

Oakland University Senate
March 18, 2010
Minutes

Members present: Awbrey, Chopin, Connery, Doman, Eis, Folberg, Grimm, Grossman, Guessous, Hanif, Insko, Izraeli, Jackson, Jhashi, Keane, Kim, Kruk, Larrabee, Latcha, Leibert, Lemarbe, Licker, Mabee, Marks, Medaugh, Meehan, Miller, Mitton, Moudgil, Osborne, Pedroni, Penprase, Piskulich, Riley-Doucet, Russell, Schartman, Schweitzer, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Switzer, Thompson, Tissot, Tracy, Voelck, Walters, Wells, Williams

Members absent: Bertocci, Berven (K), Chamra, Chen, English, Free, Giblin, Gilson, Hastings, Hightower, Jackson, Mili, Moran, Polis, Southward, Tanniru

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Item:
OU Outreach Update—Ms. Otto
2. Approval of minutes of 2-11-10 as amended (dollar amount of HHB corrected to include “million”). Ms. Miller, Mr. Licker. Approved.
3. Motion to approve revised constitution in SEHS. Ms. Osborne, Mr. Latcha. Second reading. Approved.
4. Motion to support resolution on a Statement of Academic Freedom. Mr. Grimm, Mr. Latcha. Second reading. Approved.
- 4a. Motion to direct the provost to bring the Statement of Academic Freedom to the Board of Trustees for endorsement. Mr. Russell, Ms. Jackson. Approved.
5. Motion to approve new M.S. program in Nursing, Clinical Nurse Leader. Ms. Jackson, Mr. Tracy. First reading.
- 5a. Motion to waive second reading. Ms. Jackson, Mr. Meehan. Approved.
- 5b. Motion to approve new Clinical Nurse Leader program. Approved.
6. Motion to approve new M.A. in Communications program. Mr. Grimm, Ms. Jackson. First reading.
7. Motion to endorse a resolution to support the MACLEA opposing proposed legislation regarding concealed weapons on college campuses. Mr. Osborne, Ms. Jackson. First reading.
- 7a. Motion to waive second reading. Mr. Tracy, Mr. Grimm. Approved.
- 7b. Motion to endorse resolution approved.
8. Motion to approve a policy for removal of a member of a Senate committee. Mr. Tracy, Ms. Miller. First reading.

Calling the meeting to order at 3:15, Mr. Moudgil invited Ms. Otto to give an update on university outreach. Ms. Otto referred to her presentation at the Senate one year ago, when issues were raised about the lack of classroom technology at Macomb, specifically, smart desks. Those have been purchased and are being used regularly. Another concern was the lack of availability of food on campus. Ms. Otto indicated that food carts will be available from about 4:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.; her goal is to make teaching at Macomb comfortable and easy.

Ms. Otto then referred to a handout on concurrent enrollment programs with selected Michigan community colleges. She noted the memoranda of understanding that will be signed in the near future with Oakland Community College and St. Clair Community College. Students will transfer seamlessly in a smooth process that will facilitate improvement of retention and graduation rates. Ms. Otto then showed a video that was created by students in M2O that highlighted the benefits of the dual enrollment arrangement. She remarked that the goal of the CC to OU programs is that they exist for the benefit of the student. A handout with information on incentive programs was made available to those interested, and faculty and entire departments were invited to visit Macomb to explore the development of programs.

Mr. Pedroni asked about a segment in the video in which a student referred to completion of a degree in two years; Ms. Otto clarified that the student was speaking about the post-associates phase and addressing the issue of often taking longer than four years to graduation in a traditional transfer model.

Mr. Moudgil thanked Ms. Otto for the update and directed faculty to consult with their deans for further exploration of CC to OU possibilities.

After the secretary took the roll call, a motion to approve the [minutes](#) of the February meeting was made by Ms. Miller. Mr. Licker, providing a second, noted an omission of “million” in two places in the paragraph describing the funding of the Human Health Building. The minutes were approved as amended.

Old Business

Turning to old business, Mr. Moudgil asked Mr. Latcha to read the motion, and then asked Mr. Cipielewski to present the document.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of the new [Constitution](#) of the School of Education and Human Services.

