

Oakland University Senate
January 14, 2010
Minutes

Members present: Awbrey, Bertocci, Berven (K), Chopin, Cole, Connery, Doman, Eis, English, Gillum (for Folberg), Gilson, Grimm, Guessous, Hanif, Hightower, Izraeli, Jackson, Jhashi, Keane, Kim, Kruk, Latcha, Leibert, Lemarbe, Licker, Mabee, Marks, Medaugh, Miller, Moran, Moudgil, Osborne, Penprase, Piskulich, Riley-Doucet, Russell, Russi, Schartman, Southward, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Switzer, Tissot, Tracy, Voelck, Walters, Williams

Members absent: Chamra, Chen, Free, Giblin, Grossman, Hastings, Larrabee, Meehan, Mili, Mitton, Pedroni, Polis, Schweitzer, Tanniru, Thompson, Wells

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Item:

Proposed Legislation/Concealed Weapons—Mr. Lucido

Early Alert—Ms. Andersen, Ms. Malley

Call for Volunteers, *ad hoc* Academic Software Process Review Committee—Mr.

Moudgil

Commencement Changes—Mr. Moudgil

2. Approval of minutes of 12-3-01. Mr. Latcha, Mr. Licker. Approved.

3. Motion to approve B.S. in Actuarial Science. Mr. Grimm, Mr. Tracy. Second reading. Approved.

4. Motion from Graduate Council regarding use of title “Dr.” in OU media. Ms. Jackson, Mr. Moran. First reading.

Mr. Moudgil called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and welcomed the new student representative to the Senate, Ms. Subha Hanif. He then invited police chief Lucido to present the first informational item. Mr. Lucido apprised Senators of proposed legislation intending to preempt an institution of higher education to regulate the possession and carrying of firearms on college campuses (House Bill 5474, Senate Bill 747). Currently, an Oakland University ordinance bans all firearms on campus. The Senate version of the bill could extend the right an individual with a legal permit to carry a concealed weapon to classrooms and dormitories, as well as to other general areas. Other versions of the bill would prohibit allowing weapons in classrooms, but would allow them in other areas, such as libraries and student unions. Both versions of the bill, according to Mr. Lucido, would allow students and visitors to campus to carry weapons, but not faculty or staff. He noted that campus police chiefs statewide oppose the proposed bills, and that Oakland University has taken an official stance against passage of such legislation. Acknowledging that some may view this a violation of the Second Amendment, he stressed his concern regarding the reasonableness of such actions, given the still immature judgment skills of the youth and young adults we serve. With the possible misuse of alcohol added to the picture, Mr. Lucido observed that adding firearms to the mix is unimaginable. Moreover, the possibility of someone inadvertently seeing a firearm (an open briefcase, a coat blowing open, etc.) and calling 911 is very likely. In response to such a call, Chief Lucido asserted that the appropriate measure would entail the lock-down of buildings,

which would pose an operational nightmare for the OUPD. Lastly, Mr. Lucido posed the hypothetical of a stolen firearm, and noted that larceny remains the number one crime problem on campus. He urged Senators to write their legislators, and reiterated that police chiefs on campuses across the state are united in their effort to block the proposed legislation.

The next informational item was introduced by Ms. Wallis Andersen. She gave a brief history of the efforts to initiate an Early Alert system to help identify and assist students struggling in their courses. In most cases, she noted, mid-term reports are too late to make a substantial difference. An early alert program would identify students experiencing academic difficulty in the first three to four weeks of the term. Using data from Ms. Schartman on retention, Ms. Andersen's group decided to pilot an Early Alert program in Rhetoric 150 classes. Next, Ms. Christy Lee spoke about the creation of an Early Alert referral form, available from the Academic Skills Center, which would be initiated by a faculty member and followed up with an email to the student. The email would indicate an instructor's concern and would offer recommendations for improvement in the course. A follow-up phone call would be placed with the student and face-to-face meetings arranged if necessary. Ms. Krista Malley, Director of the Academic Skills Center, then explained three phases of the Early Alert program and noted a [website](#) with further information. She offered to visit with any department or other group wishing more information and discussion about the program.

Mr. Moudgil then announced the formation of an *ad hoc* Academic Software Process Review Committee and asked for volunteers from the Senate to serve. Volunteers were requested to respond to the provost by the end of business on Friday. The last informational item concerned the changes in commencement beginning this year. Our current practice of three commencements held in one day has become unwieldy as the number of our graduates and family members wishing to attend has grown. Over months of discussion and consultation with all the academic units it has been determined that students and their families will be better served if two ceremonies for undergraduates are held on Saturday, and one ceremony for graduate students on Sunday. As the institution continues to grow, Mr. Moudgil remarked, two ceremonies will accommodate more family and friends, and also allow the opportunity for hooding of students earning doctoral degrees.

The secretary proceeded with the roll call, after which a motion to approve the [December 3 minutes](#) was made by Mr. Latcha, duly seconded by Mr. Licker, then approved as written.

Old Business

Mr. Moudgil then turned to the only item of old business: the second reading of the [proposal for a new program in Actuarial Science](#). Mr. Grimm read the motion.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees approval of a Bachelor of Science major in Actuarial Science.

