



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, April 22, 1982
Tenth Meeting
204 O'Dowd Hall

MINUTES

Senators Present: Akers, Appleton, Arnold, Boulos, Briggs-Bunting, Brown, Champagne, Chipman, Christina, dark, Copenhaver, Coppola, Cowlshaw, Dawson, Downing, Eberwein, Eklund, Feeman, Frampton, Gardiner, Gerulaitis, Ghausi, Gregory, Grossman, Hetenyi, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lambric, Mallett, Miller, Moeller, Otto, Pino, Sakai, Scherer, Sevilla, Somerville, Stamps, Stanovich, Stokes, Swartz, Wilson, Witt.
Senators Absent: Burdick, Eliezer, Hammerle, Heubel, Hightower, Howes, Kurzman, Lindell, Pak, Pine, Rhadigan, Russell, Schwartz, Shallow, Strauss, Tripp.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m., calling for consideration of the minutes of April 15, 1982. Upon motion of Mr. Hetenyi, seconded by Mr. Arnold, the Senate approved the record of its discussion without correction or commentary.

The first item of old business was a motion from the Committee on Academic Standing and Honors concerning mid-term evaluation in 100-level courses (Moved, Mr. Akers; seconded, Mr. Shallow):

MOVED that the instructors of 100-level courses provide to each registered student some form of evaluation of his or her academic progress prior to one week before the withdrawal period ends.

Mr. Grossman, still troubled by a potential responsibility to grade no-shows, proposed an amendment (seconded by Mr. Mallett) to add the words "and actually attending" after "registered." When Mr. Horwitz asked if Mr. Grossman would define the term "actually attending," Mr. Grossman declined. Mr. Hetenyi wondered what to do about someone who appeared only once; he would like to evaluate that student's work as 0.0. Mr. Ring commented that the legislation was written in behalf of the person who attends class regularly. He felt the Senate need not exercise its wits over the exceptional student who never appears. A majority vote rejected the amendment. A split vote on the unamended main motion revealed 23 supporters, 10 opponents. The motion, therefore, carried.

The second item of old business was a proposal from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to designate the degree of Bachelor of Science in Engineering (Moved, Mr. Dawson; seconded, Mr. Akers):

MOVED that the School of Engineering redesignate the Bachelor of Science degree as the Bachelor of Science in Engineering for all undergraduate engineering programs other than Engineering Physics.

Mr. Pino objected that his sense of academic purity was violated by cluttering the "traditional and hallowed" Bachelor of Science degree with additional verbiage. He would prefer an outright Bachelor of Engineering degree, but Mr. Ghausi thought that would be perceived as a technology degree and create problems of interpretation. He saw no problem with the suggested B.S.E. Mr. Kleckner recognized the break with tradition envisaged by the proposal, but Mr. Ghausi felt the university must move with the times. Mr. Hetenyi offered as a possible compromise a degree of Bachelor of Science with the word Engineering inscribed below in parentheses, but Mr. Pino denounced the alternative as tacky. He noted that specific curricular information appears on the transcript. Mr. Witt cited a campus precedent; the School of Nursing now offers a B.S.N. degree, which Mr. Pino called doubly tacky. The motion carried despite Mr. Pino's dissenting vote.

Attention then turned to another UCUI motion on behalf of the School of Engineering' (Moved, Mr. Dawson; seconded, Ms. Gerulaitis):

MOVED that the School of Engineering be authorized to deny credit toward a degree in engineering for courses which are prerequisite to, or of similar content but lower level than, MTH 154, PHY 151, and CHM 144.

Mr. Witt immediately proposed a substitute resolution which responded to Mr. Grossman's observation at the previous meeting that the original motion excludes a course which was not intended; Mr. Chipman seconded the amendment:

MOVED that the School of Engineering be authorized to deny credit toward a degree in engineering for:

a.) courses which are prerequisite or corequisite to MTH 154, PHY 151 and CHM 144, exclusive of MTH 154 which is prerequisite to PHY 151.

b.) courses which are of similar content but of lesser level than MTH 154, PHY 151 and CHM 144.