Mr. Cipielewski explained that the constitution has been brought in line with current practice, and that formatting issues have been resolved from the previous version of the document. Student representation has been added as well as staff representation in non-academic matters. He pointed out an adjustment to Article 1.5 in regard to the text “seeking advice *and* counsel of...” and noted that spaces need to be inserted into several places in the document. Mr. Grimm asked whether the deletion of “or designee” [dean’s designee] in Article 3.6 was deliberate; Mr. Cipielewski noted that it was. The Senate then voted to approve the revised constitution.

Mr. Grimm moved the second item of old business.

MOVED that the Senate support the [Statement on Academic Freedom](#) at Oakland University.

Mr. Mitton asked whether the reference to a University of Michigan committee had been

removed; Mr. Latcha observed that it had been deleted. The Senate unanimously voted to support the resolution. Mr. Russell then moved that the Senate direct the Provost to bring the statement to the Board of Trustees for its endorsement. Ms. Jackson provided a second and the Senate approved the motion.

New Business

The first item of new business was moved by Ms. Jackson and given a second by Mr. Tracy.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a [program](#) leading to the Master of Science in Clinical Nurse Leadership.

Ms. Voelck noted the absence of Library support in the proposal. Ms. Ferrari remarked that SBRC caught that issue, and that the correction is reflected in a more current iteration of the document. She then provided a rationale for the proposal, noting that the American Association of the Colleges of Nursing initiated the program to improve the quality of patient care and to create nurse leaders who provide care coordination in complex situations. The program entails 44 credits, with a certificate available at 16 credits. Students are required to complete 400 clinical hours, and would be eligible to take the Commission on Nursing exam to be certified as a Clinical Nurse Leader. Four new courses are required for the program, which existing faculty are qualified to teach. The issue with the Kresge Library budget was rectified upon the recommendation of the Senate Budget Review Committee. \$6000 was allotted in the first year; \$6450 in the second; \$6935 in the third; \$7456 in the fourth; and \$8018 in the fifth. Mr. Larrabee raised concern with enrollment issues, wondering how a new program relates to the student wait-lists that currently exist in Nursing. Ms. Ferrari replied that about 15 students are expected in the program, which would require one additional faculty member. She added that more clinical opportunities would be created for undergraduate students as OU's clinical presence grows with programs such as Clinical Nurse Leader. Mr. Meehan then asked whether the SBRC asked the dean of the School of Nursing to furnish a letter of support for the program should the program fall into financial difficulty. Mr. Latcha, a member of that committee, confirmed that the dean was asked and that she responded satisfactorily.

Ms. Jackson remarked that the VA Hospital system has indicated industry need for the program, and that all VA nurses need to be CNL certified by 2016, thus creating a direct pipeline to OU. Ms. Jackson then moved to waive the second reading, with Mr. Meehan providing a second. The Senate voted to approve. Returning to the motion regarding the proposal itself, Mr. Moudgil called the vote, and the program was approved unanimously.

The next item of new business was moved by Mr. Grimm, with a second provided by Ms. Jackson.

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a [program](#) leading to the Master of Arts in Communication.

Mr. Sudol expressed his support for the proposal, noting that he is bringing it to the Senate on behalf of the College of Arts and Sciences. He described the growth of student enrollment in Communication and is confident that bringing a master's degree forward will be successful. Ms.

Heisler, chair of the department, then presented the highlights of the proposal. She noted that the department is poised to launch the program because of the strength of the current faculty, as well as the economic situation in Michigan, where a master's degree may help individuals retool their professional careers. She then outlined the areas of concentration of the program and noted potential career opportunities. Thirty-two credits are required, plus 4 additional credits comprised of either a thesis, creative project, or comprehensive exams. The estimated enrollment is at 25 in the first year, with 50 by 2015 – profitability will be achieved in year three. One additional faculty member is required in the second year, and another in the fourth. Additionally, two graduate assistants are requested in the first year.

