



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, May 27, 1982
Eleventh Meeting
204 O'Dowd Hall

MINUTES

Senators Present: Akers, Appleton, Arnold, Boulos, Brown, Clark, Coppola, Dawson, Downing, Eberwein, Eliezer, Feeman, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hetenyi, Kleckner, Lambric, Lindell, Otto, Pine, Pino, Sakai, Sevilla, Somerville, Stamps, Stokes, Swartz.

Senators Absent: Briggs-Bunting, Burdick, Champagne, Chipman, Christina, Copenhaver, Cowlshaw, Eklund, Frampton, Gardiner, Ghausi, Gregory, Hammerle, Heubel, Hightower, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Howes, Ketchum, Mallett, Miller, Moeller, Pak, Rhadigan, Russell, Scherer, Schwartz, Shallow, Stanovich, Strauss, Sudol, Tripp, Wilson, Witt.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:09 p.m., directing attention to the minutes of the April 22 meeting. Mr. Arnold, seconded by Ms. Stokes, moved approval. Mr. Akers took the opportunity to draw a distinction between minutes of official actions by the group and a detailed record of debate. He acknowledged that the minutes as now kept put speakers on-record as more eloquent than they remember themselves but wondered whether it was necessary to maintain a report of all remarks. Mr. Kleckner suggested that the secretary might separate out a summary of actions at the beginning of minutes. He pointed out that a record of debate has sometimes proven useful not only for studying past actions of the Senate but also for suggesting the thinking processes of the worthies who accomplished those actions. The secretary then called attention to an error on page seven of the April 22 minutes. The amendment passed by the Senate was seconded By Mr. Christina rather than Mr. Chipman. The group then approved the minutes as corrected.

In the absence of old business, attention turned directly to a new motion from the Assembly of the School of Human and Educational Services, to approve an entirely revised constitution for the School of Human and Educational Services (Moved, Mr. Pine; Seconded, Mr. Brown). Mr. Pine explained that faculty in his school have labored for years under the burden of overlapping school and department constitutions each specifying its own procedures for the actions of the same faculty. The revised constitution draws upon both documents and introduces changes in order to eliminate confusion while simplifying the faculty's work. He called attention to a handout distributed before the meeting which summarizes the principal areas of change.

Mr. Grossman raised several questions about appointment procedures in the new constitution. He wondered whether areas would participate routinely in reappointment as well as appointment decisions and learned that they would. Mr. Pine explained, however, that the

detailed policies and procedures included in the existing departmental constitution for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions have been replaced by simplified language because the school means to submit its procedures to the FRPC for approval. Mr. Grossman pointed out that the proposed constitution only requires that the SHES CAP advise the FRPC on tenure decisions; it should also have the power to advise on other reviews. Mr. Pine agreed that this issue would be among those subject to FRPC guidance. Mr. Grossman also noted a discrepancy between the school's intention to elect CAP members through the Faculty Assembly and the Faculty Agreement's stipulation that all Bargaining Unit Faculty Members comprise the group of CAP electors. Mr. Brown replied that no attempt had been made to diverge from contract provisions. The proposed wording represents an effort to limit Assembly membership to those persons who have been through the regular appointment or reappointment processes. Mr. Kleckner thought it would be possible to make the language more specific in this section before the second reading of the motion, and Mr. Pine agreed. In case of any discrepancy between a school constitution and the contract Mr. Kleckner noted, the contract prevails.

Mr. Pino raised a question about the terms of office for area heads, whose duration of responsibility is left variable according to the wishes of faculty in each area. He had encountered difficulties in maintaining a current list of such officers and thought that consistency of terms would be helpful. Mr. Pine indicated that the minimum period of service has been two years, and he pointed out that regular rotation of heads has built up leadership strength in the school. Mr. Pino then inquired in what circumstances might the Dean appoint an area head. He suggested a regular systematic review such as prevails among department chairs. Mr. Brown explained that an area head in SHES is an anomaly in the university?not really equivalent to department chairs in Arts and Sciences. The system proposed reflects the drafters' desire to retain considerable faculty influence on headship decisions. The motion was then held over for a second reading on June 2, with SHES faculty fn to modify the document under consideration according to advice received from the Senate.

There were no private resolutions either for the good of the order or its harm. The solitary Information item was an announcement of Senate meetings June 2 and 3 to deliberate on CAMP items brought forward by the APPC. Mr. Kleckner indicated that the APPC had completed its open hearings and deliberated for four days before making its recommendations to the Steering Committee for the Senate agenda. That agenda for June 2 was distributed to members present and circulated by campus mail to those absent.

At Mr. Hetenyi's suggestion, the Senate adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

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

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page