



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## Oakland University Senate

3rd Meeting  
November 21, 1972

### *MINUTES*

Present: A quorum

Absent: Senators D. Bricker, E. Ettienne, R. Gerulaitis, S. Graber, C. Harding, L. Hetenyi, R. Hough, J. Jickling, P. J. Johnson, T. Kilburn, S. Schultz and A. Tripp

Prior to the commencement of the formal meeting, there was informal discussion concerning faculty merit factors, inter-library loan services, and grade point averages of recent entering classes. Mr. O'Dowd presented a chronology of events on this campus arising from the deaths of two students at Southern University. There was some discussion concerning the nature of the proposed December 2 program.

Mr. O'Dowd called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m. New members were noted: from Arts and Sciences, Marion Orton, Earl Ettienne, George Feeman, and Patrick Strauss as a presidential appointment, George T. Matthews. An announcement was made that the AP Assembly Executive Committee had selected Ray Geitka, CDPC, to replace Ed Van Slambrouck, CDPC, on the University Planning Committee.

Mr. Light, seconded by Mr. Chernov, moved approval of the minutes of the October 25, 1972, meeting.

Approved.

#### A. Old Business

The motion to amend the Constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences with respect to dean selection and reappointment procedures was opened for discussion. This motion is in the following form:

\*THAT ARTICLE I, SECT. v, para. 2, OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES BE REPLACED WITH PARAGRAPHS 2, 5, AND 4 BELOW; THAT SECTION vi BELOW REPLACE CURRENT SECTION vi; THAT CURRENT SECTION vi BE RENUMBERED SECTION viii; AND THAT SECTION vii BELOW BE ADDED TO THE CONSTITUTION.

2. The Dean shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Provost and the President, following the

procedures of Article I (vi).

3. The Provost may review the Dean's appointment at any time he deems necessary, but the review must be conducted at least once every five years. The procedures for the review are given in Article I (vii).

4. In unusual situations where there is not enough time to complete the procedures in Article I (vi) before the incumbent Dean leaves the office, the Provost, following consultation with the Executive Committee and all department chairmen, shall appoint an Acting Dean. The term of office of an Acting Dean shall not exceed one year, renewable. During the tenure of the Acting Dean, the procedures of Article I (vi) shall be in effect.

vi. Before appointment of a new Dean to the College of Arts and Sciences there shall be a Search Committee established.

1. The Search Committee shall consist of one faculty member from each of the four instructional groupings (at least two of whom shall be tenured), a non-tenured faculty member at large, and a faculty member from outside the College of Arts and Sciences.

a. The Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences shall nominate two faculty members from each instructional grouping and two non-tenured faculty members at large. Additional nominees, for any of these five positions, can be added to the ballot by petition from twelve faculty members. The election shall be conducted by the Elections Committee with all members of the Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences eligible to vote for their choice in each of the five categories.

b. The faculty members from outside the College shall be selected by the Provost with the approval of the Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences.

c. The Search Committee shall elect its own chairman.

2. The Search Committee shall be responsible for soliciting nominees, assessing their qualifications, arranging for interviews and recommending to the Provost the person to be appointed Dean. The Committee shall determine its own procedures of operation. These procedures must include consultation with all department chairmen before a recommendation is made to the Provost. The Provost can veto the nomination, in which case the Search Committee prepares a new recommendation. When the Provost and the Search Committee agree on a candidate for appointment as Dean, the name will be submitted to the Assembly for a secret referendum conducted by the Elections Committee of the Assembly. If more than fifty percent of the Assembly vote against the appointment, a new candidate must be considered. Otherwise the Provost can either proceed with the appointment of the candidate or request further recommendations from the Search Committee.

vii. When reviewing the incumbent Dean's appointment, the Provost (or his delegate) shall be assisted by a panel of three faculty from Arts and Sciences.

1. The faculty members of the review panel, including at least one non-tenured member, shall be elected by the Assembly. The Executive Committee of the College shall nominate a slate of six candidates, including at least two non-tenured members of the faculty of the College. Additional nominations may be made by a petition signed by twelve members of the Assembly.

2. The review shall be conducted in two stages: (a) a survey of opinion solicited by the panel through individual and group interviews, and (b) by referendum.

a. The Provost and the review panel shall function as an interviewing team to discuss the Dean's reappointment with a widely representative sample of individuals and groups. They shall meet with the assembled department chairmen and inner college heads, with the Assembly Executive Committee, and with all other groups they deem necessary or which seek an interview. In addition, they will conduct private interviews with as wide a range of individuals as possible, including tenured and non-tenured members of every department and inner college. The panel will also inform the University that it will be available for interviews with all individual or groups who seek them, and that it will read any signed, written communications which are presented to it concerning the Dean's reappointment.

b. After the review panel has conducted its interviews and assembled all information it deems necessary, it will submit a recommendation to the Provost. If the recommendation is a positive one, the Provost must submit it to an Assembly referendum and consider the results. However, even if both the recommendation and the referendum are positive, he may choose not to reappoint the Dean. If the recommendation of the review panel is negative, he may submit it for referendum at his discretion, and the Dean may be reappointed if not opposed by a majority of the Assembly. However, in no instance shall a Dean be reappointed if more than 50% of the Assembly oppose the reappointment.

c. The complete review procedures, including the referendum, must be carried on during a regular fall or winter term, and at least six weeks must be set aside for the process.

d. In the event the Dean is not reappointed, the search procedures specified in Article I (vi) shall be put into operation.

