



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Wednesday, June 2, 1982
Twelfth Meeting
128, 129, 130 Oakland Center

MINUTES

Senators Present: Akers, Appleton, Arnold, Boulos, Briggs-Bunting, Brown, Champagne, Christina, dark, Copenhaver, Coppola, Cowlshaw, Dawson, Downing, Eberwein, Feeman, Gerulaitis, Ghausi, Gregory, Grossman, Hammerle, Hetenyi, Hildebrand, Howes, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lindell, Mallett, Miller, Pine, Russell, Scherer, Sevilla, Shallow, Somerville, Stamps, Strauss, Stokes, Sudol, Wilson, Witt.

Senators Absent: Burdick, Chipman, Eklund, Eliezer, Frampton, Gardiner, Heubel, Hightower, Horwitz, Lambric, Moeller, Otto, Pak, Pino, Rhadigan, Sakai, Schwartz, Stanovich, Swartz, Tripp.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m. He mentioned that the minutes of the May 27, 1982, meeting were being distributed to Senators present but would not be officially presented until a subsequent meeting. Attention, therefore, shifted directly to the second reading of the new constitution for the School of Human and Educational Services (Moved, Mr. Pine; Seconded, Mr. Brown).

Mr. Pine distributed copies of a perfected document, incorporating both substantive and stylistic suggestions from last week's discussion. Mr. Strauss questioned whether the SHES Assembly had adopted a proviso to allow minor revisions without its further review. Mr. Pine claimed no such special authority but thought that the changes were more editorial than substantive. Mr. Cowlshaw inquired whether the revisions treated Mr. Grossman's questions and was told that they did. Mr. Pine pointed out that the CAP will now be elected by the school's Bargaining Unit Faculty Members and that the CAP will advise the dean on reappointment as well as tenure decisions. Mr. Russell wondered whether the wording of Article IV, section C subsection 4 was adequate; he felt that it should include reappointment decisions that must, contractually, go to the CAP even though they may not advance to the FRPC. Mr. Pine felt that this wording would not preclude the CAP from acting on these reviews. He pointed out that his colleagues are developing detailed personnel review procedures to submit to the FRPC and indicated that this matter could be addressed in that document. Mr. Kleckner commented that a constitution normally lasts longer than a contract and is written in more general language. If the constitution and contract vary, the contract prevails.

Mr. Russell then inquired why the FRPC needed to be mentioned at all, and Mr. Pine expressed willingness to put a period after "recommendations," as the drafters of the constitution had no

intent to exclude non-FRPC reviews. No Senators present from SHES registered discomfort with the proposed deletion. Some discussion arose about ways of implementing such a change: whether to send the document back to the Assembly for modification, thereby delaying the process until the fall, or to accept the constitution as it stands. Mr. Russell suggested Senate approval subject to later modification. Mr. Brown saw no problem in terms of the Assembly's intent for CAP'S role; his colleagues had hoped to avoid the dilemma of drafting a constitution insufficiently flexible to withstand contractual change. Ms. Scherer then urged that the question be called on the basis of the school's good intent to accept the proposed change. While they are at it, Mr. Grossman suggested, they should also add promotion to the list of recommendations to be made by the CAP. Mr. Pine assured the Senate that his faculty would be delighted to do so. Thus reassured, Mr. Hetenyi called the question, and the Senate approved the new constitution for the School of Human and Educational Services, subject to minor editing.

With old business so happily dispatched, discussion turned to the three motions related to the CAMP Report. Mr. Miller, seconded by Ms. Scherer, offered a resolution regarding the CAMP role and mission statement on behalf of the Steering Committee:

MOVED that in developing from the recommendation submitted by the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities a role and mission statement for Oakland University the President take cognizance of the following issues raised during the recent open hearing on the subject conducted by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee:

- a. A rhetorical balance should be struck in the discussion of research and scholarship to bring it into balance with the discussion of teaching mission and public service,
- b. the notion of educational leadership might be incorporated into the discussion of the teaching mission and public service responsibilities of the institution,
- c. a clarification might be made as to whether Oakland University is primarily a commuter or a regional institution,
- d. some remarks on admission standards might be desirable,
- e. a definition of the term "desirable size" in reference to certain programs should be given,
- f. a discussion of the nature of the Liberal Arts core of the curriculum is desirable, and
- g. a clarification should be given on the relationship between research-scholarship and the instructional mission of the institution.

