



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

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

MINUTES

Senators Present: Allvin, Atlas, Bertocci, D. Burdick, Burke, Chapa, Coffman, Eberwein, Flynn, Freeman, Genyea, Hampton, Johnson, Keegan, Ketchum, Kuczynski, Lilliston, Matthews, McKay, Obear, Payne, Riley, Russell, Scherer, Schuldenberg, Schwartz, Shacklett, Sponseller, Swartz, Torongeau, Tower, Warren and Witt

Senators Absent: Barnard, Barren, H. Burdick, Cameron, Coppola, Doane, Felton, Gardiner, Hammerle, Henry, Heubel, Hitchingham, Hovanesian, Keelin, Liboff, Moberg, O'Dowd, Pogany, Ruscio, Stonner, Swanson. Torch, Tucker and White

Mr. Obear presided.

Mr. Obear had no opening comments but welcomed Mr. Aaron Burnette, newly elected President of the University Congress to a seat in the University Senate. Meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of January 20, 1977, were approved as presented by voice vote.

Attention was then turned to the formal agenda.

I. Old Business:

None

II. New Business:

1. Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Allvin seconded that:

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE BOARD THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM OF GRADUATE STUDIES LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF MUSIC.

First Reading.

Comments: Mr. Johnson drew attention to the cost study page of the summary proposal. In this projection the State's formula budgeting models were used, a process which yields fairly

high dollars for music, since fine arts generally are differentially funded on the up side: this of course, is only a projection not money in hand, a point emphasized by Mr. Russell who stated that he understood that the State was only funding at ca. 70% this year. Mr. Russell noted that the .5 faculty, (vide 1977-1978 column of the cost study) was derived from an internal shift and was not new money, while the extra .5 implied in the 1.0 listed in the 1979-1980 column would be added only if enrollments warranted. Mr. Russell also noted that the student estimates in the cost study should be FYES. Numerous questions, chiefly by Mr. McKay elicited responses clarifying the costs and staffing items as presented.

Mr. Genyea wished to know whether the program was not simply a spring/ summer program. Mr. Allvin said no, that it was a regular academic year program; students registered for spring/summer would in largest part proceed to the fall semester. But the spring/summer enrollment will be large with many students seeking credits for certification purposes; of about 23 in elementary education in spring/summer, 8-10 will continue in regular semesters, these aiming at the music specialist rating. Question of markets arose; Mr. Freeman not optimistic, with Mr. Allvin encouraging. Mr. McKay questioned whether there were regular, routine reviews of existing graduate programs for internal audit and evaluation. Mr. Johnson replied that the Graduate Council is charged to conduct such reviews, that it has not been energetic in this particular in the past, but that it now was developing procedures for review; this is especially the case since North Central Accreditation is coming up in late 1978. Mr. Tower pointed out that the Academic Budget and Planning Committee was charged to "evaluate and monitor" existing programs, and pointed out that head count in graduate studies was dropping, about 17%, following state and national patterns. Mr. Obear added that the most severe declines were in the largest programs, those in education and hence powerful leverage was exerted on the overall percentage.

2. Mr. Bertocci presented the report from the Academic Conduct Committee. Mr. Bertocci pointed out that the only change was concerned with broadening the area of defined academic dishonesty by including the statement concerning the use of a single piece of work to fulfill requirements in different courses. The Committee wants to define such an act as academic dishonesty so long as the student does not consult the instructor(s) before hand. The Committee wishes to change the indicated part of the statement to make this clear to students. Considerable general discussion ensued, with a division of views as to whether or not academic dishonesty was the proper term for the practice of submitting to two or more courses a single essay, or piece of research without informing the instructor(s). It was agreed that a problem in the definition of academic morality had surfaced and needed more thorough study.

Mr. McKay, seconded by Mr. Shacklett then moved to recommit with instructions to the Committee to restudy the statement in the light of the discussion and report back to the Senate at its March meeting. Ruled procedural, the motion carried by voice vote, with Mr. Lilliston in opposition.

Consideration of the formal agenda having been completed, Mr. McKay inquired of Mr. Matthews what might be the time frame for the work of the *ad hoc* Committee on Presidential Review Process? Mr. Matthews replied that it was his understanding that the *ad hoc* Committee was meeting February 25 and subsequently; that it hoped to report to the Senate at its March meeting; that it would request a meeting with the Board only after it has secured firm guidance if not approval of a recommended procedure, from the Senate. Mr. Matthews was unable to say what the Board's timetable might be.

Upon motion, duly seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Submitted by George T. Matthews, Secretary
Office of the Provost/j
2/18/77

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