



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Fifth Meeting
December 6, 1973

MINUTES

Present: Senators, Akers, Barren, Barthel, Beardman, Bingham, H. Burdick, Coffman, Coon, DeMent, Doane, Evarts, Feeman, Gardiner, L. Gerulaitis, R. Gerulaitis, Graber, Gregory, Haskell, Hetenyi, Hitchingham, Hovanesian, Johnson, Liboff, Lind, Matthews, McKay, Obear, Riley, Schwartz, Seeber, Solomon, Strauss, Torch, and Woodard

Absent: Senators Dykes, Brieger, D. Burdick, Freeman, Covert, Dovaras, Gray, Kilburn, Light, McKinley, Moorhouse, O'Dowd, O'Leary, Palmer, Pas I ay, Schillace, Schmidt, Krompart, Sherry, Sturner, Susskind, Tipler, and Tower

Mr. Obear, presiding in the absence of Mr. O'Dowd, called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

A. Old Business

1. Motion from the Steering Committee (Mr. Obear)

THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE APPROVE THE NEW UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM AS DESCRIBED BY THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL CONSTITUTION AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF OAKLAND UNIVERSITY AND OF THE OAKLAND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE.

Mr. Seeber questioned why this motion was worded in such an '-up or down' fashion when at least two members of the Governance Commission felt that they were seeking the more general sentiment of the Senate. Mr. Haskell reported that this motion had been carefully considered in the Steering Committee, and that to present it in any other way seemed inappropriate. Mr. Obear reminded the Senate that several Governance Commission members had stated at the last Senate meeting that what the Commission desired was an expression of sentiment concerning a unicameral form of campus government, and not an approval or disapproval of the draft University Council Constitution. However, he pointed out, no motion embodying this sentiment was put forward.

Mr. Johnson stated that the motion to amend the current constitution seemed strange when the amendment would in fact dissolve the Senate as a deliberative body. Mr. McKay, supportive of the form of the motion as stated, said that the motion would provide an orderly way to have the Senate go out of existence.

Mr. Matthews enlightened the Senate with a bit of historical perspective by announcing that

one of the great inventions of the American people has been the notion of a constitutional convention. Mr. Matthews stated that the Senate could establish a constitutional convention and the Senate would go out of existence when a new constitution emanating from that constitutional convention had been properly ratified. He stated that the current method of proceeding makes "no sense".

Mr. Lind noted that the motion does not refer to the University Congress constitution and leaves the fate of that constitution unclear. Mr. McKay stated that other governance groups may act, too. Ultimately, a new system of governance requires Board action. Mr. Obear stated that a vote of this body will reflect to the President only University Senate sentiment.

Mr. McKay urged the defeat of the motion. Mr. Barthel asked what would happen if the motion were voted down. Mr. Obear stated that he was not certain what effect the action of the Senate would have on the Governance Commission.

Motion defeated on a voice vote.

Mr. DeMent, supported by Mr. Seeber, stated that a more coherent presentation should have been made. A more systematic presentation on large issues of this kind is very important.

Mr. Obear noted that an agenda supplement had been distributed at the meeting (copy attached to the file copy of these minutes) noting two amendments made to the current constitution since March, 1969.

2. Motion from the Academic Policy Committee

THAT THE GRADE CONVERSION SCHEME FOR OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
NUMERICAL GRADES TO THE COMMONLY USED A, B, C, D SYSTEM SHALL
BE

3.5 - 4.0 A

3.0 - 3.4 B

2.0 - 2.9 C

1.0 - 1.9 D

Mr. Feeman stated that the Academic Policy Committee had not been asked to study grading schemes from scratch, but rather to work out a compromise between the Senate legislation of last year and the University Congress legislation last year. He continued by reviewing briefly the attachment to the agenda on this issue which he had authored. Mr. DeMent then congratulated Mr. Feeman on the manner of, this presentation. Mr. Lind stated that as a result of a recent University Congress action, the Congress now favors the grade conversion scheme which was passed by the University Senate in the 1972-73 year. He therefore urged defeat of the motion on the floor.

Mr. Feeman offered to withdraw the motion, but the seconder of the motion, Mr. Tower, was not present at the meeting. As a result, the motion was voted.

Motion defeated on a voice vote.

Mr. Feeman stated that the Academic Policy Committee intended that the following should occur:

- a. Internally, the faculty should be made aware of the existence of the new grading scheme.
- b. Externally, a grading key should accompany each transcript containing the following three items:
 1. The 40 point grade conversion scheme in effect from 1963 to 1970.
 2. A statement that from 1970 through 1973 no official conversion scheme was in effect.
 3. The conversion scheme voted by the Senate in the winter term, 1973, and now concurred in by both the University Senate and the University Congress.

B. New Business

1. Motion from the Steering Committee Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Strauss moved

THAT ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP BE INCREASED BY TWO FACULTY SEATS, CAUSING THE MEMBERSHIP SPECIFICATIONS TO READ:

SIX FACULTY: FOUR STUDENTS: THE DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS, *ex officio* AND NON-VOTING: AND THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS (OR HIS DESIGNEE), THE DEAN FOR STUDENT SERVICES, AND THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL AIDS, EACH OF WHOM SHALL BE *ex officio* AND VOTING.

First reading.

Mr. Gregory stated that the Admissions Committee is very busy because of its consideration of the internal admissions recommendation referred to it by Mr. Obear. For this reason, the Committee needs more manpower. Mr. McKay stated that it was not clear to him that the Committee should be taking cognizance of that recommendation. He stated that the Steering Committee had on its agenda a consideration of what should be done about the drafts of recommendations from George Matthews, but that the Steering Committee had not yet dealt with the matter. Mr. Gregory stated that the Admissions Committee does not see itself as having been assigned the consideration of this recommendation. Rather, the Committee (as the minutes of recent meetings will note) views the situation as follows: A recommendation was submitted to it which the committee found within its charge to consider, and after reflection, it chose to study that recommendation. It is currently in the process of doing so.

Mr. McKay stated that he did not want the minutes to attribute to him a position which he did not hold. He stated that he was not at all certain that the Steering Committee had chosen to forward this recommendation to the Senate because of workload problems within the Admissions Committee. Mr. Obear stated that the Steering Committee had discussed the workload of the Admissions Committee as it considered this issue; that discussion may have

influenced the judgment of the Committee to place the item on the agenda. Mr. Burdick stated that he had heard no good argument for the expansion of the Committee and that he was concerned that Senate committees may be considered to be "accordion"-like - expanded and contracted as the workload of the committees changes. At his suggestion, Mr. Obear agreed that the Steering Committee would consider as an agenda item the development of a rationale as to what motives caused the Steering Committee to put this expansion recommendation before the Senate.

2. Mr. Obear called attention to the information items presented in the agenda. Mr. Johnson stated that he hoped a member of the Graduate Council could be placed on the *ad hoc* Commission on Constitutional Improvement. Mr. Obear asked Mr. Johnson to formalize his request and stated that it would then be placed on the agenda of the Steering Committee

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Robert H. Bunger, Secretary
University Senate
Office of the Provost/ss

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page