Mr. Russell immediately inquired whether these three motions represented the only Senate action anticipated on the CAMP Report and learned from Mr. Kleckner that they were the sum total of motions brought forward by the APPC and Steering Committee.

Mr. Strauss launched discussion of the first new motion by wondering what was meant by asking the President to "take cognizance" of listed items. Mr. Kleckner replied that a role and mission statement is being developed for the University; the Senate is now rendering advice to help formulate that document, a final version of which is likely to come back to the Senate to be approved as an institutional position statement. Mr. Dawson, having served on the CAMP, remarked that a number of the issues raised in APPC hearings had been discussed in detail by the CAMP, although fresh issues also arose from the floor. Ms. Scherer wondered why, if educational leadership had been considered by the CAMP, it had not been mentioned in the report. Mr. Sudol, representing the APPC, noted that his committee had simply compiled a list of things that might have been overlooked in the CAMP Report for the Senate and President to consider.

Mr. Christina wanted to know why the APPC had made no procedural recommendations regarding the formulation of a role and mission statement. He thought there should be a committee for this purpose such as the one the APPC recommended for general education. Mr. Beardslee tried to recall the evolution of the current statement, now on file with the State Board of Education. He and Mr. Kleckner thought it had originated with the Long-Range Planning Committee and had gone through the Senate. Mr. Russell asked whether the President intended to rewrite this statement for further Senate action or take it directly to the Board. President Champagne answered several questions by asserting that the CAMP was itself the committee charged to prepare a draft statement. That statement, reviewed by the APPC, now comes to the Senate for its advice, and he expects to profit from the counsel of these governance bodies in editing a revised statement. He considered these recommendations generally good and thought that they could be woven into a perfected statement, which he would be willing to resubmit to the Senate before asking the Board for final approval. Should an impasse develop between the Senate and the President, the Board would learn of it from Senate minutes. Mr. Feeman reported that the APPC, though explicitly charged only to review the CAMP Report, thought that statements in the SUAMP and Public Service reports should also be considered for amalgamation into the final role and mission statement. President Champagne recalled that the mission statement in the SUAMP Report had been very supportive of the academic mission and highly compatible with the CAMP Report.

Mr. Russell, seconded by Mr. Gregory, then moved to amend the motion by deleting section c. Both Mr. Russell and Mr. Sevilla objected to defining the University as either a commuter or a regional institution. Mr. Hetenyi agreed, citing historical precedent for Lansing readers to interpret such diction in invidious ways. Mr. Stamps and Mr. Williamson thought that the University should give some sort of formal recognition to the substantial number of commuter students who populate our campus and whose patterns must be taken into account in institutional planning, scheduling, and facility development. Neither felt it necessary to label the University regional. President Champagne thought that these issues were more directly confronted in the SUAMP Report than CAMP'S, as student life activities should provide a framework to enhance total student development. He felt we should be realistic in defining ourselves, even to Lansing, in a way that allows us to be honest about our situation but not restrictive of our goals. Ms. Stokes suggested that the term commuter should be applied to a group of students rather than to the University. Mr. Sudol mentioned that listing in this motion meant only that the issue deserved consideration, and Mr. Russell professed satisfaction with the President's reasoning.

