



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Sixth Meeting .
Thursday, March 17, 1977
3:00 pm.
128 - 130 Oakland Center

AGENDA

Submitted by George T. Matthews, for the Steering Committee

The Chair will comment upon Act 267, Michigan Public Acts of 1976, sometimes called the "open meeting" law.

I. Old Business

1. From the agenda of February 17, 1977, Item I. (New Business), Johnson/Allvin; unamended:

MOVED 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.

Second Reading; debatable, amendable and eligible for final vote.

2. Presentation of a report from the Academic Conduct Committee containing a revised *University Policy Statement on Academic Conduct*, dated March 17, 1977. Mr. Bertocci, Chair of the Academic Conduct Committee is responding to the McKay/Shackleton motion of February 17, directing the Committee to report back with a revised version of the original report presented on February 17.

Mr. Bertocci and members of the Committee are prepared to discuss the report under rules of informal consideration.

After sufficient discussion the Chair will entertain a motion to recommend adoption of the report as revised. If this motion carries it will be considered as first reading requiring a second reading at the next meeting. If the motion fails the Chair will entertain a motion to table the revised report, with the understanding that the present policy unchanged will remain in force.

The following is the report, dated March 17, 1977, from the Academic Conduct Committee, recommending approval of certain changes in the *University Policy Statement on Academic Conduct*.

Comment: Wording in upper case is entirely new and added and represents the only change from the original statement.

The change recommended in the proposed statement which appeared in the February 17 agenda involving an entirely new second paragraph has been withdrawn.

UNIVERSITY POLICY STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC CONDUCT

March 17, 1977

All members of the academic community at Oakland are expected to practice and uphold standards of academic integrity and honesty. An instructor is expected to inform and instruct students about the procedures and standards of research and documentation required of students in fulfilling course work. A student is expected to follow such instructions and be sure the rules and procedures are understood in order to avoid inadvertent misrepresentation of his work. Students must *assume* that individual (unaided) work on exams and lab reports and documentation of sources is expected unless the instructor specifically says that is not necessary. **STUDENTS MUST ALSO ASSUME THAT IF THE INSTRUCTOR ASSIGNS AS PART OF THE COURSE REQUIREMENTS A SPECIAL PROJECT OTHER THAN OR IN ADDITION TO EXAMS, SUCH AS A RESEARCH PAPER, AN ORIGINAL ESSAY OR A BOOK REVIEW, HE INTENDS THAT WORK TO BE COMPLETED FOR HIS COURSE ONLY. ANY SUCH WORK STUDENTS MAY HAVE COMPLETED FOR A COURSE TAKEN IN THE-PAST, OR BE COMPLETING FOR ANOTHER PRESENT COURSE, MUST NOT BE SUBMITTED IN THAT INSTRUCTOR'S COURSE, UNLESS THEY RECEIVE HIS PERMISSION TO DO SO.**

Academic integrity means representing oneself and one's work honestly; misrepresentation is cheating since it means a student is claiming credit for ideas or work that is not actually his and is thereby trying to get a grade that is not actually earned. The following definitions are examples of academic dishonesty:

I. Cheating on examinations by

- a. using materials such as books and/or notes when not authorized by the instructor.
- b. by taking advantage of prior information not authorized by the instructor regarding questions to be asked on the exam,
- c. copying from someone else's paper,
- d. helping someone else copy work or
- e. other forms of misrepresentation.

Students would be well advised to be careful to avoid the appearance of cheating.

2. Plagiarizing from work of others. Plagiarism is using someone else's work or ideas without giving the other person credit; by doing this, a student is, in effect, claiming credit for someone else's thinking. Whether the student has read or heard the information he uses, the student must document the source of information. When dealing with written sources, a clear distinction would be made between quotations (which reproduce information from the source word-for-word within quotation marks) and paraphrases (which digest the source information and produce it in the student's own word's).

Both direct quotations and paraphrases must be documented. Just because a student rephrases, condenses or selects from another person's work, the ideas are still the other person's, and failure to give credit constitutes misrepresentation of the student's actual work and plagiarism of another's ideas. Naturally, buying a paper and handing it in as one's own work is plagiarism.

3. Cheating on lab reports by

- a. falsifying data or
- b. submitting data not based on student's own work.

4. Falsifying records or providing misinformation regarding one's credentials.

If a student feels that practices by the instructor are conducive to cheating, he may convey this information either directly to the instructor or to the student Ombudsperson of the University Congress, or to any member of the student-faculty Committee on Academic Conduct (either directly or through the Office of the Dean for Student Services).

Instructors are expected to bring evidence of plagiarism, cheating on exams or lab reports, falsification of records or other forms of academic misconduct before the Academic Conduct Committee of the University Senate for determination of the facts in the case and, if warranted, assessment of penalty. If academic misconduct is determined, the Committee assesses penalties ranging from academic disciplinary reprimand (which is part of the student's confidential University file), to academic probation to suspension or dismissal from the University.

GUIDELINES FOR INSTRUCTORS

Instructors have at least three roles to play in maintaining proper standards of academic conduct:

1. To assist their students in recognizing the way in which general standards apply in context of a particular course or discipline.
2. To take practical steps to prevent cheating and to detect it when it occurs.
3. To report academic misconduct to the Dean for Student Services in 134 NFH for the Committee on Academic Conduct.

