



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Eighth Meeting
Thursday, April 15, 1976
3:15 p.m.
128-130 Oakland Center

Minutes

Members Present: Alt, Barnard, Bertocci, Burke, Coffman, Evarts, Felton, Freeman, Genyea, Hampton, Hitchingham, Johnson, Karasch, Keegan, Liboff, Matthews, McKay, McKinley, Moeller, Obear, O'Dowd, Pogany, Russell, Scherer, Schluckebier, Seeber, Shacklett, Shantz, Strauss, Torch, Tower and Voight

Members Absent: Atlas, Barron, Beardman, Chernov, DeMont, Doane, Gardiner, Hamilton, Hammerle, Hetenyi, Heubel, Hovanesian, Keelin, Ketchum, Klein, Moberg, Paslay, Riley, Ruscio, Schuldenberg, Schwartz, Sponseller, Swanson, Swartz, Tucker, White and Williamson

Mr. O'Dowd presided.

Mr. O'Dowd's preliminary remarks touched on three areas of University concern, the first scary, the second an annual cause for concern, the third a subject of joy.

First, the President informed the Senate that the April monthly installment of the State's annual appropriation to the University has not been received; it is conceivable but not likely that unless the money is received, there would be none to meet the April bills. Second the State Senate has approved an appropriation of \$15 million for higher education more than recommended by the Governor; OU's budget would go up by about \$1,000,000 under this bill; but it is unlikely that these figures will be even close to what finally gets approved. Third, the Slavic Folk Ensemble will go to Poland this summer on invitation of that country; this is a great tribute to the work of Professor Helen Kovach-Tarakanov and her students over the years.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

Upon motion of Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Freeman, the minutes of the meeting of March 18, 1976, were approved as distributed by voice vote. Attention was then directed to the formal agenda.

A. Old Business:

1. Main Motion unamended (Mr. Tower, Mr. Hetenyi):

* THE SENATE APPROVE THE PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES DESCRIBED

IN THE *PROPOSAL* OF THE ACADEMIC AND CAREER ADVISING COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 18, 1976, AND RECOMMEND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION AS
SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Comments: Mr. Alt led off discussion with an inquiry about costs; Ms. Burdick responded that in total direct cost might be about \$1,100 per year, as to the costs in faculty time. It is true more time would be demanded, but Ms. Burdick stated that one of the objectives of the advisory program as proposed, was to increase faculty contribution to advising.

Mr. McKay questioned the locus of responsibility for accurate advice under the *Proposal*; if the University accepts responsibility for a Program Plan and then does not provide the conditions whereby the details of the Plan can be met, then is not the University liable? Under the present system (or lack thereof), the student has the responsibility to meet graduation requirements. Ms. Burdick replied that the essence of the *Proposal* was to increase student responsibility, since the Program Plan was not mandatory but advisory. Mr. Shacklett then informed the Senate that the University Congress has studied the Proposal and on April 1, had reached a final conclusion, which is as reproduced below:

MEMORANDUM

April 12, 1976

To: Dolores Burdick, Chairperson Academic and Career Advising Committee
From: Donald R. Fuller, President University Congress
RE: Latest action in the ACAC advising proposal

The presentation on April 1 by both Ms. Keegan and Mr. Bezdek prompted Congress to rescind its previous action by the necessary two-thirds vote margin, and later accept the advising document by roll call vote. However, some recommended changes were adopted by the Congress for possible inclusion in the proposal. They are:

1. add "shall make every effort to..." at the beginning of IV, A, 3(a).
2. change IV, A, 3(a), to "evaluate completed Program Plans and notify students who have submitted programs which do not meet University standards."
3. insert, after the word "shall" in IV, A, i, the phrase, "be urged to..."

It was also recommended that if any changes were made in the proposal by the Senate, that the advising proposal be brought before Congress again for its approval. Final vote: 13 aye, 3 nay, 2 abstain.

It is my belief that it is the responsibility of the Student Senators to insure that any changes made by the Senate are reported to Congress, so you need not worry about that provision. With regard to the recommended changes, however, I would appreciate your opinion on their possible impact before the proposal is voted on by the Senate.