Returning to the main motion, Mr. Strauss expressed concern that the CAMP spent less time on the role and mission statement than previous planning groups; he advocated further

refinement of the document before sending it to the President but saw no value in mulling it over at this point. Mr. Dawson countered by stating that the CAMP started working on the role and mission statement as its first project and continued refining it for four months. The commuter issue was one the committee had faced. Mr. Strauss, seconded by Ms. Gerulaitis, then moved to refer the role and mission statement to the Steering Committee for reformulation. Mr. Gregory inquired of the Steering Committee members present whether they expected significant improvements would be made by such referral. Mr. Miller thought the Steering Committee could take expeditious action in revising the document to incorporate issues raised in the hearings, although the Steering Committee would prefer to let the President attempt the editing. Mr. Christina thought too much work was involved to hope that the Steering Committee could return to the Senate with a perfected document the next day. When Ms. Scherer inquired whether rejection of the referral motion would be taken as endorsement of the role and mission statement a general rumble of dissent relaxed her worry. Mr. Russell preferred to see the President's response to advice than the Steering Committee's. Mr. Hammerle observed that a university always acts with a mission statement, implicit or explicit; the CAMP statement will be used for the near future, whether perfected or not. He advocated sending it to the President now and rewriting it later, if need be. The referral motion was defeated by voice vote.

Mr. Gregory, seconded by Ms. Briggs-Bunting, then moved to amend the main motion by deleting section e, with its call for a definition of desirable program size. Mr. Gregory argued that the role and mission statement already makes a general assertion about desirable size; any more specific language must be assigned to commentary on particular programs. Mr. Akers feared endless debate if the Senate considered whether to approve or reject each of the listed items rather than sending them on to the President for his consideration. Mr. Cowlshaw worried that the language of the motion suggested a clear-cut Senate recommendation rather than a proposal of items for consideration. Mr. Kleckner thought that discussion of these matters by the APPC and the Senate had already provided useful advice. Further advice may be rendered when this motion comes up for a vote at the next meeting.

The second item of new business was a motion from the APPC on general education, moved by Mr. Coppola and seconded by Ms. Scherer:

MOVED that the Academic Policy and Planning Committee's recommendations regarding general education found in the CAMP Report be adopted; to wit:

- a. That a very high priority be assigned to insure that sufficient resources be made available to provide a strong component of General Education which would be common to every undergraduate program at Oakland University,
- b. that this component constitute at least thirty-six credits of every baccalaureate degree, and
- c. that a University-wide committee be charged to administer the program in General Education;
 - (1) The primary responsibility of such a committee will be to approve and maintain a pool of courses that may be used to satisfy the requirement;

(2) it is likely that the Initial pool will closely resemble, but will not be restricted to, the current one that exists in the College of Arts and Sciences;

(3) inclusion of courses from the professional schools in this pool is to be encouraged;

(4) those courses offered by the Department of Rhetoric to satisfy the writing proficiency requirement would be part of the pool so that the thirty-six credits could include this work;

(5) only courses approved for the pool could be used to satisfy the requirement, and no courses in the pool would be excluded from a study merely because they are required within the major program.

d. that the following responsibilities would be included in the committee's charge:

(1) To define areas via groups of courses and set distributional requirements over these areas,

(2) to invite and consider approval of additional courses for the pool from the Schools and the College,

(3) to monitor the program and to recommend to the College or appropriate Schools the offering or development of courses needed to strengthen the program,

(4) to consider the exclusion of certain courses in the pool from students of particular programs at the request of the sponsors of that program, and

(5) to consider exceptions for specific programs to the General Education requirements.

Mr. Copenhaver applauded the motion as taking a very healthy direction for the University. Mr. Cowlshaw wondered why the form of these three motions relating to the CAMP Report varied so drastically in form and specificity and was informed by Mr. Kleckner that this proposal on general education was the only one which the APPC had studied sufficiently to know just what it wanted the Senate to do; it had enjoyed less time for reflection on the first and third motions. Mr. Stamps noted a possible contradiction between items c.5. and d.4. with respect to exclusion of courses. Mr. Copenhaver explained that c.5. prevents certain reasons being used to exclude a course while d.4. allows open reasoning within specific programs. Mr. Coppola indicated that the APPC had tried to maintain as much flexibility as possible.