1. Motion from the *ad hoc* Committee on Presidential Review (Ms. Titus):

WHEREAS THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ON JANUARY 20, 1977, ADOPTED A RESOLUTION CREATING THE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW AND CALLED FOR THE COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY REPORT TO THE SENATE THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROCEDURES TO GATHER FACULTY JUDGMENT OR JUDGMENTS REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW AND BE

IT FURTHER

RESOLVED THAT A QUESTIONNAIRE BE ADMINISTERED TO ALL REGULAR FACULTY MEMBERS AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED THAT THE EXISTING *AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW DESIGN, ADMINISTER AND CONDUCT THE TABULATION OF RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED THAT THE RESULTS BE CONFIDENTIAL. THE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW WILL TRANSMIT THE RESULTS IN A SUMMARY REPORT TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

Procedural Motion: eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comments:

Criteria on which questions are designed:

Educational Leadership
Administrative Leadership
Educational Planning
Relationship with University Community
Relationship with Faculty
Ability to define, communicate, and Implement objectives
Senate Leadership
Fiscal Management

Objectives:

- Develop an impression of the relative importance of the criteria in the judgment of the faculty
- Establish the degree of faculty consensus on the criteria
- Identify faculty PERCEPTION of the President's performance on each of the most important criteria
- Degree to which the faculty's overall subjective evaluation of the President's performance can be understood in terms of the most heavily weighted criteria

Purpose based on the results of above analysis:

- Provide a faculty assessment of the performance of the President
- Provide faculty recommendations as to the reappointment of the President
- Identify specific areas of faculty concern which could lead to constructive input for improved President-faculty relations.

Tentative Procedural Timetable

- Step One Senate Presentation: Preliminary Report *ad hoc* Committee on Presidential Review
- Step Two *ad hoc* Committee on Presidential Review meeting with Board of Trustees
- March 23, 1977 Questionnaire Distribution
- April 4, 1977 Deadline for Submission of Completed Questionnaires
- April 5-12, 1977 Initial Data Tabulation (Hough, Heubel, Titus)
- April 13, 1977 *ad hoc* Committee on Presidential Review - Final Meeting
- Week of April 21-25, 1977 Sealed results conveyed

D R A F T C O N F I D E N T I A L
 Faculty Evaluation of the President of the University

PART 1.
 Check One

1. Academy of Dramatic Arts
 Center for General and Career Studies: Learning Skills and New-Charter College
 Center for Health Sciences
 College of Arts and Sciences
 School of Economics and Management
 School of Education
 School of Engineering
 University Library
 School of Nursing
2. tenured
 untenured
3. Employed at Oakland 0-5 years
 6 years and over

Part II.

The following are assumed to be desirable attributes of a President of the University.

I. Mark the response which represents your evaluation of the President's performance

1. Keeps faculty informed of matters of importance to them

Strongly						Strongly
----------	--	--	--	--	--	----------

Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Agree
----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

2. Seeks advice of faculty when appropriate

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

3. Takes advice of faculty when appropriate

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

4. Fairly and accurately represents faculty views to the Board

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

5. Supportive of faculty research needs

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

6. Provides clear and effective intellectual leadership

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

7. Demonstrates awareness and knowledge of trends and developments in the realm of higher education.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

8. Effectively utilizes available data for planning and program changes

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

9. Projects a positive and, balanced image of the University to the community

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

10. Is sensitive to constitutional guidelines and procedures

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

11. Makes independent decisions when necessary

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

12. Effectively represents the University to the external non-academic community

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

13. Relates well to the faculty

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

14. Overall subjective evaluation of the President

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

I feel I have a) sufficient; b) insufficient information to respond to this question.

Part III.

I. FOR THE TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRE - Mark the 3 most important question numbers

II. FOR THE TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRE - Mark the 3 least important question numbers

Part IV.

Make any other comments you desire.

Part V.

Should the President of the University be reappointed?

_____ Yes
 _____ No
 _____ No Opinion

II. Motions from the Steering Committee (Mr. Tower)

I. MOVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE APPROVE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW STANDING COMMITTEE, THE ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (APPC) AND ITS PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE, THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION (UCUI) EFFECTIVE FALL 1977, AS FOLLOWS:

ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

CHARGE: THE ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE IS A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND CHARGED BY IT: TO RECOMMEND TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION, ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND IN CONSULTATION WITH THE GRADUATE COUNCIL TO COORDINATE UNDERGRADUATE WITH GRADUATE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WHERE NECESSARY; THE APPC SHALL RECEIVE AND CONSIDER REGULAR REPORTS FROM THE ORGANIZED FACULTIES AND DULY CONSTITUTED EQUIVALENTS.

TO RECOMMEND TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ADOPTION OF NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS AND THE DISCONTINUANCE OR MAJOR REORGANIZATION OF EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS; TO ADVISE THE SENATE ON THE ACADEMIC AND BUDGETARY IMPLICATIONS OF ANY ACADEMIC PROGRAM BROUGHT TO THE SENATE FOR APPROVAL, DISCONTINUANCE OR REORGANIZATION; TO OVERSEE THE DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATING OF SHORT-RANGE (1-5 YEAR) UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLANS, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES; TO EVALUATE (WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE

GRADUATE COUNCIL WHERE APPROPRIATE) ON-GOING AND PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAMS FOR THEIR CONSISTENCY WITH THOSE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES AND WITH LONG-TERM (5-15 YEAR) UNIVERSITY PLANS; TO PREPARE AND DISSEMINATE GENERAL BUDGETARY REPORTS ON ALL EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS.