Mr. Kleckner inquired whether the technical wording of the amendment would force the School back to the Senate each time course numbers change. Mr. Witt hoped not. Mr. Feeman wondered how the movers of the amendment meant to evaluate "similar to" and "lesser level than." Mr. Cowlshaw wondered whether the disallowed courses belonged to any special category and learned from Mr. Witt that the School of Engineering hopes to pinpoint courses preliminary to the introductory ones in its program while avoiding the word remedial. Mr. Miller suggested that the issue might be addressed by separating three tiers of courses required for the Engineering degree (major and corequisites, general education, and free electives) and excluding for general education or free elective credit any course specified as a prerequisite to major courses; a detailed list of such preliminary courses would be necessary. Mr. Witt noted, however, that there have been cases of students taking Physics 101 after 151 who could argue that they were electing it freely rather than using it as preparation for the more challenging course. Problems of interpretation continued to arise, with Mr. Downing wondering whether

Physics of Music might be "similar to" PHY 151 and Mr. Hetenyi asking what other Physics courses might be excluded.

Other problems included Mr. Ketchum's concern about increasing the actual number of courses required for a degree in Engineering and Mr. Stamps's continuing uneasiness about regular returns to the Senate for modification of policy. Mr. Kleckner thought the latter problem might be handled by the Steering Committee, which could judge which specific additions to the disallowance policy call for Senate action. Mr. Pino observe that an option still exists in that the School need not exercise authority granted it to deny credit.

Mr. Miller suggested returning to the original motion modified to read "for courses that are of lower level than" MTH 154, PHY 151, and CHM 144. Mr. Witt foresaw danger of excluding unintended courses. Mr. Pino, seconded by Mr. Sevilla, then offered a modification of Mr. Miller's suggestion as an amendment which would eliminate the words "which are prerequisite to, or of similar content but" from the main motion. Mr. Grossman sensed that the Senate might be offering the School of Engineering undue latitude to deny credit to courses of lower level than Math 154 in other fields: e.g. French 114. He expressed trust in the Engineers, however, and Mr. Miller assumed that the School intended to monitor only courses in Mathematics, Chemistry, and Physics. Mr. Cowlshaw supports the substitute motion, sensing that the amendment to the main motion could eliminate any lower-level science courses?even astronomy. When Mr. Horwitz asked Messrs. Ghausi and Witt whether they could live with the amendment, Mr. Witt expressed a preference for the wording "more elementary than" to "lower level" to avoid classing all 100-level courses together.

Mr. Wilson urged amending the amendment by adding the phrase "in those respective disciplines"?a modification accepted by Mr. Sevilla but rejected by Mr. Pino, who thereby incurred the charge of tacky behavior. Mr. Cowlshaw then suggested rewording the substitute motion to exclude "courses more elementary than" rather than "of lesser level than" the famous triad. Neither Mr. Pino nor Mr. Sevilla objected strongly. Mr. Witt reminded the Senate that his colleagues had no wish to write this motion into the catalog in its entirety; they simply plan to exclude particular courses with each new edition. Mr. Pino felt that the wording of the resolution was meant to give that faculty discretion.

After so much discussion, the Pino/Sevilla amendment to the main motion carried by voice vote. Immediately thereafter, the Witt/Chipman substitute motion was voted down with loud nays and no vocal support. The main motion as amended then reached the floor, wit Mr. Grossman inquiring of Mr. Witt whether the School of Engineering wants this authority for all its degrees or only for B.S.E. programs. Mr. Witt replied that his colleagues have felt no pressure from accrediting agencies to make such exclusions within the Computer Science program and therefore request no such authority. When the question was finally called, the amended motion carried with general expressions of approval and muted nays:

MOVED that the School of Engineering be authorized to deny credit toward a degree in engineering for courses of lower level than MTH 154, PHY 151, and CHM 144.

The fourth item of old business, also proposed by UCUI, concerned B.G.S. degree requirements (Moved, Mr. Miller; seconded, Ms. Briggs-Bunting). The Russell/Chipman amendment to change the number 12 to 24 received attention first. Mr. Chipman reported to the Senate that

his survey of its records indicated that the Senate rejected a similar 24-credit proposal on February 16, 1978. He acknowledged the negative precedent but found his judgment swayed by discovering that this is the second time the Faculty Council for General Studies has requested such a strengthening of its program. As the Senate had just taken similar advice from the School of Engineering, he urged it to show equal respect to the Council's recommendations. Mr. Grossman, however, noted that the Council had asked for only 12 credits this time and wondered how they felt about 24. Mr. Eklund reported that they were very happy with the amendment but would be willing to step back to 12 in order to help some such motion pass. When Mr. Moeller wondered whether they would prefer 36 credits, Ms. Chapman-Moore stated that B.G.S. advisers would be happy with 24 but felt that a steeper requirement would place undue pressure on non-traditional students. The amendment to double the required credits earned within the B.G.S. program passed by voice vote.

