

Oakland University Senate  
December 3 , 2009  
Minutes

Members present: Aistrop, Awbrey, Bertocci, Berven (D), Berven (K), Chen, Chopin, Cole, Connery, Doman, Eis, Free, Gillum (for Folberg), Gilson, Graetz, Grimm, Grossman, Guessous, Jackson, Jhashi, Kim, Kruk, Latcha, Leibert, Lemarbe, Licker, Mabee, Marks, Medaugh, Meehan, Mili, Miller, Mitton, Moudgil, Osborne, Penprase, Piskulich, Russell, Schweitzer, Schartman, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Switzer, Tardella, Tracy, Voelck, Walters, Wells, Williams, Wood

Members absent: Chamra, English, Giblin, Hightower, Izraeli, Keane, Pedroni, Polis, Riley-Doucet, Southward, Tanniru, Thompson, Tissot

**Summary of Actions:**

1. Informational Item:
  - Senate Meetings Audio Archive—Ms. Jhashi
  - Provost Updates—Mr. Moudgil
2. Approval of minutes of 11-12-09 as amended. Mr. Tracy, Mr. Russell. Approved.
3. Motion to approve a revised Constitution of the Library. Ms. Bhargava, Mr. Goslin. Second Reading. Approved.
4. Motion to approve policy on transfer of credit from a non-regionally accredited institution. Ms. Osborne, Mr. Tracy. Second reading. Approved.
- 4a. Motion to amend text of policy on transfer of credit. Ms. Awbrey, Ms. Guessous. Approved.
5. Motion to endorse resolution regarding placing names of OU academic units on campus buildings. Ms. Jackson, Mr. Meehan. Second reading. Approved.
6. Motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee to revise the Academic Status Forgiveness Policy. First reading. Mr. Grimm, Mr. Tracy.
  - 6a. Motion to waive second reading of the Academic Status Forgiveness Policy. Mr. Medaugh, Ms. Mabee. Approved.
  - 6b. Motion (6) approved, one opposed, two abstentions.
7. Motion to staff Senate standing committees. Mr. Tracy, Ms. Jackson. Approved.
8. Motion to bring the Actuarial Science proposal to the table for second reading. Mr. Sudol, Mr. Meehan. Approved, with 8 opposing.
  - 8a. Motion to postpone second reading until January meeting. Ms. Mili, Ms. Cole. Approved.

Mr. Moudgil called the Senate to order at 3:15. The first informational item was presented by Ms. Jhashi, who noted that an archive of audio recordings of Senate meetings has been created by Linda Hildebrand with the help of George Preisinger. It is accessible from the Senate homepage along with the written minutes of the meeting. Mr. Moudgil then congratulated all the faculty and staff involved with the recent NCA accreditation review process. OU received a positive review from NCA and is free from focus visits until the next mandated review in ten years.

The secretary proceeded with the roll call. A motion to approve the [minutes](#) was made by Mr. Tracy and seconded by Mr. Russell. The Senate voted to approve with the following amendments to the discussion regarding the transfer policy: 1) Mr. Russell had raised the issue of whether courses at OU had instructors of record without masters degrees. A later reference to graduate students who are authorized as instructors of record is not reflected in the minutes; 2) it should have been noted that an amendment was forthcoming by Ms. Awbrey to add the word "primarily" to the language of the motion in the last line ("...taught primarily by faculty with a masters degree...")

### **Old Business**

Mr. Moudgil read the motion regarding the Kresge Library Constitution (brought forth last year, and moved by Ms. Bhargava, seconded by Mr. Goslin).

**MOVED** that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the new [Constitution of the Library](#).

Ms. Kraemer observed that the issue regarding the word "staff" in Article I will remain in the text. She noted that the Library faculty may discuss issues or make decisions about services that affect both faculty and staff and therefore the terminology is appropriate. One additional change was made on page 5 of the Constitution under Article IV, item 5 where the word "faculty" will be added after Library to distinguish the faculty portion of the Library from the definition of the Library that includes both faculty and staff. The Senate voted to approve the Constitution.

The next item of old business was addressed by Ms. Awbrey, who restated the need for the transfer policy and then moved to amend the text to add "primarily" in the last line. Thus, item 4: "the institution's courses are taught primarily by faculty with masters degree or above." Ms. Guessous seconded; the Senate approved.

**MOVED** that the Senate approve the following policy on Transfer of Credit from a Non-Regionally Accredited Institution:

If a prospective student from a non-regionally accredited institution meets OU admissions requirements, they will be admitted to Oakland University. The student's credits from prior non-regionally accredited colleges and universities will be accepted according to the following policy:

Oakland University may accept for transfer those credits for which a grade of 2.0 (on a four-point scale) or higher was earned from institutions with candidacy status from a regional accrediting agency or from other accredited institutions provided that: 1) the institution grants a baccalaureate or associate degree; 2) the institution is a recognized member of CHEA; 3) the courses presented for transfer are shown to have equivalency or are determined to be of traditional academic nature and are acceptable to an Oakland University department; and 4) the institution's courses are taught by faculty with a masters degree or above.