MEMBERSHIP: FIVE FACULTY AT-LARGE (BUT NO MORE THAN TWO FROM ANY ONE ORGANIZED FACULTY) ONE OF WHOM SHALL BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE APPC AND MEMBER OF THE UNIVERSITY PLANNING COMMITTEE AND ONE OF WHOM SHALL BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION; ONE ADMINISTRATIVE- PROFESSIONAL; FOUR STUDENTS, ONE OF WHOM SHALL BE THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY CONGRESS (OR DESIGNEE); THE VICE PRESIDENT. FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PROVOST (OR DESIGNEE) AND THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR CAMPUS AND STUDENT AFFAIRS (OR DESIGNEE); ALL OF THE ABOVE BEING VOTING MEMBERS. IN ADDITION, THE FOLLOWING SHALL BE *EX OFFICIO* AND NON-VOTING MEMBERS; THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUSINESS AFFAIRS (OR DESIGNEE); THE DEAN OF THE LIBRARY (OR DESIGNEE), THE DEAN OF CONTINUING EDUCATION (OR DESIGNEE), THE DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH.

THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

CHARGE: THE UCUI IS A PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE APPC CREATED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND CHARGED BY IT TO REPORT TO THE APPC AND:

TO INITIATE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF UNIVERSITY-WIDE SCOPE AND TO RECEIVE AND CONSIDER REPORTS FROM THE VARIOUS COLLEGE/SCHOOL COMMITTEES ON INSTRUCTION OR DULY CONSTITUTED EQUIVALENTS; TO OVERSEE THE GENERAL REQUIREMENTS WITHIN WHICH THE SPECIFICS OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS FUNCTION; TO EVALUATE AND MONITOR SUCH UNIVERSITY-WIDE CONCERNS AS THE UNDERGRADUATE GRADING SYSTEM, REVIEW OF PETITIONS OF EXCEPTION, UNDERGRADUATE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS AND SUCH OTHER MATTERS AS THE APPC MAY REQUEST; TO ACT AS THE ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST.

MEMBERSHIP: ONE AT-LARGE FACULTY WHO SHALL ALSO BE A MEMBER OF THE APPC AND WHO SHALL BE CHAIRPERSON; ONE FACULTY DESIGNATED BY EACH COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION OR DULY CONSTITUTED EQUIVALENT; ONE ADMINISTRATIVE-PROFESSIONAL; FOUR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS DESIGNATED BY THE UNIVERSITY CONGRESS; THE ABOVE TO BE VOTING MEMBERS. IN ADDITION, THE FOLLOWING SHALL SERVE *EX OFFICIO* AND NON-VOTING, THE DEAN OF STUDENT SERVICES (OR DESIGNEE), THE REGISTRAR (OR DESIGNEE), AND PROVOST (OR DESIGNEE).

Comment: This motion provides for a reorganization of two existing standing committees whose charges and memberships currently are as follows:

ACADEMIC BUDGET AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Charge: To prepare and disseminate general budgetary reports on all existing academic programs; to advise the Senate on budgetary implications of any academic program brought to the Senate for its approval; to oversee the development and updating of medium (3-5 year) and long-term (10 year) goals, objectives, and plans for programs and budgets; and in conjunction with the Academic Policy Committee to evaluate and monitor ongoing and proposed academic programs for their consistency with these goals and objectives.

Membership: Five faculty; three students; three administrative-professionals; and the Provost, who shall be *ex officio* and non-voting.

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Charge: To recommend University academic policies for the baccalaureate programs and to receive and consider regular reports from the various Committee on Instruction. Such topics as the establishment of undergraduate degrees and the general undergraduate requirements within which the organized faculties of the University shall devise undergraduate degree programs, the grading system, the credit system, and other University academic policies shall fall within the purview of the Committee. Petitions of exception to approved policies will be handled ordinarily by the Committees on Instruction of the organized faculties, subject to review by the Academic Policy Committee.

Membership: The Provost (or an academic officer representing him), two at-large faculty (one of whom shall be chairperson), one faculty member from and designated by the Committee on Instruction (or equivalent) of each organized faculty; five students, one administrative-professional; and the Registrar and the Dean for Student Services, both of whom shall be *ex officio* and non-voting.

At present there are six Committees on Instruction and two counterpart curriculum committees:

- Arts and Sciences (Committee on Instruction)
- Economics and Management (Committee on Instruction)
- Education (Committee on Instruction)
- Engineering (Committee on Instruction)
- Library (Committee on Instruction)
- Nursing (Committee on Instruction)
- General and Career Studies (Curriculum Committee)
- Health Sciences (Curriculum Committee)

As may be seen the functions and powers of these two committee have been redistributed to either the new APPC or its permanent subcommittee and in certain matters, especially the review of undergraduate degree level programs, somewhat strengthened. The establishment of the University Planning Committee last spring which has been charged with the development of long-range (5-15 year) plans, made the long-range planning function of the ABPC redundant and so has been eliminated from the charge of the new APPC. These changes have been reviewed and approved by the Academic Budget and Planning Committee, the Academic Policy Committee, and the Dean of Graduate Studies. The Steering Committee believes this new arrangement, which systematically links the university-wide long-range planning function with the new APPC, the new UCUI and finally the several Committees on Instruction (or their

equivalents), will improve internal communications and make for a more coherent development of institutional policy.

Procedural Motion: debatable, amendable and eligible for final vote at this meeting.

2. MOVED THAT THE ACADEMIC BUDGET AND PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE BE DISCHARGED OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES EFFECTIVE FALL 1977, WITH THANKS TO THEIR PAST AND PRESENT MEMBERSHIPS FOR WORK WELL DONE.

Comment: Passage of Motion II., 1. (New Business) on this agenda renders these two committees redundant. Should Motion II., I. (New Business) fail, Motion II, 2. (New Business) will be withdrawn.

Procedural Motion: debatable, amendable, and eligible for final vote at this meeting.

