. To receive from the Provost reports on the allocations of resources to the various academic programs and to advise the Provost on the priorities for such allocations;
- and

7. To advise the Senate and its committees (UCUI, the Graduate Council, and the General Education Committee) on the University-wide academic and budgetary implications of proposed new academic programs or the discontinuance, or major reorganization of existing academic programs as may be proposed.

Membership: Seven faculty-at-large (but not more than two from any one organized faculty) one of whom shall be chair; one administrative-professional; two students, one of whom shall be the President of the University Congress (or designee); the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies; the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies; all of the above being voting members. In addition, the following shall be *ex officio* and non-voting members; the Vice President for Finance and Administration (or designee); the Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee); the Dean of the Library (or designee); the Director of Computer and Information Systems (or designee); and the Director of Institutional Research.

A similar tendency to discuss proposed charges and membership by way of the amendment process characterized debate on the motion relating to UCUI (Moved Mr. Splete; seconded, Ms. Titus). As before, membership amendments took precedence over all others. Yet again, Mr. McClory introduced an amendment to restore student membership to four voting members rather than the two proposed by the Steering Committee (Seconded, Mr. Boganey). When Mr. Hartman inquired how many voting members are actually proposed in the main motion, Mr. Kleckner explained that there are six organized faculties represented; the total of voting members would therefore be ten. Mr. McClory urged forthright statements of opposition to increased student membership on the assumption that candor would be healthy, and Mr. Russell answered his challenge by questioning the appropriateness of any student's voting on petitions of exception for other students? a position which, as Mr. Bertocci pointed out, would threaten all student representation on UCUI, not just two additions, Mr. Kleckner noted, however, that students already have votes on two analogous committees: Academic Standing and Honors and Academic Conduct. Ms. Chagnon-Royce noted that, without a majority, students could not easily conspire to ease graduation requirements; and Mr. Downing noted, on the basis of his experience on the Academic Conduct Committee, that the students who accept governance assignments tend to be exceptionally rigorous in their judgments, holding [to a "hang-'em-high" policy with respect to academic violations. Ms. Bledsoe questioned whether it is objective to reduce committee size simply in the interests of efficiency, though Mr. Kleckner considered the UCUI proposal from the Steering Committee to be a total reconstitution of the body rather than simply a streamlining. The amendment failed, with its thirteen supporters considerably outnumbered.

The charge to UCUI proved more controversial than its membership, Mr. Eberwein offered an amendment on behalf of Senator Appleton to amend charge #1 by adding the phrase "except for general education requirements" after "undergraduate education" on line 2 (Seconded, Mr. Copenhaver). The revised wording is intended to clarify that prime responsibility for general education rests with the General Education Committee. Ms. Easterly objected, however, that UCUI should have overall responsibility for all undergraduate programs including general education. She proposed that the General Education Committee be made a subcommittee of UCUI, resting her case on three main values: educational quality; a tenable position for the new Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, and a balanced management structure. Mr. Copenhaver, however, supported the Eberwein amendment on the very grounds of educational clarity and administrative efficiency, and Mr. Eberwein reminded the Senate that the proposed charge already calls for cooperation between UCUI and the General Education Committee so

that his amendment is offered in that spirit. Mr. Copenhaver indicated that he would propose, at some future point, making the new Associate Provost an *ex officio* member of the General Education Committee. Mr. Chipman acknowledged the possibility of administrative untidiness in having two committees sharing responsibility for undergraduate instruction while the Graduate Council acts independently of other committees prior to the Senate, but he recognized a special university commitment to general education that must be carried out.

Mr. Kleckner agreed that folding of the two committees into each other would be premature at this point when Oakland University is just getting started on a strong general education policy and program. Mr. Hartman then inquired about the effect of duplicate committees on students, wondering whether a student would have to petition two different committees for release from certain academic requirements. According to Mr. Kleckner, the amendment draws a sharp line keeping UCUI out of general education decisions, A student only needs to petition one committee for any given problem. The amendment carried by voice vote.

Attention then turned to the Appleton/Bertocci amendment from the March meeting co revise charge #2 to read "To evaluate and monitor petitions of exception regarding University-wide undergraduate academic requirements except for general education requirements." Mr. Kleckner commented on the similarity in spirit between this amendment and the one just passed. He agreed with Mr. Grossman's paraphrase of the language as meaning that UCUI observes, evaluates, and monitors the decisions of committees on instruction rather than acting directly itself on petitions of exception. The amendment carried by a voice vote. The main motion on UCUI charges and membership specifications, doubly amended, then passed with few dissents:

MOVED that the Senate approve the following charge and membership specifications for UCUI.