Mr. Grimm asked whether the policy would affect graduate admissions, specifically, whether OU would recognize an undergraduate degree from a religious-based institution that is recognized by CHEA for admission to graduate programs. Ms. Awbrey replied that this would not be the case under the motion, and that departments have the ultimate discretion in admitting students. Mr. Bertocci then suggested a revision in the first line, suggesting that "prospective students" be substituted for the language as written. The Senate voted to approve the policy.

Mr. Moudgil then turned to the final item of old business.

MOVED that the University Senate endorse a resolution to the Board of Trustees requesting that the names of the College of Arts and Sciences and each professional school be placed on the building that houses their main administrative offices.

College of Arts and Sciences -- Varner Hall  
School of Education and Human Services -- Pawley Hall  
School of Engineering and Computer Science -- Dodge Hall  
School of Nursing -- O'Dowd Hall  
School of Business Administration-- Elliott Hall  
School of Health Sciences -- Hannah Hall

Without additional discussion, the Senate voted to approve (one negative vote recorded from Mr. Kim).

### **New Business**

Mr. Grimm moved the following, with a second from Mr. Tracy:

**MOVED** that the Academic Status Forgiveness Policy be revised:

Current wording (UG 2009-2010 catalog, p. 80):

Students attending Oakland University after an absence of three or more years who were not in good academic standing prior to their absence may file a Petition of Forgiveness with the Academic Standing and Honors Committee. The committee may forgive, for academic standing purposes only (probation and dismissal), all or part of the record used to compute probationary and dismissal status. Students may submit the Petition to the Committee through the Academic Skills Center (103 North Foundation Hall).

Proposed rewording:

Academic Forgiveness changes the academic standing of students who are on academic probation or dismissal option status. To petition for Academic Forgiveness, students must meet the following conditions: absent from the university for six or more years; not in good academic standing prior to their absence; and not permanently dismissed from the university.

Students who meet these requirements may petition the Academic Standing and Honors Committee for academic forgiveness. The petition must include a letter from the student stating why they are seeking academic forgiveness and supporting documentation. If the petition is granted, the student is considered exempt from the probation outreach and dismissal option status program. Petitions must be submitted to the Academic Skills Center, 103 North Foundation Hall.

Ms. Malley, Director of the Academic Skills Center, spoke on behalf of the Academic Standing and Honors Committee, who brought the motion forward to the Senate. Ms. Chopin asked why six years was chosen as the timeframe. Ms. Malley explained that this policy would affect those students applying for readmission, and that the readmission policy stipulates a six-year period. Thus, the aim of the ASH committee was to maintain consistency between the policies. She remarked that the policy addresses academic status only, and does not deal with grade forgiveness. Further, the policy clarifies what steps must be completed to petition for forgiveness, i.e. a letter and supporting documents. Mr. Medaugh moved to waive the second reading; Ms. Mabee provided a second.

Mr. Licker asked why reference to a physical address in a building is necessary in the text of a policy. Mr. Sudol then suggested that the second paragraph be corrected (plural "students" for grammatical agreement). Ms. Malley responded that students needed the practical information of knowing where to submit documentation. Mr. Aistrop wondered whether the location would change in six years; Ms. Malley noted that it was certainly possible and that the physical location can be omitted from the text. Ms. Cole asked whether the policy addresses students who were dismissed because of academic conduct or simply because their grades were too low. Ms. Malley replied that the policy applies to those dismissed either a first or second time, but not a third time or permanently. Ms. Berven asked whether six years was too long to be considered for readmission, adding that perhaps it is too strict. Ms. Malley noted that students who apply for readmission under this policy generally have been gone for long periods, often beyond six years. Students who return after shorter absences do not have to reapply for readmission, particularly if they leave with good academic status. Ms. Osborne then asked for clarification regarding the supporting documentation required. Ms. Malley observed that only one student in the past five years has applied for readmission under this policy and that the requested documentation will assist the ASH committee in making a thoughtful determination. Mr. Pedroni then inquired why as a matter of policy a student would be denied before the six-year period; Ms. Malley responded that the students likely to apply for the forgiveness are those who would fall into a readmission category and six years remains consistent with the overall readmission policy. The vote was called; the motion was approved with one recorded no (Ms. Wells) and two abstentions (Ms. Cole, Mr. Pedroni).

The final item of new business was a motion to staff a standing committee. Moved by Mr. Tracy and duly seconded by Ms. Jackson, the Senate gave its approval.

**MOVED** that the person listed below be appointed to the committee designated:

Senate Planning Review Committee  
Wallis Andersen (CAS) – 2009-2010

Mr. Moudgil then turned to the Good and Welfare. Ms. Jackson announced that the first printing of the 6th edition of the APA Manual for Citations has been published with multiple errors. The second printing is fine, but the first is riddled with mistakes. Mr. Sudol raised the issue of the second reading of the Actuarial Science program proposal, noting its disappearance from the agenda because of what he understands to be minor issues, namely, a column of figures that do not add up. He expressed a desire to get the proposal passed at this meeting so that the program can be included in the catalog. Mr. Grossman advised that a motion could be made to bring the proposal to the table for a second reading. Mr. Sudol made the motion; Mr. Meehan provided a second.