II. Motions from the Academic Policy Committee (Mr. Tower for Mr. Fullmer, who will present the motions in seriatim).

1 MOVED THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SHALL GRANT CREDIT FOR ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS UNDER THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

a. CREDIT SHALL BE AWARDED FOR SUCCESSFULLY PASSING THE EXAMINATIONS AT THE "5" OR "4" LEVEL. STUDENTS WHO PASS AT THE "3" LEVEL SHALL BE AWARDED CREDIT ONLY AT THE DISCRETION OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT CONCERNED.

b. CREDIT SHALL BE GRANTED ONLY IF THE STUDENT WAS A HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT AT THE TIME OF THE TESTING.

c AN ORGANIZED FACULTY MAY MODIFY THE APPLICATION OF THIS MOTION SELECTIVELY BY COURSE OR PROGRAM WITH ADVANCE NOTIFICATION TO THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE.

d. THIS MOTION IS EFFECTIVE FALL 1977, AND IT REPLACES AND SUPERSEDES ALL PREVIOUS UNIVERSITY SENATE LEGISLATION CONCERNING ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS.

Comment: Advanced Placement Tests are tests given to high school students who have taken college-level work. They are prepared and administered by the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service and cover 15 disciplines: American History, Art History, Studio Art, Biology, Chemistry, Classics, English, European History, French Language, French Literature, German Literature, Mathematics, Music, Physics, Spanish Language, and Spanish Literature. The grading of the tests is as follows: 5-extremely well qualified, 4-well qualified. 3--qualified, 2-possibly qualified, and 1-not recommended.

The new motion is intended to provide for consistent university-wide application except as organized faculties take deliberate action. It replaces legislation of June 2, 1961, that reads:

1. That MSUO participate in the advanced placement program under the AEGIS of the College Entrance Examination Board.
2. That college credit toward graduation be granted to students presenting evidence of satisfactory completion of advanced placement courses with a grade of "5" or "4." In cases where a grade of "3" or "2" is achieved, the examination would be subject to review by the department concerned which may grant advanced placement with or without credit toward graduation.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

2. MOVED THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SHALL GRANT CREDIT FOR COLLEGE LEVEL EXAMINATION PROGRAM (CLEP) GENERAL EXAMINATIONS (6 CREDITS EACH) UNDER THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- a. A STUDENT MUST NOT HAVE ACCUMULATED 32 CREDITS AT THE TIME THE TEST IS TAKEN.
- b. CREDIT SHALL BE AWARDED ONLY FOR EXAMINATIONS PASSED ABOVE THE FOLLOWING CUTTING SCORE: . 600 TOTAL SCORE AND NEITHER SUBSCORE BELOW 55, PROVIDING THE AVERAGE OF THE SUBSCORES IS AT LEAST 60. IF THE TOTAL SCORE IS ABOVE 600 AND ONE OF THE SUBSCORES IS BELOW 55, CREDIT SHALL NOT BE AWARDED.
- c. CREDIT SHALL NOT BE AWARDED FOR EXAMINATIONS TAKEN IN FIELDS IN WHICH A STUDENT HAS PREVIOUSLY DONE WORK FOR CREDIT.
- d. AN ORGANIZED FACULTY MAY MODIFY THE APPLICATION OF THIS MOTION SELECTIVELY BY COURSE OR PROGRAM WITH ADVANCED NOTIFICATION TO THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE.
- e. THIS MOTION IS EFFECTIVE FALL 1977, AND IT REPLACES AND SUPERSEDES ALL PREVIOUS UNIVERSITY SENATE LEGISLATION CONCERNING CLEP GENERAL EXAMINATIONS.

Comment: CLEP General Examinations (currently 60 minute objective tests, 90 minute tests in 1978) measure college-level achievement in five areas of the Liberal Arts: English Composition, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences and History. The tests measure material normally covered in the first two years of college. The examinations are scored in two related ways. Each CLEP general examination yields a total score reported on a scale from 200 to 800. In addition, each General Examination (except for English Composition) has two subscores reported on a scale from 20 to 80. The "cutting score" is the score determined by the University as the lowest score level for either the total score or the

subscores at which credit will be awarded.

The new motion is intended to specify how CLEP General Examinations are to be evaluated. It replaces legislation of February 18, 1971, that reads:

I. Competency in various subjects tested in the college level examination program, administered by the Educational Testing Service is acceptable in fulfillment of Oakland University graduation requirements.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

3. MOVED THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SHALL GRANT CREDIT FOR CLEP SUBJECT EXAMINATIONS UNDER THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

a. A NON-TRANSFER STUDENT MUST NOT HAVE ACCUMULATED 64 CREDITS AT THE TIME THE TEST IS TAKEN. A TRANSFER STUDENT MUST TAKE THE TEST PRIOR TO EARNING 32 CREDITS AT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY.

b. CREDIT SHALL BE AWARDED ONLY FOR EXAMINATIONS PASSED ABOVE THE CUTTING SCORE OF 60. IN THE CASE OF SUBSCORES, EACH OF THE SUBSCORES OF THE TEST MUST BE ABOVE 60.

c. THE AMOUNT OF CREDIT AWARDED-FOR SUBJECT EXAMINATIONS THAT ANTICIPATE INSTITUTIONAL VARIANCE IS DETERMINED BY THE ACADEMIC UNIT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SUBJECT, BUT THE AMOUNT OF CREDIT AWARDED SHALL BE EITHER 3 CREDITS OR 6 CREDITS.

d. CREDIT SHALL NOT BE AWARDED FOR A SUBJECT EXAMINATION IN A FIELD IN WHICH THE STUDENT HAS PREVIOUSLY TAKEN MORE ADVANCED WORK.

e. AN ORGANIZED FACULTY MAY MODIFY THE APPLICATION OF THIS MOTION SELECTIVELY BY COURSE OR PROGRAM WITH ADVANCE NOTIFICATION TO THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE.

f. THIS MOTION IS EFFECTIVE FALL 1977, AND IT REPLACES AND SUPERSEDES ALL PREVIOUS UNIVERSITY SENATE LEGISLATION CONCERNING CLEP SUBJECT EXAMINATIONS.