Mr. Chernov raised a procedural question about the role of the Senate in approving Constitutional amendments. He suggested that the Senate should not discuss the substantive aspects of this amendment in detail, but that its proper role was to accept amendments which were advanced to it by the Assemblies unless the Senate perceived that such amendments would do grievous harm to the University. Thus the Senate should vote "yes" on this motion

on procedural grounds alone. He further suggested that there was no need for another hour and a half of debate on this issue.

Mr. McKay supported Mr. Chernov's statements. He further stated that the amendment should not be viewed as a constraint on the power of the Board of Trustees. Mr. O'Beare disagreed, stating that the amendment makes no provision in unusual circumstances for the appointment of an individual as dean who lacks 50% support, analogous to appointment of executive officers (such as exists in the Department chairmen amendment). Since the Board currently has that power, acceptance of the amendment is therefore limiting.

Mr. Barthel stated that the Board has final authority now, and will retain that authority under the proposed amendment. What is recommended is a plan that is ideal under normal circumstances. When such circumstances do not exist, the Board can perform those actions necessary.

Mr. Feeman sought clarification as to the makeup of the four instructional groupings referred to in I.vi.l. Mr. Matthews responded that definitions of those groupings appear in another portion of the Arts and Sciences Constitution. Mr. Heubel stated that he disagreed with some parts of the legislation proposed, but that he was not prepared to argue those substantive questions here. If there is no group here suggesting that the legislation be returned to the Assembly for revision, it should be approved by this body. The meaning of such a vote is that the Senate feels obligated to forward these amendments.

Upon Mr. O'Beare's request, a secret ballot was conducted by the Elections Committee; result: 20 votes "for" the amendment, 18 votes "against".

Approved.

2. Discussion was opened on the motion to amend the Constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences with respect to department chairperson appointments and reappointments. The motion reads as follows:

\* THAT PARAGRAPH vii.l.c. and vii.l.d. BE REPLACED WITH THE FOLLOWING WORDING:

c. Before recommending appointment or reappointment of a chairman, the Dean must follow the procedures specified in the bylaws.

d. In unusual circumstances the Dean may appoint an executive officer over a department, after consultation with the Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences, the President, the Provost and with all department chairmen.

Mr. Chernov stated that his remarks with respect to the Dean amendment also applies here. He solicited the Provost's position on this issue. Mr. O'Beare responded that if he were Dean, he would vote "no". He further stated that his opposition to this amendment was not as strong as that related to Dean selection.

Mr. Beardman again at this meeting asked what the Economics and Management Constitution

provided concerning department chairmen selection. Mr. Obear read the applicable provision. Mr. Beardman then asked why the Provost is opposed to an amendment to the Arts and Sciences constitution which is weaker than the provision already existing in the Economics and Management constitution. Mr. Obear deferred to Mr. Seeber for response. Mr. Seeber stated that the Economics and Management organization is substantially different. The chairman of Economics and Management is not in the same administrative role as a chairman in Arts and Sciences; for example, the chairman of Economics has no budgetary control.

Mr. McKay stated that the proposed procedures mirror what is currently being done in the College of Arts and Sciences. The detailed procedures for department chairmen appointment and reappointment are stated in the bylaws; these can be amended without Senate and Board action in the future.

Upon Mr. Obear's call for a secret ballot on this issue, the Elections Committee conducted an election. The result: for the amendment, eighteen (18); against the amendment, eleven (11).

Approved.

B. New Business (New Business was conducted during the ballot count on motion A.I.)

1. Motions from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee

\* a. Mr. Evarts moved THAT MOTIONS b., c. AND d. BE APPROVED FOR FINAL VOTE AT THIS MEETING. Seconded by Mr. Pettengill.

Approved.

\* b. Mr. Evarts, seconded by Mr. Beardman, moved THAT THE FACULTY OF OAKLAND NOMINATE FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE, CONFERRED AS OF AUGUST 15, 1972, THE STUDENTS NAMED ON THE LIST (AS AMENDED) DISTRIBUTED TO SENATORS AND DEPARTMENT OFFICES WITH THIS AGENDA. (A copy of this list is attached to the file copy of these minutes).

Approved.

\* c. Mr. Evarts moved, seconded by Mr. Tomboulian, THAT THE SENATE FIND ADEQUATE FOR UNIVERSITY HONORS PURPOSES THOSE GRADE POINT AVERAGES SET FORTH ON THE LIST DISTRIBUTED WITH THIS AGENDA. (A copy of this list is attached to the file copy of these minutes).

Approved.

\* d. Mr. Evarts, seconded by Mr. Tomboulian, moved THAT UNIVERSITY HONORS BE AWARDED TO THOSE PERSONS SET FORTH ON THE LIST ATTACHED TO THE FILE COPY OF THESE MINUTES.

Approved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m. without formal vote.

Submitted by:  
Robert H. Bungler  
Secretary, University Senate

Provost's Office/ss  
It/29/72

---

\*Motion and amendments adopted at this meeting

*Back to*  
**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY**  
**SENATE**  
*Home Page*