Now that Congress has more or less recessed for the Spring and Summer, it becomes even more imperative that the staff be informed of major policy changing considerations by any committee on campus. Please keep us informed of future development.

Thank you for your interest in seeking Congressional opinion on this matter.

cc: Gerald Alt
George Matthews
Jim Pequette
Jack Schluckebter
John Shack left
Ray Torongeau
DRF/lar/jb (COPY)

Ms. Burdick said that if Congress is adamant, then a collision course is set; she pointed out that sentiment in the Senate was for mandatory advising requirements with sanctions, while Congress was for the opposite. Mr. Bezdek insisted that a start had to be made, thus the *Proposal* was framed as voluntary, permitting a testing time before further, more stringent recommendations might be advanced. Mr. Shantz stated that if we adopt a system with sanctions, then an elaborate system is needed; if a voluntary system is adopted, then few will seek aid; why is an elaborate system needed? Mr. Coffman inquired what do we have if we don't at least require the four checkpoints? Mr. Bezdek stated that the *Proposal* would result in a heightened sense of student responsibility; if you file a plan (we say to the student) we can help you. But first we need to get a system working, test it, and then make needed changes. Mr. Shantz suggested a better flow of published advising information is needed; Ms. Keegan pointed out such information is available at orientation.

Mr. Hampton (seconded by Mr. Strauss) then offered a substitute motion as follows:

MOVED THAT THE SENATE RECOMMIT THE PROPOSAL FOR A UNIFIED UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING SYSTEM AT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY FROM THE ACADEMIC AND CAREER ADVISING COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 18, 1976 TO COMMITTEE WITH THE PROVISION THAT THE COMMITTEE REPORT BACK IN FALL, 1976.

Considerable discussion on the substitute motion ensued, the central theme of which was the problem of whether to require students to adhere to the procedures with sanctions, or to adopt the *Proposal* with its stress on voluntary action. Mr. Burke pointed out that the *Proposal* was neither fish nor fowl in this regard. Mr. Bezdek asserted it struck a middle ground position. Mr. Bertocci inquired whether the committee wanted the substitute motion or would prefer the *Proposal* voted up or down? Ms. Burdick said she preferred the later. Question was called on substitute motion which was defeated by voice vote.

Attention was then returned to the Main Motion.

Mr. McKay pointed out that the wording of paragraph two, lines four and five, of the *Proposal's* preamble threatened the juridical competence of the Senate in the advising area; he requested that the committee insert the phrase "by way of" between "Senate" and "Academic", in future promulgations, and requested that this be noted in the minutes as the consensus of the Senate; there being no objections. it was so ordered.

Upon call of the question, the Main Motion unamended was approved by voice vote.

2. Main Motion unamended (Mr. Strauss, Mr. Tower)

THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY'S GRADING SYSTEM BE CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING WAY EFFECTIVE THE FALL TERM, 1976: THAT ALL GRADES OTHER THAN WN APPEAR ON A STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT.

Comments: Mr. Moeller for the Academic Policy Committee read into the minutes the April, 1976, action of the University Congress opposing both Main Motion 2. and 3., as follows:

MEMORANDUM

April 12, 1976

To: Daniel Fullmer, Chairperson Academic Policy Committee

From: Donald R. Fuller, President University Congress

RE: Proposal to change grading system

At its meeting of April 1, University Congress defeated both motions before it concerning the APC's proposed changes in OU's grading system. The motions were identical to those now before the Senate. Division of the question was requested, and the final roll call votes are as follows:

MOVED THAT: Oakland University's grading system be changed in the following way effective Fall term, 1976: that all grades other than WN appear on a student's transcript.

Vote: 5 aye, 8 nay, 3 abstain

MOVED THAT: Oakland University's grading system be changed in the following way effective Fall term, 1976: that the use of the N grade be eliminated in numerically graded courses and replaced by the use of 0.0.