Comment: CLEP Subject Examinations are 90 minute objective tests plus in most cases, a 90 minute essay section. The essays are sent for grading to the faculty of the institution which is being asked to award credit. The subject examinations are not based on a particular syllabus, but rather, stress concepts, principles, relationships, and applications of course material. Some of the tests are designed to cover material for which one course or 3 hours of credit is anticipated; others are designed to cover material normally presented in two semesters of the

subject. A third category covers subjects which vary so widely from school to school in how much credit is awarded that no general expectation is possible.

The new motion is intended to specify how CLEP Subject Examinations are to be evaluated. It replaces legislation of February 18, 1971, above.

1. Subject exams anticipating one semester of credit: (3 credits)

Afro-American History
 American Government
 College Algebra
 College Algebra-Trigonometry
 Computers and Data Processing
 Introductory Macroeconomics
 Introductory Microeconomics
 Introductory Macro-Microeconomics
 Educational Psychology
 Elementary Computer Programming (Fortran IV)
 General Psychology
 History of American Education
 Human Growth and Development
 Introduction to Business Management
 Introductory Business Law
 Introductory Marketing
 Microbiology
 Money and Banking
 Statistics
 Tests and Measurements (classroom tests, standardized tests, etc.)
 Trigonometry

2. Subject tests anticipating two semesters (6 hours) of credit:

American History
 American Literature
 Analysis and Interpretation of Literature
 Biology
 Calculus with Analytic Geometry
 English Composition
 English Literature
 Freshman English
 General Chemistry
 Geology
 Introductory Accounting
 Introductory Sociology
 Western Civilization

3. Subject tests which anticipate institutional variance in the amount of credit granted:

Three modern language examinations?
 College French? Levels I and 2

College German?Levels I and 2
College Spanish?Levels I and 2

Four nursing tests-
Anatomy, Physiology, Microbiology
Behavioral Sciences for Nurses
Fundamentals of Nursing
Medical-Surgical Nursing
Clinical Chemistry
Hematology
Immunohematology

Subject examinations are scored on a scale from 20 to 80. Some subject examinations will have total scores as well as subscores also graded on the 20 to 80 scale. Tests having such subscores are: American History, Biology, College Algebra-Trigonometry, and College French, German and Spanish. Again, the "cutting score" is the lowest score for which credit will be given and is determined by the institution granting the credit. A further note about the "cutting scores" mentioned in the proposed legislation is necessary because they represent very high "cutting scores" compared to other institutions. According to the data available, the "cutting scores" indicated in the legislation will result in credit being granted only for students scoring in the 82-83 percentiles or higher. This percentile equivalent is a general truth. In some cases the percentile ranking is lower, say a 79 or 71 or in two cases a 68. But in general the percentile ranking is the low 80's.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

4. MOVED THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SHALL GRANT COMPETENCY CREDIT UNDER THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- a. THE GRADE RECEIVED SHALL BE ON A S/N BASIS.
- b. A STUDENT MAY REGISTER FOR A COURSE FOR COMPETENCY CREDIT ONLY WITH THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON, DEAN, OR PROGRAM DIRECTOR OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COURSE.
- c. A STUDENT MUST PASS AN APPROPRIATE COMPETENCY EXAMINATION NOT MORE THAN SIX WEEKS AFTER REGISTRATION CLOSES.
- d. A STUDENT MAY RECEIVE UP TO ONLY 60 SEMESTER HOURS OF COMPETENCY CREDIT.
- e. COMPETENCY CREDIT SHALL NOT BE GRANTED IF THE STUDENT HAS CREDIT FOR A MORE ADVANCED COURSE IN THE SAME AREA.
- f. THE REPEAT COURSE RULE APPLIES TO THE REPEATING OF COMPETENCY EXAMINATIONS.

g. THIS MOTION IS EFFECTIVE FALL 1977, AND IT REPLACES AND SUPERSEDES ALL PREVIOUS UNIVERSITY SENATE LEGISLATION CONCERNING COMPETENCY CREDIT.

Comment: Written permission is required so that the Registrar is able to charge reduced fees and so that a determination can be made that the student has taken a more advanced course in the same area.

The new motion is a clarification of the legislation of May 3, 1972, that reads:

I. That students may receive credit designated as competency credit (graded on an S/N basis) on their transcripts for Oakland University courses, subject to the following provisions:

a. They register for the course at registration with permission of the department chairperson, dean, or program director of the academic unit responsible for the course. The letter "P" shall be placed after the course number to distinguish registration for competency examination from regular registration for the course.

b. They pass an appropriate competency examination not more than six weeks after registration closes. A student may receive up to 60 semester hours of competency credit based upon non-classroom experience. Ordinarily credit will not be permitted for a course when a student has acceptable credit for more advanced courses in the same area. The repeat course rule shall apply to repeating of such competency examinations.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

5. MOVED THAT THE LEGISLATION OF APRIL 12, 1972, ESTABLISHING AN ACCELERATED DEGREE PROGRAM BE RESCINDED.

Comment: Motions 1. and 4. above, provide flexible opportunities for students to accelerate their programs at various rates without the trappings of the 1972 legislation, which further seems unnecessary in that no student has attempted the program. The April 12, 1972, legislation reads:

1. That entering students who have had no previous college experience and who have demonstrated superior preparation and accomplishment be considered for admission into the accelerated degree program at Oakland University. Students who are successful in entering the program will be awarded advanced placement credit to the extent that they may earn a baccalaureate in three academic years.

