



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## Oakland University Senate

12th Meeting  
May 2, 1972

### *MINUTES*

**PRESENT:** A quorum

**ABSENT:** Ms. Gerulaitis Terry, Tripp, White; Messrs. J. Appleton, Barthel, Becker, Brieger, Cafone, Dahlmann, Dovaras, Glass, Harding, Haskell, Heubel, Hill, Hough, Howes, P.J. Johnson, Kent, Mitra, Powell, Riley, Russell, Shantz and Sturner.

Meeting called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Mr. Obear in the absence of President O'Dowd.

(Continuation of items from the April 26th agenda.)

Item 6: Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Chernov, moved to approve the establishment of the Professional Development Degree in Engineering. Mr. Johnson explained that the Development Degree was neither a graduate degree nor a pure undergraduate degree, but was designed for engineers who graduated at least five years earlier, and who wanted to upgrade their skills to approximately the level of present engineering Bachelor's graduates. Mr. McKay commented that as a member of the *Ad Hoc* Review Committee he was most impressed with the thoroughness of preparation of the proposal and the candor of its sponsors, and indicated his strong support for the proposal. Mr. Marz asked what letters would be used to indicate the degree, such as B.A., B.S., M.A., etc. Mr. Johnson replied that no abbreviations had yet been specified.

Item 7: Mr. Witt, seconded by Mr. Chernov, introduced the two motions from the Academic Policy Committee to reserve the course numbers from 000 to 099 for courses specially designed to enrich academic skills, and to place a 16 credit limit on such courses. The question was raised as to who would decide which courses were to be considered developmental or for enrichment and therefore numbered below 100. Mr. Witt replied that each department or school and the appropriate Committee on Instruction would make that decision.

Item 8: Mr. Tomboulion, seconded by Mr. Marz, introduced Mr. Russell's motion that a student may offer toward fulfillment of graduation requirements no more than 8 credits in "regular" composition courses offered by the Department of Learning Skills. (Regular courses are to be defined as 100 level or higher.)

Item 9: Mr. Witt, seconded by Mr. Susskind, Introduced the motion from the Academic Policy Committee to establish procedures for internal competency testing. Mr. Susskind then pointed out that previously fee structures had never been legislated by the Senate but rather set by the

Board of Trustees. Mr. Marz therefore moved to strike item iii, seconded by Dean Gibson. Mr. Tombouljian offered an amendment to specify two-thirds of the regular tuition per credit, and Mr. Tagore offered an amendment to specify "an appropriate and reasonable fee to be charged after due consultation with the Board." After some further discussion both amendments were withdrawn in favor of a suggestion by Mr. Beardman that the sentiment of the Senate be expressed in the comments that the fee should be less than the full tuition (such as two-thirds), and that full information including the fee structure be distributed to students when this program is eventually established.

Item 10: Mr. Witt, seconded by Mr. Hetenyi, introduced the final motion on the Senate Agenda this year, the motion from the Academic Policy Committee to revise the repeat-course regulations to include repetition by competency examination.

#### A. OLD BUSINESS

(Due to the great length of the agenda and the fact that few amendments had been offered, no new agenda was prepared for the second readings. The motion numbers below then therefore refer to the items on the April 26th agenda.)