Mr. Horwitz then led off the assault on the amended motion, noting the likelihood of establishing something like a sub-program and observing the inconvenience threatened to transfer students with considerable previously-earned credit who might resent being forced into a program of many patterned courses. Mr. Kleckner noted that this motion would do nothing to affect the 36 Oakland University credits required for any degree.

Ms. Gerulaitis worried about students who lose interest in a major in their last year. She wondered what would happen to those persons, who have already completed other graduation requirements such as Rhetoric and residency. Ms. Chapman-Moore volunteered the possibility of making exceptions for hardship cases? a possibility Ms. Gerulaitis thought contradictory to the actual motion. Mr. Stamps, while professing his respect for flexibility, was embarrassed to be associated with a university which would award a degree to a student who could not pass courses in any structured program and simply picked up courses here and there across the curriculum, looking for a last-minute bail-out upon amassing the magic number of graduation credits.

Mr. Mallett explained that the point of the motion was simply to bring a student back into the advising process: to have someone examine the person's plan of work, not to force anyone into a structured program nor to deny a degree. Ms. Chapman-Moore observe that a self-structured program need not be unstructured. She assured Mr. Moeller that the advising committee would accept a plan for 124 credits which met all university requirements but outlined no specific program. Mr. Cowlshaw reminded the Senate, however, that university requirements include a minimum number of 300-level courses, most of them with prerequisites; total lack of curricular structure seems scarcely possible. Ms. Briggs-Bunting stressed that the motion would not impose a specific structure but would force the student to clarify direction with an adviser's help. Mr. Dawson indicated that the motion asks the B.G.S. candidate to make a commitment to the degree program analogous to that asked earlier in an academic career in many other programs. Mr. Stamps wanted to be sure that any degree candidate could satisfy an adviser of some sort of academic design, although he thought the advising committee might include members more or less devoted to academic structure.

Mr. Copenhaver supported the resolution in the hope that 24 credits of guided study might help a student achieve something like a general education. He could envisage a degree without a major, since some students quite reasonably conceive of education without regard for job training or graduate-school specialization, but he could not understand an academic program which gave no preparation for the universal concerns of citizenship. The main motion, as

amended, was approved by a vocal majority:

MOVED that, to obtain a Bachelor of General Studies degree, the student must successfully complete at least the last 24 hours as an admitted candidate to the program; and that candidacy be authorized by the University and the Faculty Council for General Studies when the student has approval of his/her plan-of-work and rationale for the Bachelor of General Studies degree from the Bachelor of General Studies Advising Committee.

The solitary item of new business, a procedural motion from the Steering Committee to extend the Senate year for discussion of the CAMP Report, elicited lengthy debate (Moved, Mr. Dawson; seconded, Mr. Akers):

MOVED that the Senate extend its business year until June 4, 1982, for the purpose of:

- a.) considering the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities, and
- b.) considering amendments to the Constitution of the School of Human and Educational Services to be proposed by the faculty of that School.

Mr. Kleckner indicated that its Constitution requires the Senate to agree on specific items of business when extending its session beyond the Winter term. This motion identifies two such items, only one of which attracted any attention. No quorum is specified for such an extended session. No dispute arose about the propriety of extending the Senate year for such deliberation everything else, however, proved controversial. The June 4 termination date raised questions at once, with Mr. Grossman asking what would happen if the press of business should call for additional meetings. Mr. Kleckner saw nothing sacred about June 4 but hoped for promptness. Mr. Christina wondered whether the framers of the motion actual expected the Senate to reach agreement by the stipulated date. He doubted that the group could adequately consider all university programs within two months and, therefore, supported moves to focus discussion on a limited number of specific issues. Mr. Champagne explained that speedy action was necessary because of the budget deadline and because needed Senate guidance on academic priorities before launching a major development effort in the fall. He maintained that these times required rather rapid movement but was willing to be flexible about means of arriving at advice. Mr. Christina, recalling earlier time constraints on the CAMP, agreed that timing was critical but not necessarily within a set deadline. He noted that the Senate could deal with some of these issues the coming academic year. Mr. Kleckner indicated that June 4 may not be sacred, but 1 is. The Senate could vote to extend its calendar still further, if decisions cannot b reached by the original date.