Admission requirements for the accelerated degree program are:

a. A recommendation to the accelerated degree program by a person qualified to judge the student's academic ability.

b. Scores at or above the national mean for beginning college sophomores in each of the five college-level general examinations or equivalent advanced placement examinations.

d. A recommendation by an Oakland University faculty member in the student's major field of interest based upon a personal interview.

Candidates for an accelerated degree will have 32 credits of advanced placement entered upon their transcripts and all general education requirements will be waived. Such students will be required to meet all other degree requirements and must maintain the same academic record as regular students.

By scoring successfully on competency examinations, college-level subject examinations or advanced placement examinations, a student may earn an additional 28 credits by examination, however, credit will not be awarded for examinations covering the same subject matter as the examinations ,in part 2 above.

During the first year in the program participating students will be assigned individual faculty advisers.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

GENERAL COMMENT: These several motions are the result of an intensive study by a subcommittee of the Academic Policy Committee, chaired by Mr. James Ozinga, to whom thanks are due.

SPECIAL COMMENTS ON THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Background information concerning the Great Constitutional Question (GCO) to which the following motions to amend propose an answer, may be found in the Report on Steering Committee Activities (pp 2-tl) presented to the University Senate on its agenda of September 11, 1976, and will not be repeated here.

On September 30, 1976, the Steering Committee, after the summer's hiatus, resumed the search for an answer to GCQ. Ms. Eberwein (who was serving as a one semester replacement for Mr. Hampton on leave) and Mr. Hammerle were constituted as a subcommittee to work with the Board's subcommittee (Messrs. Lewis and Saltzman) to draft amendments to the Constitution which might be acceptable to the Board of Trustees on the one hand and to the Senate's ratifying constituency on the other.

The appointment of the Steering Committee's GCQ subcommittee was announced on the Senate agenda of October 21, 1976. Meanwhile informal conversations among the principles and their agents (Messrs. De Carlo, Hewlett and Matthews being most conspicuous among the latter) finally resulted in a meeting between Ms. Eberwein and Mr. Hammerle and Messrs. Lewis and Saltzman on October 26, 1976, the substance of which was reported on October 28, to the Steering Committee. The meeting was portrayed as cordial, civilized and productive; Ms. Eberwein and Mr. Hammerle felt that verbal formula agreeable to both parties had been explored and that the prospects for final resolution within about two weeks were bright. Contrary to the exhilarating expectations the step from October 28, 1976, to March 17, 1977,

turned out to be painfully long, not so much because of unsuspected differences as because of the sheer difficulty of arranging a second meeting to settle the matter. Time drifted by. Fall examinations and mid year holidays came and went. But at length in mid January a flurry of letters, memos and telephone conversations signaled renewed activity. Finally, in response to a letter from Mr. Hewlett, University Attorney, the Steering Committee developed the substance of the amendments which appear below and conveyed them to Mr. De Carlo, Secretary of the Board. Mr. De Carlo conferred with Messrs. Lewis and Saltzman, with Mr. Hewlett, and with Mr. Matthews who in turn conferred with the Steering Committee. The product of this feverish activity - the product of more than two years' quest for an answer to GCQ is now laid respectfully before the Senate for its consideration.

The Steering Committee recommends adoption of these motions to amend as a necessary step toward a realistic alignment of university governance with the vectors of force that have both emerged and been newly defined in the last five years. Assuming ratification of the amendments as provided for in Article VIII, section I and approval of them (and of the entire constitution as amended in April 1975) by the Board of Trustees, then at last the relation of the University Senate (and by implication the various other governance bodies in the college, the schools and the centers) to the Board and the President will have been publicly clarified. This being done, the way will have been opened for a more thorough going reformulation of the internal structure of governance, should the Senate so desire. For this reason the Steering Committee resisted the temptation offered by this round of amendments to recommend either an extensive "tidying up" or an intensive reconstructing of the Constitution.

Future Senates may wish for more fundamental changes; future Steering Committees will respond. Meanwhile once again, the Steering Committee commends these motions to your attention.

IV. Motions to amend the Constitution of the Oakland University Senate (Mr. Tower, for the Steering Committee, will present the motions *in seriatim*).

I. MOVED THAT THE WORDING OF ARTICLE I OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE (AS AMENDED 1975) BE DELETED ENTIRELY AND THE FOLLOWING WORDING SUBSTITUTED:

THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE IS AN ORGANIZATION EXISTING PURSUANT TO ARTICLE VII OF THE BYLAWS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF OAKLAND UNIVERSITY. THE SENATE SHALL BE ORGANIZED AND SHALL FUNCTION AS PROVIDED HEREIN, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THIS CONSTITUTION AND ANY AMENDMENT THEREOF BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment: (Kindly refer to Article I of the attached 1975 Constitution for comparison)

a. With the change from the 1969 *Constitution of Oakland University and of the University Senate* to the 1975 *Constitution of the Oakland University Senate*, constitutional definition of the President is no longer appropriate. Instead the Steering Committee recommends this proposed statement of the actual derivation of the Senate's authority from the Board of

Trustees. Article VII of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of Oakland University reads:

The Board of Trustees recognizes the University Senate as an organization to advise the President in regard to academic policies and programs. The University Senate shall be organized and shall function in accordance with such Constitution of the University Senate as may be approved or amended by resolution of the Board of Trustees.