Charge:

1. To recommend to the University Senate academic policies and procedures concerning undergraduate education (except for general education requirements) and, when necessary, seek advice from other appropriate bodies concerning the impact of these policies and procedures;
2. To evaluate and monitor petitions of exception regarding University- wide undergraduate academic requirements except for general education requirements;
3. To make recommendations to the University Senate and to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies regarding proposed and existing undergraduate programs, including recommendations for program modification, suspension, or discontinuance;
4. To advise the Academic Policy and Planning Committee concerning proposed new undergraduate programs;
5. To cooperate with the General Education Committee in overseeing undergraduate instruction throughout the University;
6. To ensure review of all undergraduate program in timely fashion and report

findings to the University Senate;

7. To evaluate ongoing and proposed undergraduate programs for their consistency with University academic policies and mission and to monitor catalog copy to ensure compliance with all such policies; and

8. To advise the Senate on all matters that body may refer to it concerning undergraduate instruction and the general requirements within which the specifics of undergraduate degree programs function.

Membership:

The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, who presides as chair and shall also represent UCUI on the APPC; one faculty member from each organized faculty, appointed to staggered two-year terms by the Senate upon nomination by the Steering Committee, each of whom shall represent UCUI to the Committee on Instruction or equivalent group in her/his academic unit; the Director of Academic Advising; and two undergraduate students designated by the University Congress; the above to be voting members. In addition, the following shall serve *ex officio* and non-voting: the Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee) and the Registrar (or designee).

The final item of old business was a motion to modify the charge to the General Education Committee to stipulate its responsibility to handle petitions of exception regarding University-wide general education issues (Moved, Ms. Eberwein; seconded, Mr. Moore) Mr. Feeman suggested the deletion of the word "general" before "policies and requirements" in line 2 to avoid unnecessary duplication of language: a stylistic correction accepted by both the mover and seconder, Mr. Copenhaver then asked if it would be appropriate for him to offer an amendment adding the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies as an *ex officio*, non-voting member of the General Education Committee. Upon learning that an amendment would be in order, he offered one (seconded by Mr. Chipman); and the amendment carried unanimously. So did the main motion:

MOVED that the Senate's charge to the General Education Committee be expanded to read: "To recommend to the Senate policies and requirements for undergraduate general education, to function as a curriculum committee for a university-wide program of general education, and to respond to petitions of exception relating to that program, in accordance with Senate authorizations.

New business then took center stage, with Mr. Russell (seconded by Mr. Downing) offering the following motion:

MOVED that the University establish a School of Health Sciences and an organized faculty of Health Sciences, to be governed by the proposed Constitution of the School of Health Sciences.

Mr. Russell then traced the history of the Center since it was first proposed in 1975 as an umbrella for several programs including the School of Nursing,, which has since developed as a separate entity. The original plan called for the Center to become a school when it had sufficient full-time faculty and when its programs achieved full accreditation. As of next year,

Health Sciences will have twelve full-time faculty with primary appointments in that unit and another four with secondary appointments; in addition it will have eight faculty who regularly teach part-time and over fifty clinical faculty members. It boasts varied and vigorous degree programs and enrolls substantial numbers of students. The faculty judge that faculty size and stability, degree complexity, program accreditations (some through the University, others through hospitals), and student numbers now merit school status. At present, the Center has an acting director and a small administrative and clerical staff; it would need no more as a school. The same staff and space needs would exist under whichever name.

While agreeing that school status makes sense, Mr. Grossman wondered about the constitutional item establishing a chairperson for each program. He wondered why coordinators would be insufficient. Mr. Russell noted that these worthies are now called directors and could retain that title, despite AAUP objections. These programs are very distinct, and each requires detailed, knowledgeable direction?especially in meeting accreditation requirements and overseeing facilities. He justified the proportion of chairs to full-time faculty in terms of the six to twenty clinical faculty associated with each program. Mr. Kleckner agreed that Health Sciences already has a number of "program honchos" who will continue their labors under some sort of name. Mr. Russell called the attention of his colleagues to the fact that these programs, because of their close ties to hospitals, are run far more cheaply than their counterparts at Ferris State University. Mr. Stransky also emphasized the crucial contribution of clinical faculty. Mr. Edgerton, however, expressed concern about the relative disregard of the clinical faculty in the proposed constitution and by-laws. They seem to have no representation on standing committees. Mr. Russell justified the omission as recognizing time demands on these persons, most of whom serve without compensation. They participate in program meetings and on the Assembly and should be spared further committee burdens. Mr. Edgerton wanted opportunity for such service to be held open and was assured by Mr. Russell that the by-laws neither exclude clinical faculty from standing committees nor guarantee them seats. Mr. Kleckner noted that this constitution is patterned after existing models in other units, and Mr. Russell thanked Senators Hammerle and Tombouljian for their advice in drafting it.

Mr. Chipman commented on the APPC response to the Health Sciences proposal and asked that its specification of charges from its 22 March 1984 memorandum to the Provost be read into the minutes:

In assessing the specific academic and budgetary implications of such status change the committee wishes to make two points, The first is that no difference is perceived in the budgetary needs of the proposed school as opposed to the current center. The second concerns the likely relationships between such a new school and already existing health related activities, particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Nursing, The committee notes that the charge to the Commission on the Future Development of the Center for Health Sciences addresses the relevant issues in items 1, 2, and 5 of its charge and expects that the final report of that Commission will make recommendations whose adoption will provide for both the productive interaction of these groups within Oakland and between them and the external medical community.