The Senate's role in such deliberations, in respect to the President's role and the APPC's, elicited much discussion. Mr. Ketchum introduced the topic by stating that he understood that the CAMP report had been presented to the President, to whom he looked for specific recommendations for Senate debate. He saw the motion on the floor as an inversion of responsibility in asking the Senate to comment before the administration made a public response to the CAMP report. Mr. Kleckner said that CAMP had offered a set of recommendations about which various groups have been submitting information and new

proposals; the motion at hand was meant to provide an orderly way for the Senate to contribute its advice in this comprehensive process. When he inquired whether Mr. Ketchum was suggesting that the administration provide a set of specific proposals, Mr. Ketchum replied affirmatively. At the very least, Mr. Christina wanted specific procedures for implementation to be offered. Mr. Hetenyi and Mr. Kleckner indicated that the current system would result in specific proposals from the APPC to the Senate after its public hearings. Mr. Christina, however, felt unsure of the Senate's role and worried that its input might be nothing but talk. Mr. Champagne assured the Senate that his intentions from the start were being carried out; he has sought advice from many people before making his decisions and now thinks it appropriate for him to receive the advice and consent of the Senate before formulating his response to specific CAMP recommendations. Mr. Kleckner noted that the Senate could endorse the whole CAMP report or vote on specific issues; although Mr. Ketchum found it mind-boggling to vote on every CAMP recommendation with little time and less information than was available to the CAMP.

Trying to identify a workable procedure, Mr. Champagne asked if the Senate would agree to debate a series of specific propositions on a limited number of issues. Mr. Ketchum was quite willing, and the President declared it acceptable to him to put forward eight or ten proposals on issues pertinent to the Senate. Mr. Kleckner indicated that it would be possible to bring forward such proposals once the Senate identified what matter it needed to consider; he thought that phasing-out of programs and other matters to be determined early were likely to be of immediate interest. Mr. Hetenyi thought that the wording of the motion left all kinds of options open to the APPC, the President, the Provost, and anyone who wanted to bring proposals to the Senate. Ms. Scherer wondered whether it would not be more efficient to reverse the proposed order of business by letting the Senate act quickly on eight or nine specific proposals while having the APPC conduct open hearings later on less urgent issues. Mr. Dawson felt that the motion as it stood responded to the time needs of the APPC, which the CAMP had all along intended to include with the Senate in the review process. He reminded his colleagues that its Constitution gives the Senate an advisory rather than legislative role in this area and noted that open hearings and APPC channeling of new information allowed for better advice even though no group could hope to contemplate and digest all issues in a short time. Mr. Akers suggested that the APPC invite anyone wanting a hearing to request one rather than trying to include all issues in general hearings; he understood that some groups had been pressing their cases in other ways.

Mr. Ketchum stressed the importance of notifying faculty and students in programs vulnerable to phasing out that a proposal actually exists to discontinue their programs before giving them a chance to respond. He wanted CAMP recommendations refined to a set of proposals. Mr. Kleckner commented that, for Senate purposes, all CAMP recommendations should be considered proposals. Mr. Ketchum exclaimed that there were hundreds, and Mr. Christina observed that attention focused naturally on phase-outs even though other recommendations have profound academic implications. He wanted a clear sense of how the Senate would consider. President Champagne, recognizing the trouble the community was having in finding ways to provide feedback, wanted to make sure that these issues would be aired in every possible forum. He was willing to accept a Senate response to a set of specific proposals but would welcome broader deliberation on related issues. Several different Senate roles in this process occurred to Mr. Gregory: having hearings so that people who want to be heard can be; taking up the President's offer to encapsulate a limited number of proposals for Senate debate; serving as a sounding-board for the President's thinking after he gathers all information and before he brings his recommendations to the Board; and working out priorities and a sequence

of activities. Ms. Scherer asked that a few points be formulated as proposals if eight points, then eight meetings with concurrent open hearings and Senate debate; Mr. Christina preferred six.