Later in this series of motions, attachment of Article VII of the Bylaws to the Constitution will be recommended.

b. In the event that this motion to amend Article I carries, the Steering Committee will offer the following Resolution:

MOVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ELIMINATE PROVISION FOR AN ANNUAL STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY MESSAGE, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE HEREBY EXTENDS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY A STANDING INVITATION TO CONVENE THE FACULTIES, THE STAFF AND THE STUDENT BODY TO DELIVER A REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY AT LEAST ONCE A YEAR, DURING THE FALL OR WINTER SEMESTERS.

2. **MOVED** THAT ARTICLE III OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE (AS AMENDED 1975) BE AMENDED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

a. THAT THE TITLE OF ARTICLE III BE CHANGED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SENATE: POWERS TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE: POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

b. THAT ARTICLE III SECTION ii BE CHANGED TO READ:

RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT CANDIDATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES IN COURSE, AND CANDIDATES FOR UNIVERSITY HONORS;

c. THAT ARTICLE III SECTION v. BE CHANGED TO READ:

HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE CONSULTED ON ALL MATTERS OF ACADEMIC IMPORTANCE TO THE UNIVERSITY;

d. THAT ARTICLE III SECTION vi BE CHANGED TO READ:

APPROVE, DISAPPROVE AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE CONSTITUTIONS PROPOSED BY THE VARIOUS ORGANIZED FACULTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY.

e. THAT ARTICLE III SECTION vii. BE CHANGED TO READ:

RECEIVE REPORTS OF THE ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ORGANIZED FACULTIES AND, WHERE APPROPRIATE, APPROVE, DISAPPROVE OR MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SUCH ACTIONS.

First Reading; debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment: (Kindly refer to Article III of the attached 1975 Constitution for comparison)

- a. None needed.
- b. The phrase "and through him to the Board of Trustees" has been eliminated.
- c. Word added is underlined.
- d. New wording added is underlined.
- e. New wording added is underlined.

3. MOVED THAT ARTICLE IV OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE (AS AMENDED 1975) BE AMENDED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

- a. THAT ARTICLE IV SECTION vii. BE AMENDED BY THE ADDITION OF THE FOLLOWING FINAL SENTENCE:

A COPY OF THE MINUTES OF ALL SENATE MEETINGS SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE BY THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AT THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD.

- b. THAT ARTICLE IV SECTION ix. BE AMENDED BY THE INSERTION OF: (OR HIS DESIGNEE) AFTER THE WORD "UNIVERSITY" AND BEFORE THE WORD "WHO."

First Reading: debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment: (Kindly refer to Article IV of the attached 1975 Constitution for comparison)

- a. This is recommended to assure that actions of the Senate as found in its approved minutes will, be known to the Board.
- b. This is to permit the Provost to designate a deputy to chair the Steering Committee as has been the case in the last two years and as is symmetrical with the President's power to designate a presiding officer for the Senate and with membership provision on various standing committees. This is the only "tidying up" the Steering Committee is recommending.

4. MOVED THAT ARTICLE VI OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE (AS AMENDED 1975) BE AMENDED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

- a. THAT ARTICLE VI SECTION i. BE CHANGED TO READ:

A GRADUATE COUNCIL SHALL BE CONSTITUTED WITH POWERS TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND TO THE PROVOST REGARDING ALL GRADUATE PROGRAMS OF INSTRUCTION AND WITH REGARD TO THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL. THE GRADUATE COUNCIL MAY MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEAN OF

GRADUATE STUDY ON ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES PERTAINING TO THE OPERATION OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS.

b. THAT ARTICLE VI SECTION iv. BE CHANGED TO READ:

THE GRADUATE COUNCIL SHALL BE RE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RECOMMENDATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF ALL CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATE DEGREES.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment: (Kindly refer to Article VI of the attached 1975 Constitution for comparison)

a. The phrase "and through him to the President" has been deleted as in the similar proposed amendment of Article III Section II. and the phrase "for the institution or termination of" has also been deleted.

b. Again the phrase "and through him to the Board of Trustees" has been deleted.

5. MOVED THAT THE TITLE OF ARTICLE VII OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (AS AMENDED 1975) BE CHANGED FROM STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE TO STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY SENATE GOVERNANCE.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment: (Kindly refer to Article VII of the attached 1975 Constitution for comparison) This amendment would bring this title in line with the changed name of the instrument as a whole.

6. MOVED THAT THE WORDING OF ARTICLE VIII SECTION ii. OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE (AS AMENDED 1975) BE DELETED AND THE FOLLOWING WORDING SUBSTITUTED:

IN THE EVENT THAT A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT SHOULD BE ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND ANY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNIT, THE MEMBERS OF WHICH ARE ALSO REPRESENTED IN THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, AND IF SUCH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT CONTAINS ANY PROVISIONS REGARDING MANDATORY SUBJECTS OF BARGAINING WHICH ARE INCONSISTENT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CONSTITUTION, SUCH PROVISIONS OF THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT SHALL BE DEEMED TO SUPERSEDE AND CONTROL THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CONSTITUTION AS THEY MAY BE APPLICABLE TO MEMBERS OF THAT BARGAINING UNIT, BUT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CONSTITUTION SHALL CONTINUE TO BE IN EFFECT FOR ALL OTHER PURPOSES UNTIL THEY ARE AMENDED AS PROVIDED HEREIN.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment: (Kindly refer to Article VIII of the attached 1975 Constitution for comparison)

7. MOVED THAT APPENDIX I OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

SENATE (AS AMENDED 1975) BE HEREIN AFTER CALLED ATTACHMENT I AND THAT ARTICLE VII OF THE BYLAWS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF OAKLAND UNIVERSITY BE ATTACHED AS ATTACHMENT II TO THE CONSTITUTION.