Mr. Latcha, a member of the Senate Budget Review Committee, raised two issues that the committee considered. The first involved two tables describing the budget for library resources. One table appeared as a footnote to the overall budget, with an indication that it was a revision of a previous table in the proposal; the numbers in that table are incorrect. The second issue was the lack of a letter of support from the Dean of CAS. In the view of the SBRC, this has budgetary impact as a letter of support would signal a commitment to the necessary resources.

Mr. Grossman then observed a point of order – a vote would be necessary to take the item from the table for a second reading. The Senate voted to do so, with 8 opposed.

Mr. Tracy addressed the library budget in Appendix C of the proposal, noting a fluctuation in the budget because of the cost of a publication required every four years. The budget was adjusted to reflect this. Ms. Voelck confirmed that the numbers reflect the purchase every four years. Mr. Latcha said that the SBRC understood the issue of the up/down resources because of the publication purchase. Ms. Jackson then expressed discomfort in voting for a program without allowing a Senate committee the necessary period of time to review the proposal and make a recommendation. She would not vote in favor without the committee's report. Mr. Meehan stated that the budget questions could be easily addressed; he then wondered which dean did provide the support letter. Mr. Sudol acknowledged that he did not submit the letter. He stated that during his time as dean twelve new programs have been approved by the Senate and that letters of support are redundant because he is the sponsor of the programs generated from CAS. As presiding officer of the CAS Assembly and Executive Committee, and as supervisor of the CAS budget, he gives his full support to the proposals. Mr. Moudgil asked that in lieu of written support whether Mr. Sudol can give verbal support. Mr. Sudol replied that yes, he is giving verbal support, emphasizing that it goes without saying as he is the sponsor. Mr. Grossman pointed out that the minutes of the previous Senate meeting indicated that the Deans of the College and SBA supported the proposal. Ms. Jackson then asserted that as Chair of the Senate Planning Review Committee she fully expects there will be ample opportunity in the future for Mr. Sudol to participate in such redundancies.

Mr. Russell asked about the schedule for material submitted to the UG catalog. Mr. Tracy replied that the deadline is December 18. Given the deadline, Mr. Russell suggested that the material be included in the catalog with the option of pulling it should there be a problem with the proposal in January. Mr. Tracy raised another concern regarding the time required for approval for the BOT and the President's Council, suggesting that approving the program now would expedite those other layers. Ms. Cole then spoke to honoring the policies and procedures that have been put in place for appropriate governance, and recounted her experience in getting approvals from several individuals within a short window of time for the Women and Gender Studies proposal. She advised the proposers to comply with the requests of the SBRC.

Mr. Grossman suggested that a motion could be made to postpone until the January meeting. Ms. Mili made the motion to postpone; Ms. Cole provided a second. Mr. Russell again clarified the timetable for approvals by the Board and President's Council. Mr. Berven wondered whether the web-based catalog could be changed, to which Ms. Awbrey explained that it could not since students come in under one catalog which must stay in place for one year. Ms. Mili asked for confirmation about the number of students in the program, and observed that a program in Engineering had been approved before appearing in the catalog. Mr. Tracy explained that there are no current students in the program, but that several are interested. The expectation is that five students (at most) per year will be in the program. Mr. Meehan summarized that the program may be postponed today because of minor accounting issues and the lack of one support letter. He "gets" the procedural stuff but urged people to get the required material and move forward. Mr. Leibert expressed surprise about the proposal itself (tape is inaudible). Mr. Meehan reminded him that the first reading of the program took place last month, that the proposal has been on the website, and that it is legitimate to question why the item was not on the agenda for second reading. Ms. Jackson said that she didn't know whether the budget issues are minor, and that is why the SBRC must complete its review. She asserted that the SPRC posted its recommendation without Dean Sudol's letter (the committee asked for Dean Tanniru's letter and received it within one week), but that she did not realize Mr. Sudol was not intending to submit the letter. Mr. Latcha reiterated that the committee decided not to vote until the issues are addressed. Mr. Tracy wanted clarification that the SBRC understood the budget issues; Mr. Latcha confirmed. The Senate voted (with a show of hands) to postpone until January. Mr. Latcha closed the discussion by noting that he will let the SBRC members know about the discussion today and will work to get the issues resolved by the January meeting.

Mr. Moudgil expressed his gratitude for the work of the Senate during the fall semester, in particular the members of the Steering Committee; Mr. Preisinger for his technical expertise; Ms. Hildebrand for the work involved with Senate archives, and Ms. Jhashi for her role in coordinating Senate meetings. Adjournment at 4:20.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi  
Secretary to the University Senate