Vote: 0 aye, 14 nay, 0 abstain

The Congress Constitution, as approved by the Board of Trustees, allows for the establishment of joint conference committees if Senate- and Congress-adopted legislation differs. If the Senate chooses to approve either of the two motions, I plan to exercise the right of conference committee in order to arrive at mutual agreement. If you desire a further explanation of Congressional action, please do not hesitate to call me at 7-3097.

cc; Gerald Alt
George Matthews
Jim Pequette
Jack Schluckebier
John Shacklett
Ray Torongeau
DRF/iar/Jb
(COPY)

Mr. Moeller explained that the Academic Policy Committee was eager to cooperate with the Congress to work out a solution in the event the Senate approved the controversial measures. The issue thus amiably joined, discussion ensued, first on Constitutional questions. It became clear to the membership that indeed the University Congress had a "veto" over the Senate in

certain areas.

Attention then turned to the substance of the issue. Mr. McKay (seconded by Mr. Freeman) moved to amend the Main Motion 2. as follows (amendment wording underlined).

THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY'S GRADING SYSTEM BE CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING WAY EFFECTIVE THE FALL TERM, 1976: THAT ALL UNDERGRADUATE GRADES OTHER THAN N AND WN APPEAR ON A STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT.

After some discussion, the McKay amendment failed to carry by voice vote.

Attention was then directed to the Main Motion unamended.

Mr. Shacklett (seconded by Mr. Burke) then offered an amendment as follows (amendment wording underlined):

* THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY'S GRADING SYSTEM BE CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING WAY EFFECTIVE THE FALL TERM, 1976: THAT ALL UNDERGRADUATE GRADES OTHER THAN WS AND WN APPEAR ON A STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT.

Debate proceeded with emphasis on the central issue: should a student's transcript be a full record of that student's academic activity including failures as well as successes, or should it be a record of successful completions only?

Upon call of the question, the Shacklett amendment carried by voice vote.

The Main Motion as amended was then approved by voice vote

3. Main Motion unamended (Mr. Tower, Mr. Torch)

THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY'S GRADING SYSTEM BE CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING WAY EFFECTIVE THE FALL TERM, 1976: THAT THE USE OF THE N GRADE BE ELIMINATED IN NUMERICALLY GRADED COURSES AND REPLACED BY THE USE OF 0.0.

Comments: Discussion continued in the view of Motion 2., focusing upon the question of the uses of a transcript. Mr. Freeman inquired if there is no "zero" recorded for a failure, what does a GPA mean? An average only of courses passed, not of all work attempted? Mr. McKay replied affirmatively, upon which the Main Motion was disapproved by voice vote.

B. New Business:

1. Motion from the Academic Policy Committee

THAT THE GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY GIVEN STUDENT ARE THOSE STATED IN THE UNIVERSITY CATALOG EXTANT AT THE TIME AT

WHICH THE STUDENT IS ADMITTED TO OAKLAND UNIVERSITY OR THOSE STATED IN ANY SUBSEQUENT CATALOG ACCORDING TO THE STUDENT'S CHOICE.

Flrst Reading.

Comments: Mr. Moeller moved and Mr. Shacklett seconded the motion.

Scattered discussion explaining present practice followed. Motion held for second reading at next meeting.

The formal agenda being completed, questions were then raised concerning the third informational item. On a response to a question by Mr. McKay, the President explained that the recommendations of the University Planning Committee would be directed to him because he, as President, was in the best position to direct them to appropriate agencies, such as the Senate and its committees, the AP Assembly, administrative officers and so on for needed action, legislative or administrative. The President's faculty nominees to this Committee will be presented for confirmation by the Senate at its meeting of April 22; although the Committee is not a Senate Standing Committee, the President with the agreement of the Steering Committee, felt confirmation to be important. Mr. Burke questioned what happens if the Senate does not confirm? Mr. O'Dowd replied that he would present alternatives in that case.

Mr. Russell then inquired about the position of the Senate in regards to Main Motion 2., Old Business, agenda of February 26. Mr. Matthews replied that the Steering Committee is prepared to do its duty provided something comes to it from the College of Arts and Sciences, a provision colored somewhat by his experience of the recent meeting of the Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences, which in his (Mr. Matthews') opinion was not one of that Assembly's more exemplary seances. However, the Steering Committtee was alert to the problem, and would cook up a PLAN OF ACTION.

Upon proper motion, duly seconded (as by voices from on high) the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Office of the Provost/j

4/20/76

*Motions passed at this meeting.

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page