First Reading: debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment:

a. Present Appendix I is Act No. 35, Public Acts of 1970 which established Oakland University as an independent institution. It has been pointed out that a law of the sovereign state of Michigan can hardly be regarded as an Appendix of our Constitution.

b. The wording of Article VII may be found under comment I to motion to amend I above.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE SENATE

1. The Steering Committee has appointed Mr. Harvey Arnold (Mathematics) to replace Mr. Tung Weng (Engineering) as Chairperson of the University Committee for Applied Statistics. Mr. Weng will remain as a member of the Committee. The Steering Committee takes this opportunity publicly to thank Mr. Weng for his past services.

2. The following report from the Athletics Committee with Guidelines for Athletic Eligibility, September, 1975 attached is placed here for the information of the Senate; no action is requested or required.

MEMORANDUM

February 7, 1977

TO: George T. Matthews, Vice Provost
Senate Steering Committee

FROM: Glenn A. Jackson, Chairman
Athletic Committee

SUBJECT: Guidelines for Athletic Eligibility .

Attached is a copy of the Guidelines for Athletic Eligibility that are presently being used at Oakland University. I was requested to forward these guidelines to the Steering Committee at the January 20th Senate meeting. For your information, it is the joint responsibility of the Athletic Director and the Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA to make certain that all athletes participating in intercollegiate athletics satisfy these criteria.

The guidelines were formally defined in September, 1975, by the Athletic Committee chaired by Mr. DeMent, with the assistance of the Athletic Director and both faculty representatives to the GLIAC. The guidelines defined as closely as possible what had been the past practice with respect to athletic eligibility. Since their approval in November, 1975, two revisions have been made, and are present in the attached copy.

The changes were:

1. All reference to the NAIA has been deleted, since Oakland no longer is a member of that organization. (9/24/76)
2. Point 3 in paragraph 1 in the middle of page 1 has been changed from "Academic Probation" to "Liable for Dismissal". (11/12/76)

I would like to make it clear that although it may appear that the Athletic Committee lowered the academic standards by the second change, this is not really the case. Prior to September, 1976, Academic Probation did not in actual practice, mean "less than a 2.0 GPA". To my knowledge, no student has ever been denied athletic eligibility just because his or her GPA dipped below 2.0.

When the new Academic Probation and Dismissal Policy was introduced in September, 1976, stating specifically that academic probation and a 2.0 GPA were one-and-the-same, the present Athletic Committee felt that a change to liable for dismissal was warranted for two reasons:

1. Liable for dismissal, as now defined, appears to be consistent with what has actually been practiced in the past.
2. Liable for dismissal, as now defined, is consistent with NCAA legislation. The NCAA rescinded the 2.0 GPA rule several years ago for Division II schools, and now lets each school define its own policy as far as GPA is concerned. Each school is free to define "normal progress" as it sees fit. Points 1 & 2 in paragraph 1 in the middle of page 1 are the main criteria specifically found in NCAA legislation concerning progress toward graduation. On behalf of the Athletic Committee, I urge you to accept the attached guidelines. They are consistent with what is being done at other NCAA Division II schools across the country. They are also consistent with what has been practiced at Oakland over the past ten years..

As an informational item, I am attaching the cumulative GPA's of all students who participated in intercollegiate athletics during Fall 1976 and Winter 1977. I think you will find the change to liable for dismissal was not made with the intent of allowing a large number of low GPA Students to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

GAJ:ac/j
Attachments (3)
cc: Members, Athletic Committee
(COPY)

Guidelines for Athletic Eligibility

Physical Education and Athletic Department

Oakland University
September 1975

The Oakland University Department of Physical Education and Athletics operates and administers an intercollegiate athletic program for men and women students. This program is

designed and administered on the basis of sound educational principles as an enrichment activity and individual developmental opportunity supplementing a student's academic education while at the university. The program is operated under the principles and rules which fall within the structured framework of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, in addition, Oakland University is a member of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and is governed by rules as promulgated by the membership of that unit.

I. For a student athlete to participate on an intercollegiate athletic team he or she must meet the following academic criteria.

1. The student athlete must be carrying a minimum of 12 credit hours per term.
2. During the calendar year immediately preceding the semester currently in progress the student athlete, except for freshmen, must have successfully completed a minimum of 24 credit hours of work.
3. A student must not be liable for dismissal from the university, as determined by the Academic Probation and Dismissal Table, or be on the Dismissal Option Program. Under university rules of due process, students may request an appeal where extenuating circumstances exist with the University Academic Standing and Honors Committee for a determination of academic standing. In no case is institutional eligibility declared by the Director of Physical Education and Athletics for a student athlete in violation of the statutes of the following legislative bodies:

1. The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
2. Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women.
3. GLIAC, Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
4. Oakland University uses a one term transfer rule for determination of in season competition.

II. Students on university social probation (non-academic violations) may be declared ineligible pending a review of the particular conduct violation by the Director of Physical Education and Athletics with the concurrence of the Student Judiciary Officer and the University Senate Athletic Committee.

Date of Approval: November 26, 1975

Revised: September 24, 1976 and November 12, 1976

Student Athlete GPA's - Fall 1976

(Cumulative)

2.3 3.6 2.79

2.61 2.48 2.45

2.99 2.13 3.77

2.72 3.38 3.0

3.40 3.14 2.71
2.26 2.91 3.39
2.98 3.55 2.89
3.14 2.49 3.15
2.46 2.43 2.78
2.98 2.77 3.51
2.71 2.51 2.74
2.57 3.08 1.75-8 hours (summer'76)
(Additional GPA's available in paper files)

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