



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## **Oakland University Senate**

Third Meeting  
Thursday, November 17, 1977  
3:00 p.m.  
128-130 Oakland Center

### ***MINUTES***

Senators Present: Blatt, Boulos, Braun, Burke, Butterworth, Chernob, Coffman, DeMent, Eberwein, Edgerton, Grossman, Hampton, Hetenyi, Hildum, Hovanesian, Holladay, Jackson, Johnson, Jones, Kleckner, Liboff, Matthews, McKay, Merz, Moeller, Obear, O'Dowd, Orton, Pogany, Russell, Schwartz, Sloane, Wargo and Witt

Senators Absent: Allvin, Arnold, Bantel, Barry, Doherty, Easterly, Felton, Gardiner, Heubel, Hohaus, Keegan, O'Leary, Osthaus, Ozinga, Randolph, Riley, Seeber, Stransky, Torch, Torongeau, Tower, Tucker, Ward and Weiner

Mr. O'Dowd presided.

Mr. O'Dowd had no special comments and there were no inquiries from the floor.

Meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.. Minutes of the meeting of October 20, 1977, were approved by voice vote upon motion of Ms. Braun seconded by Mr. Kleckner.

Attention was then directed to the agenda.

#### A. Old Business:

none

#### B. New Business:

1. Motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee, moved by Mr. McKay and seconded by Ms. Sloane.

Mr. Chipman, Chair of the committee then commented on the motion: the intent is to permit a change in computer programming such that about 50 students who are readmitted to the University after three years, can be treated as transfer students for committee computation purposes only. Mr. Grossman wondered why three years? Mr. Chipman replied that some students do come back after one, or two years of absence but in the committee's view three seemed to have the right fit with other elements of the October 20, 1975, policy. In response to query by Mr. Witt, Mr. Chipman assured that such students are readmitted only once.

No amendments were offered.

2. Motion from the Athletics Committee moved by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Coffman.

Mr. Jackson remarked that in response to the Senate's January 20, 1977, request, the committee reviewed Senate legislation and discovered only one example, eleven years old. Since then many changes have occurred in the Athletics Program and the March, 1977 [\*Position Statement\*](#) represented the present committee's view of its activities and responsibilities, absent further directives from the Senate other than the March, 1977 charge. Mr. McKay observed that the *Position Statement* seems to regard the committee as advisory to the Director of Athletics alone and not also to the Senate. Mr. Jackson conceded this was an oversight; the committee brings the Statement to the Senate for information and advice; it did not consider it necessary to iterate its obvious relation to the Senate.

Mr. McKay then moved to recommit, seconded by Mr. Grossman on the grounds the *Position Statement* did not address important questions and recommend policies in regards to them.

Mr. McKay preceded to query Mr. Jackson; are sports scholarships awarded? Mr. Jackson: yes. Mr. McKay; are admissions fees charged for athletic events? Mr. Jackson: yes. Mr. McKay expressed the view that policies in these matters and others, such as eligibility, should be formulated by the committee in the form of recommendations to the Senate and that without such recommendations the Position Statement was inadequate. Mr. DeMent, sometime Chair of the Athletics Committee remarked that there has always been much confusion concerning the responsibilities of the committee, that this state of affairs was no ones fault but that it ought to be cleared up. Mr. Van Fleet pointed out that policies regarding eligibility, probation, dismissal established by the Senate had been scrupulously followed by the Director of Athletics: policy in these matters had not been disregarded; but since 1966 the University has become a member of several athletic associations and conferences the rules for which fill a small library and that it is impossible to present such details to the Senate, certainly not within at least six months.

Mr. McKay reaffirmed his belief that the *Position Statement* should recommend policy and should be returned to the committee with direction to make such recommendations.

Mr. Hetenyi suggested that some editorial perfection of the Statement might be made between first and second reading- let us not recommit but instruct the committee to perfect its *Statement*, taking account of Mr. McKay's concern that it does not include reference to its advisory role *viz a viz* the Senate. Mr. Jackson felt the committee could not get it all in order by December 1 (the date the Steering Committee would prepare the agenda of December 8). Ms. Braun felt that there were deep philosophical differences represented by Mr. McKay on the one hand and Mr. Jackson on the other, that these needed reconciliation and she doubted that such could be accomplished in this way, a position subscribed to by Mr. McKay. Mr. Chernoff suggested Mr. McKay withdraw the motion to recommit to avoid a division at this time.

Upon ruling of the Chair, Mr. McKay supported by Mr. Grossman withdrew the motion to recommit.

The field by now thrice plowed yet still discussion continued; Mr. McKay insisted that he wished the policies of the athletic program be made consistent with what was going on in the

program; Mr. Jackson, not in disagreement, was equally insistent that it could not be done quickly for the committee itself must have leeway in view of the innumerable details involved. Mr. Matthews referred to the sequence of events from January 20, 1977, including a new committee membership and the entire summer hiatus, with intent to show that the committee had made some progress. Finally it was decided by uncontested ruling of the Chair reflecting general agreement that second reading would be put off until the January agenda and that the committee should perfect its statement for that time.

No amendments were offered.

3. Motion from the Campus Development and Environment Committee was moved by Mr. Coffman and seconded by Mr. Hildum.

Mr. Gaylor, Chair of the committee then commented on the motion. The committee has worked 18 months on this [project](#) to set aside some 425 acres with nature trails, picnic tables and ski trails. Mr. Liboff noted that two facilities of the Department of Physics - the Kettering Magnetics Laboratory and the Observatory - would be encapsulated by this development and worried that certain improvements needed by these facilities - an improved road and toilets - would no longer be possible if this recommendation were adopted; Mr. Liboff was mildly aggrieved that neither he nor his department had been consulted in the matter. Mr. Gaylor pointed out that an improved road was not precluded, but that because of a high water table, toilets might be a problem. The question of suitability of the land for new University construction arose; Mr. O'Dowd said the northwest corner of this area might ultimately be designated as a building site. Mr. Gaylor promised a map for the December meeting.

No amendments were offered.

Upon motion of Mr. Hetenyi, seconded by Mr. Hildum, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

---

#### FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE SENATE

The Steering Committee has examined all 1976-1977 reports of the standing committees for policy implications; the result is evident on the agenda of November 9, New Business motions 2. and 3.. In addition a recommendation found in the Admissions Committee's report was considered, but the Steering Committee decided no change in policy was involved, and that an appropriate-catalog entry would cover the matter. In response to a request from Mr. McKay that the ad hoc Committee on Presidential Review report to the Senate, the Steering Committee decided that such a report was not in the charge of the ad hoc committee, that the committee had faithfully completed its mission, that the committee (at its own request) had been discharged with thanks, and that consideration of future review procedures would be taken under advisement.

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**SENATE**

*Home Page*