



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Fifth Meeting
February 19, 1976

Minutes

Present: Alt, Atlas, Barnard, Barren, Bertocci, Chernov, Coffman, DeMont, Doane, Evarts, Felton, Freeman, Hampton, Hetenyi, Heubel, Hitchingham, Hovanesian, Karasch, Keegan, Keelin, Ketchum, Klein, Liboff, Matthews, McKay, McKinley, Moeller, Obear, O'Dowd, Paslay, Riley, Russell, Scherer, Schluckebier, Schuldenberg, Seeber, Shacklett, Sponseller, Strauss, Swartz, Torch, Tower, Voight, White and Williamson
Absent: Beardman, Burke, Gardiner, Genyeva, Hamilton, Hammerle, Johnson, Moberg, Pogany, Ruscio, Schwartz, Shantz, Swanson, Tucker

Mr. O'Dowd presided.

Mr. O'Dowd's preliminary comments concerned budget prospects for next year: The future is not bright.

Mr. O'Dowd called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Upon motion of Mr. Hetenyi, seconded by Mr. Coffman, the minutes of the meeting of December II, 1975, were approved by voice vote.

There being no Old Business, attention was directed to New Business:

Item II: *Report on Alternatives to the Proposed Position Shift Layoffs.* The Report was introduced by Ms. Scherer for the Academic Budget and Planning Committee and the Academic Policy Committee who called for general discussion. Mr. Russell, referring to 6.2.1. of the Report inquired about the meaning of "equalization." Mr. Fullmer (for the Committees) reported that equitable equalization of ratios among departments is desirable, but that the real location of positions within Arts and Sciences ought to be reconsidered. Mr. Russell then questioned the meaning of 4.3.3. in regards to tenured faculty.

Mr. Heubel pointed out that Motion 3. which is germane to 4.3.3. is indeed concerned with tenured faculty.

Mr. Russell then questioned the 9:1 ratio in the School of Nursing (6.1.1.) Ms. Felton stated that the 9:1 ratio was in clinical settings and should not be compared to Classics as was suggested.

Mr. McKay lamented a perceived confusion about ratios in Appendix 5. Mr. McKay then sought

clarification concerning the budget figures used: Mr. Freeman wanted to know why (referring to Appendix 5) consideration was restricted to Academic Affairs. Mr. O'Dowd pointed out that about 65% of the University's budget was in Academic Affairs and that of the total budget about 95% was in salaries. For Senate committees concerned with faculty layoffs to look to non-academic budgets for relief would be inappropriate since savings there would have to come largely from layoffs of non-faculty personnel, a subject of some concern to those affected. Mr. O'bear pointed out that the subject of discussion was a "position shift layoff" entailing no reduction of overall Academic Affairs budget, but a reallocation of resources within Academic Affairs; this being the case, going outside the Academic Affairs budget was inappropriate.

Ms. DeMont questioned the process of recycling decisions already made back through the Arts and Sciences constitutional machinery. Mr. Fullmer referred the matter to Mr. Torch, who responded he had followed constitutional procedures, consulted with Arts and Sciences' Executive Committee and Committee on Instruction in regards to decisions taken. Mr. Fullmer said the Committees he represented did not regard the process as invalid, but that the decisions should be reconsidered for other reasons. Mr. McKay said a second reading and vote by the Assembly is constitutionally required. Mr. Torch remarked that that is only Mr. McKay's opinion and not constitutional law.

Mr. O'Dowd observed that the Faculty Agreement which provides the basis for the position shift layoff places very tight time constraints on any decision making process: perhaps the administration should, on the basis of the best projections it can get, announce potential layoffs as far into the future as 1981. Mr. O'Dowd felt this might be too unsettling.

After some further discussion of the ins and out of budgeting, Mr. Strauss urged the Chair to move to the next order of business, the time being then about 4:50 p.m.

Attention was then directed to New Business, Item III.

Main Motion 1.: Ms. Scherer moved the adoption of Motion I., seconded by Mr. Coffman.

Questions were raised concerning the meaning of "endowment." Mr. Hetenyi, seconded by Mr. O'bear moved to amend the main motion by adding after "endowment" the phrase OR SIMILAR EXTERNAL SUPPORT, INCLUDING ASSURED STATE SUPPORT.

Mr. O'Dowd suggested the Academy might develop a degree program in lieu of the present certificate program. Mr. O'bear, in response to a query by Mr. Riley, pointed out that the report of the Committee on Matthews Recommendation VI contained recommendations for conversion of the certificate program to an M.F.A. which might be used as guidelines. Mr. O'bear, seconded by Mr. Hetenyi, then offered a motion to amend the main motion by adding after "1977" the phrase BUT THAT THE SENATE ENCOURAGE CONTINUED PLANNING TOWARD A DEGREE PROGRAM IN DRAMATIC ARTS.

Mr. O'bear, seconded by Mr. Chernov, then further moved to amend the main motion by inserting the phrase NEW ADMISSIONS INTO after "Art," and changing "1977" to 1976.

Mr. McKay questioned whether, if the suspension were lifted, would such action be brought to the Senate? Mr. O'bear replied "yes."

Main Motion 2.: Ms. Scherer moved the adoption of Motion 2., seconded by Mr. Liboff. After some discussion Mr. Russell, seconded by Mr. Shacklett, moved to amend the main motion by deleting the second "whereas" paragraph.

Main Motion 3.: Ms. Scherer moved the adoption of Motion 3., seconded by Mr. McKay. After considerable discussion of the relative merits of "whatsoever" as opposed to "capable of useful instruction", and the withdrawal of a motion by Mr. McKay to amend by eliminating "wheresoever", Mr. Russell, seconded by Mr. Riley, moved to amend the main motion by striking the phrase "capable of useful instruction." Upon question of Mr. Russell, Mr. Fullmer stated that the Committees meant useful instruction at Oakland University.

Mr. Chernov, seconded by Mr. Hetenyi, moved to amend the main motion by adding the phrase AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT after the phrase "capable of useful Instruction."

Main Motion 4.: Ms. Scherer moved the adoption of Motion 4., seconded by Mr. Obear. Discussion ensued regarding the role of the Steering Committee, revealing anxieties on the part of some about same. Mr. Matthews sought to allay such anxieties and Mr. Liboff offered an amendment to the main motion to substitute the ACADEMIC BUDGET AND PLANNING COMMITTEE for the "Steering Committee" as the proper agency of selection; motion to amend seconded by Mr. Shacklett.

Upon proper motion, duly seconded the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Office of the Provost/j
2/23/76

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page