Representing the Senate Budget Review Committee, Mr. Latcha read a statement that indicated approval for the proposal with the following notations: the footnote to Appendix G replaces Appendix C of the memorandum from the Library, Appendix A; the committee is disappointed

that it did not receive a letter of support from Dean Sudol, believing that the request did not place excessive burden on the dean or that it went beyond the charge of the committee to conduct appropriate due diligence for evaluating and documenting support for a new program; the final report includes Dean Sudol's verbal support given at the December 3, 2009 meeting of the Senate. The Senate voted to approve the program and Mr. Moudgil offered his congratulations.

New Business

Moved by Ms. Jackson, and seconded by Mr. Moran, the first item of new business concerned the use of the academic title "Dr." in Oakland University media:

MOVED that the use of the title "Dr." on Oakland University print and electronic media shall be under the exclusive purview of the faculty of the associated academic discipline.

Ms. Jackson observed that the Doctor of Nursing Practice program was supported with external funding of nearly one million dollars. Part of that came from the Kellogg Foundation, which required holding a Leadership Conference on campus. When materials were created for the conference, Communications and Marketing told the organizers that the title "Dr." could not be used in the program to refer to the four distinguished guests invited to speak. C & M's decision was based upon an Associated Press manual published in the 80s that allows the title "Dr." to be used only for M.D.s and Ph.D.s. The SON informed them that the Doctor of Nursing Practice is a relatively new program and would not have been in existence in the 1980s, but that information was not enough for C & M to change the policy. Ms. Jackson believes that a decision of this type should not be at the discretion of C & M or the Associated Press. It was embarrassing to the SON and to the University. Individuals should be referred to with the titles they have earned and an academic department should have the authority to determine the appropriate form of address. Further, she asked that should the Senate approve the motion that President Russi inform C & M that academic titles are under the purview of the academic units. Mr. Moran wondered whether she should have just used the title anyway, despite C & M. Ms. Jackson said that she was willing to pay to have the programs done elsewhere, but that the dean would not approve it.

Moving on to the Good and Welfare, Ms. Jhashi asked Senators for feedback on the current policy that prohibits faculty from giving exams during the week prior to final exam week. She noted that as associate provost, she receives several complaints every term from students who claim that instructors have given a test or a quiz during that week. Some instructors have expressed that they believe quizzes are allowed, which, according to Ms. Jhashi, adds to confusion about what exactly is permitted under the current policy. She asked for opinions on the policy (created in 1963). Mr. Berven noted that for the last 28 years it has been customary in the Department of Biological Sciences to give a lab during that week and that students have never objected. If that were not possible, students would lose valuable time for a course that meets weekly. Mr. Moran acknowledged that the concern for students inherent in the policy is genuine, and that it offers some protection from a faculty member giving a final exam and ending the term early. Despite that, he is also concerned that formal language restricting an instructor's pedagogical goals is problematic. He supports the spirit of the policy so that students can prepare adequately, but also reminded everyone that the Senate can, in fact, only make

recommendations and that such policies are not binding over the faculty. Ms. Penprase observed that in the accelerated program in Nursing it is imperative to include exams during that week because of the fast pace of the courses. Ms. Eis would like clarification about what constitutes an examination, specifically whether a quiz or studio art critique falls into that category. She believes that the phrase “written examination” is not clear enough based on the variety of practices throughout the departments. Ms. Jackson suggested that a process be put in place whereby an instructor could request an exception to the policy, perhaps directed to Graduate Council and to UCUI, depending on the course. Mr. Medaugh opined that the policy should be revisited to protect the students. Ms. Jhashi thanked Senators for the feedback and encouraged further comments to be sent to her via email.

Turning to the Good and Welfare, Mr. Dinda spoke to the issue of the 48-hour final exam grading policy enforced by the Registrar. Because of enrollment increases in the past few years, he believes that 48 hours presents difficulties in grading student work appropriately. He mentioned the potential for mistakes during a short grading period, and the subsequent need for time-consuming grade change processes. He requested the Senate to consider a change in the policy in order to better serve our students. Mr. Moudgil noted that Mr. Shablin was in the audience and that the issue will be taken under consideration. Mr. Moran added his support for Mr. Dinda’s plea, recounting his recent experience of reading 900 pages in a 3-day period in an “all-nighter” in his office. The time limit, in his view, is artificial and unnecessary, and burdensome in a discipline such as History. Ms. Penprase noted that the quick turnaround causes mistakes and forces the use of multiple-choice exams. Mr. Shablin clarified that the matrix in the AAUP contract notes the 48-hour deadline for grade submission, so that the issue would need to be wrestled with in that context as well. Ms. Tissot added that grades are not posted in a timely fashion, which causes anxiety for students, and that an extended deadline would help mistakes in paperwork. Mr. Moudgil also noted that many students need grades posted quickly in order to pursue internships or employment, but that need should be balanced with meaningful exams that evaluate students properly.

Lastly, Mr. Russell raised the issue of raises that were given to members of the Athletic department prior to President Russi’s announcement on July 1 regarding a salary freeze for all non-represented employees. Mr. Russell noted that faculty accepted a contract without a raise, and the two MEA unions followed suit. The faculty who ratified their contract believed they were doing so in a spirit of shared sacrifice. The raises reflected in June 30 paychecks for members of the Athletic Department run counter to that spirit. Mr. Russell offered a [sheet with the data](#) to anyone who wanted a copy.

Upon Mr. Tracy’s motion, the Senate adjourned at 4:15.

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