The third item, a motion from the Steering Committee, concerned specific program proposals from the CAMP Report (Moved, Mr. Akers; Seconded, Ms. Boulos):

MOVED that the Senate forward to the President for his consideration the written materials presented to the APPC in conjunction with their conduct of the open

hearings on issues related to the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities.

Ms. Gerulaitis opened discussion by inquiring about the multitudinous CAMP recommendations not deliberated upon in APPC hearings. She wondered whether the APPC was endorsing those but was assured by Mr. Coppola that his committee most decidedly did not issue a blanket endorsement. The APPC forwarded information only on those specific issues the President referred to it for advice. Mr. Feeman noted that an equally bulky package of responses to other issues would also be sent to the President. Ms. Briggs-Bunting argued that the Senate was abdicating its responsibility to render advice by simply sending along a pile of paper; she especially felt the Senate should take a specific stand on program phase-outs. Mr. Ketchum was also concerned about the motion as written, particularly because of the overlap between the Steering Committee and the CAMP. Mr. Stamps felt that the programs included in the motion had justified themselves effectively at APPC hearings, but he felt that programs slated for increased funding should also have been required to substantiate their cases while programs slated for reduced resources needed a chance to explain themselves. He approved sending on this material but hoped the President recognized its limitations. Mr. Sudol explained that the APPC would have found it impossible to make recommendations on specific programs, given one-sidedness of presentations at the open hearings. According to Ms. Briggs-Bunting the hearing on journalism revealed lack of direct study by the CAMP; she maintained that the Senate had an obligation to give specific advice. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that CAMP did receive reports from every program and acted upon available evidence, and Mr. Christina indicated that statements had been made to CAMP about journalism, some included in the report and others available in the committee's back-up file.

Mr. Grossman then inquired whether the Senate would eventually be asked to make recommendations on particular programs or whether this was the body's last chance. To ensure adequate review, Mr. Russell (seconded by Mr. Christina) offered the following special motion:

MOVED that the Senate request the President when considering CAMP recommendations concerning program reductions and/or eliminations to follow appropriate general recommendations of the CAMP Report? specifically those contained in Section VII, recommendations 4 (Faculty Retraining and Development) and 13 (Implementation of Recommended Changes).

Mr. Cowlshaw felt supportive but wondered whether such a motion was appropriate or necessary, as it seemed to imply that the President could ignore recommendations 4 and 13. Mr. Russell replied that he offered the motion in the spirit of a request hoping that, if the President should choose to phase out any programs, he should do so in the spirit of the CAMP Report. President Champagne then asked if the motion included all recommendations in section VII and learned that Mr. Russell intended to present only recommendations 4 and 13 for immediate Senate endorsement. Mr. Stamps favored the motion because it allowed time for adequate discussion of any endangered programs. Mr. Cowlshaw pointed out that these are still recommendations. The President still has not decided on cuts; once he does, it is necessary that the Senate play some part in the subsequent process. Mr. Russell thought the President probably had the right to fold a program and recognized that his resolution would be needless if the President absolutely refused to exercise that right. President Champagne then claimed that right but reiterated his intention to seek maximum advice so long as his hands are not tied

by interminable talk; he thought the Russell motion very appropriate. Mr. Kleckner concluded the new business by indicating that the agenda for the next day's meeting, now expanded to four motions, would be distributed at that meeting.

In the good and welfare section of the meeting, Mr. Williamson asked the Steering Committee what action it meant to take on the SUAMP Report and learned that the Steering Committee had not formally discussed it. There were no information items.

President Champagne concluded the meeting by expressing sincere appreciation for the work of the Senate, APPC, Steering Committee, University Congress, and CAMP in deliberating on these issues and communicating their thoughts to him. He valued the community's ability to control emotions and make reasoned judgments, and he thought that the ultimate decisions would be ones the University could live with. He considered that Oakland University had responded impressively to an onerous task.

Upon motion of Mr. Hetenyi, the Senate adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

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

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