He hoped that the Commission report, due out soon, would take these understandings into consideration. Thus informed, the Senate set aside this proposal until its 23 April meeting and

proceeded to the second item of new Mr. Feeman (seconded by Mr. Pine) then offered the following, motion to establish a new graduate program;

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board the establishment of an academic program leading to the degree of Master of Science in Exercise Science.

He introduced discussion by assuring die Senate that the proposal before it had been closely scrutinized and approved by all appropriate bodies. This master's program, he explained, is unique in Oakland University history in that it does not spring from an undergraduate program but emerges instead from a well regarded, highly visible, community health-enhancement program under the direction of Mr. Stransky. He noted the widespread development of wellness and cardiac rehabilitation programs throughout the country, each generating additional need for people trained to work or do research in the field. The fate of this program seemed to him more auspicious than that of the now-dormant Medical Physics in that Exercise Science has unusual financial and programmatic support from outside the University. When Mr. Bertocci. asked whether the proposed new courses had yet won institutional approval, Mr. Feeman explained that the usual practice is for the Graduate Council to review and approve specific courses after a program has been approved in principle. Mr. Kleckner and Mr. Pine both recalled the long history of this proposal, planning for which began years ago in the School of Human and Educational Services. Having followed its evolution over a prolonged period, Mr. Pine commended the Exercise Science program for its healthy integration of instruction, research, and service. This motion, too, becomes eligible for final vote at the next Senate meeting.

The third item of new business was a procedural motion from the Steering Committee to staff standing committees (Moved, Mr. Edgerton; seconded, Ms. Boulos):

MOVED that the faculty nominated below be confirmed as appointed to committees and terms as specified:

a. Academic Career and Advising Committee

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.

Lucinda Hart-Gonzales

Alice Horning

Floyd Willoughby

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85).

Roberta Schwartz (Chair)

Chris Pillow

b. Academic Computing Committee.

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.

Anne Jaworski

Peter Schmidt

Jerrold Grossman

Gerald Post

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85)

Helen Schwartz (Chair)
Gary Moore

c. Academic Conduct Committee

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86), effective fall, 1984.

Robert Goldstein
Frances Jackson

Anne Tripp

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year 1984-85.

Robert Gaylor (Chair)

Steven Miller

Dean Purcell

Mildred Merz (Alternate)

d. Academic Standing & Honors Committee

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.

Augustin Fosu

Richard Rozek

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85).

Willard St. John (Chair)

Hoda Abdel-Aty-Zohdy

e. Admission and Financial Aid Committee

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.

Louis Bragg

Luellen Ramey

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85).

Linda Hildebrand (Chair)

Gary Shepherd

W. Patrick Strauss

f. Campus Development & Environment Committee (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.

Daniel Fullmer

Harold Zepelin

William Hoffman

CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85).

Adeline Hirschfeld-Medalia (Chair)

David C. Housel

g. General Education Committee

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.

Jean Easterly

Robert Edgerton

Sheldon Appleton
CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85)
Jack Moeller (Chair)
David Daniels
Richard Stamps

h. Research Committee

NOMINEES to new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984,
Ro Craig Taylor
Jean Braun
Mark Workman
Lawrence Orton
Ronald Tracy
CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85).
I. E. Schochetman (Chair)
Bhushan Bhatt (Graduate Council appointee)
Michael V. Riley
William A. Macauley

i. Teaching and Learning Committee

NOMINEES Co new two-year terms (1984-86) effective fall, 1984.
Harvey Burdick
Virginia Blankenship
Janet Krompart
CONTINUING MEMBERS serving final year (1984-85)
Joan Rosen (Chair)
William Bryant
Jerry Marsh

Mr. Kleckner explained that the Steering Committee, conscious that membership specifications for the APPC and UCUI might change as a result of Senate actions at this meeting, had refrained from nominating faculty to APPC and UCUI vacancies. Nominating slates for those committees will appear on the agenda for the final meeting, Mr. Feeman inquired why Mr. Willoughby, a visiting faculty member until August 1985, should have been nominated to a two-year position on the Academic and Career Advising Committee, but Mr. Kleckner indicated that there are various kinds of visitation possible at the University and that there is no intent for this scholar to disappear in the midst of his duties, Mr. Russell observed that the Research Committee is heavily staffed with Arts and Sciences faculty and suggested that the Steering Committee might appoint a clinically-based researcher in the future. Mr. Feeman reported that the Graduate Council still has a position to fill on this committee and that it will attempt to fill one of several gaps. The motion to name faculty members as listed to the standing committees passed unanimously.

With no private resolutions presented for the good of the order, Mr. Kleckner mentioned that the final meeting of the academic year is scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on Monday, 23 April, in Gold Rooms A, B, and C. These rooms had been unavailable for the present convocation but will be tried again so that members can discern which room is less unacceptable. President Champagne

plans to make a presentation as the Senate completes its business. Thus primed to anticipate its next gathering, the Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

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

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page