Mr. Ketchum, seconded by Mr. Christina, then offered an amendment to reword part a.) of the main motion as "considering President Champagne's specific proposals regarding CAMP." When the President found that language unacceptable in associating him with proposals before he has actually approved the CAMP report, Mr. Ketchum revised his amendment to read "considering President Champagne's specific requests for further input on recommendations of the CAMP." Mr. Feeman wondered whether the amendment would limit the Senate to only those items; he and Mr. Dawson had difficulty accepting restriction of Senate advice to only a few topics. Mr. Chipman interpreted the Constitution to allow the President to ask Senate advice on anything, but he sensed that such advice would be better should the President request advice now on particular programmatic issues without shelving others such as the Role and Mission Statement. Mr. Kleckner thought there might be a catch-all category among the proposals. Seeing the direction of this discussion and amendment as important, Mr. Akers stressed that history shows institutions moving in the directions their administrations push them. He believed that the Senate needed to hear whatever consensus exists within the administration about the CAMP report and hoped the a long period of drift at Oakland University might soon give way to the President's and Provost's informing the university what way we shall be moving in the nineteen-eighties. President Champagne declared himself satisfied with the process being developed; he and Mr. Kleckner would bring proposals to the Senate and would not involve the Board until the end of the process, after all advice has been rendered (including possible Senate response to some issues in the fall).

Ms. Scherer, seconded by Mr. Appleton, proposed an amendment to reword item a.) of the main motion to read "advising President Champagne on specific issues related to the CAMP report." After hearing the Ketchum/Chipman amendment read, she was willing to withdraw her amendment but was prevented by the seconder who found her version less restrictive and more elegant. Mr. Kleckner agreed that "The specificity is more open." When President Champagne inquired who would identify the issues, Ms. Scherer said the President while Mr. Appleton left open the possibility of the Senate's adding proposals to the President's. Mr. Ketchum, on the other hand, wanted to limit discussion to the President's recommendations and chose to keep his amendment on the floor. A split vote on the Scherer/Appleton amendment showed 16 ayes against 18 nays. A subsequent vote showed strong support for the Ketchum/Chipman amendment to consider President Champagne's specific requests for further input on recommendations of the CAMP. The main motion, thus amended, carried by voice vote.

Mr. Kleckner and Mr. Coppola, chair of the APPC, then reported on the intended schedule of activities. The APPC plans eight two-hour hearings during the first two weeks in May (May 4, 6, 11, and 13; from ten to twelve and one to three each day). The President will establish and publicize specific issues for these hearings and for Senate debate. Mr. Akers expressed concern about Senate procedures, fearing that the body must vote in order to make recommendations but seeing such votes as indices of lobbying strength of interested groups rather than reasoned conclusions about complex issues. He wondered how the Senate could do more than provide a forum in the limited time available. Ms. Gerulaitis agreed on the merit of a non-voting open debate; she did not want to force people to defend themselves and would find it disastrous to have to vote anyone out of a job.

Several members raised concern about the flow of information within the University community. Mr. Feeman wondered how materials now in the hands of CAMP members could be made available in order to move discussions from the emotional to the rational realm. Messrs. Ketchum and Gregory inquired about mechanisms for factoring in additional information now being funnelled to the APPC. Provision of a central data file for study by interested persons seemed reasonable to Mr. Gregory; although Mr. Kleckner thought it would be hard to gather all such material in one place. Mr. Chipman suggested that the APPC could invite people with information to attend public hearings and provide evidence. Mr. Kleckner noted that information has come from people around the University whom he would urge to make it widely available. Mr. Ketchum thought that the President and Provost could notify concerned persons about the location of materials important to them, and Mr. Kleckner indicated that the Senate and APPC could certainly communicate widely while soliciting and distributing information on specific issues.

Following these lengthy discussions, no Senator summoned the energy to offer a private resolution for the good of the order. The promised UCUI report on the undergraduate grading system was distributed in written form to all members in attendance and will reach absent Senators by mail. Seeing the agenda concluded, Mr. Frampton then called for adjournment at 5:30 p.m., and the Senate adjourned until the first of its special sessions in May.

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

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page