Item 1: The two motions to approve the establishment of an evening program were then introduced; a lengthy and lively debate then ensued. While there seemed to be little if any opposition to the establishment of evening courses in-load on campus, and to the establishment of an Evening Council, there was great disagreement over the wisdom of authorizing now the eventual establishment of instruction in off-campus centers on an over-load basis. Mr. McKay presented a table showing levels of financial support for instruction at Oakland University, Wayne State, OCC and MCCC, and contrasted these figures with the level of support which would be available from tuition income alone in the proposed off-campus evening program. He argued that there would not be adequate financial support. Mr. Torch, on the other hand, argued that it was inappropriate to compare the proposed evening college costs for the Oakland program with the level of support for on-campus programs (which are state supported), and that the appropriate comparison would be between levels of support for off-campus evening programs directly between the various institutions. These data were not available. He also asked if Mr. McKay believed that these other colleges were really losing money on their evening programs. Mr. McKay indicated that he didn't know whether the other colleges were losing money or not, but he believed that Oakland could not provide a quality program in the off-campus centers without losing money. Other senators also enthusiastically joined the fray, expressing either support for or opposition to the various proposals. Eventually the chair perceived a desire to vote, and the substitute motion failed with 10 positive votes (15 required). Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. McKay, then offered an amendment to strike the sentence in recommendation 3, (page 4 of the agenda), reading "We further recommend that instruction (either on-campus or off-campus), beyond the part of load obligations, should be treated as an overload and should command extra compensation. (Load remains to be defined. We suggest that a faculty member is eligible for overload compensation in any semester in which he or she teaches more than three courses, one of the three courses being an evening course. In other words, a faculty member would have to teach at least two courses at night in order to receive extra compensation.)" After a brief parliamentary discussion as to whether or not it was proper to amend one of the recommendations from the report even though it was not included in the motion itself, Mr. O'Dowd ruled that the intention of the amendment was clear, and allowed it to receive a vote. However, it also failed with 10 positive votes. Mr. Beardman,

seconded by Mr. Burke, then moved to strike in the same paragraph the parenthetical material beginning "(Load remains to be defined .....)" This amendment also failed. Attention was then directed to the main motion which was adopted with 15 positive votes.

**\* THAT THE REPORT OF THE EVENING COLLEGE COMMITTEE ENTITLED "*PROPOSED STRUCTURE FOR EVENING PROGRAM*" BE RECEIVED, THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE REPORT BE APPROVED, AND THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVENING PROGRAM BE AUTHORIZED.**

Comment: The five recommendations whose eventual or possible implementation would be authorized by this legislation are listed below. It should be clear that not all of these recommendations could be implemented immediately. The rest of the Evening College report is explanatory or commentary in nature, and would not be given the force of legislation by the adoption of this motion.

#### Recommendations:

1) We recommend that the evening program offer instruction both on campus and in off-campus centers. It is our belief that, minimally, off-campus should be established in Pontiac and Royal Oak, and that additional centers should be established in geographic areas where demand is sufficient. We further recommend that the off-campus centers be integrated with the efforts of Oakland Community College to the extent that we use its facilities and complement, rather than compete with, its courses.

(2) We recommend that our initial curricular offering at night include at least Junior and senior level courses in psychology, sociology, speech communication, English, history, elementary education, business administration and engineering. We further suggest that maximum enrollments will obtain if courses are taught primarily in late afternoon (i.e. after 4 p.m.) and evening on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

(3) We recommend that instruction in the evening program be provided by the present faculty as part of the normal teaching load. While the number of courses taught in the evening would be dependent on the inclination of the individual faculty members and the needs of the program, we recommend that no faculty member should be required to teach more than one evening course in the regular academic year. We further recommend that instruction (either on-campus or off-campus), beyond the part of load obligations, should be treated as an overload and should command extra compensation. (Load remains to be defined. We suggest that a faculty member is eligible for overload compensation in any semester in which he or she teaches more than three courses, one of the three courses being an evening course. In other words, a faculty member would have to teach at least two courses at night in order to receive extra compensation.)

(4) We recommend that the evening program be administered by a vice-provost and that an Evening Council be established to assist the vice-provost in generating a quality evening program. The Evening Council should include among its members representatives from the various School and College Committees on Instruction.

This recommendation is not intended to suggest that the Evening Council should substitute for the University Senate in its traditional role in approving curricular changes.

(5) We recommend that Oakland take whatever steps are necessary to insure that the various offices and services available to day students be made available to night students.

The meeting then adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Submitted by: James E. Davis  
Secretary, University Senate

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

*Home Page*