Ms. Guessous asked about the generic-sounding course title, “Introduction to Graduate Studies.” Ms. Heisler commented that this course, designed as an orientation, could be retitled to include “Communication.” Mr. Meehan noted that in the full proposal the course is titled, “Introduction to Graduate Studies in Communication.” Mr. Licker wondered if the department was prepared to offer four new courses in the first year and thirteen in the second. Ms. Heisler indicated that it is, and that the plan includes a reduction in the number of 400-level courses that are currently under-enrolled. Faculty can be redirected to teaching in the graduate program. Mr. Licker also asked if the program is intended for someone without an undergraduate degree in the discipline. He also warned that in the third year twenty-five students could be doing their theses and projects. Ms. Heisler replied that many students will not reach the exit course in two years because many will be attending part-time. She speculates that approximately half the students will opt for the comprehensive exams. She added that students would come from both inside and outside OU, with the bulk from our undergraduate program but a smaller number from areas such as English.

Mr. Pedroni asked how students would decide whether to take the qualitative or quantitative tracks. Ms. Heisler said that much depends on the faculty member the student chooses to work with. Mr. Grossman inquired about faculty in-load replacements, and whether PT adjuncts would be teaching undergraduate courses, allowing FT faculty to teach in the grad program – a situation that runs counter to the trend we have been decrying for years. Ms. Heisler replied that it is not the intention of hiring PT faculty, but rather, to better manage enrollment, for example, in the 400-level courses. The budget, she noted, was crafted with a conservative and watchful eye. Mr. Grossman corrected the previously mentioned 50% increase in students in year 3 and noted that a jump from 25 to 55 is a 120% increase. Mr. Tracy asked whether using 3-credit courses was considered, an option that would solve the problems of breadth that Ms. Heisler talked about. Ms. Heisler replied that in her opinion using a 3-credit model would not differ substantially from the current 4-credit model. Ms. Jackson expressed the opinion of the SPRC that the Department of Communication should consider adding more courses, and that the committee strongly endorses the program.

Ms. Voelck asked the proposers to reconsider the Library budget, which is \$6000 less than what KL requested. Ms. Heisler responded that the incentive program from the Macomb University Center could make up the difference in library needs. Mr. Kruk asked what UG majors are acceptable for admission; according to Ms. Heisler some majors are natural fits, such as English or Sociology, but that other disciplines would be also considered. Mr. Lau then offered the observation in response to Mr. Grossman's earlier comment that there was no intention of PT

faculty going into upper divisional courses, and if the need arises for additional PT faculty they would teach lower divisional courses only. Ms. Osborne asked about graduate assistants and whether they would be teaching in the program; Ms. Heisler replied that they would be considered research assistants.

Ms. Osborne then moved to support a Senate resolution, with a second by Ms. Jackson:

MOVED that the Senate endorse a resolution to support the position of the Michigan Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators opposing Michigan Senate Bill 747 and House Bill 5474.

Mr. Meehan distributed a packet of information referring to proposed legislation intended to allow concealed weapons to be carried on college and university campuses in Michigan. He expressed concern about the proposed law and urged the Senate to support the efforts of our campus law enforcement to keep a safe environment. He pointed out that this law would allow guns in our classrooms and dormitories. The police are very concerned about the possibilities that could arise, including larceny theft of guns and the potential deadly mix of alcohol and guns. Moreover, should there be an active shooter on campus, other individuals on campus possessing guns would undoubtedly cause multiple problems for our campus police.

Mr. Grossman asked whether there was a sense of urgency about the matter. Mr. Tracy then moved to waive the second reading; Mr. Grimm provided an enthusiastic second. All approved waiving the second reading, as well as the original motion. Mr. Meehan expressed his desire that this issue also go before the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Tracy then moved the final item of business:

MOVED that the Senate approve the following policy for the removal of a member of a Senate committee:

In the event that a chair of a Senate committee wishes to remove a committee member for inappropriate conduct, he/she must make that request in writing to the Senate Steering Committee, via the Senate Secretary. This request should provide a detailed rationale; it is appropriate to include documentation that may substantiate the request.

If the majority of the Steering Committee members agree that the chair's request should be granted, a member of the Steering Committee will meet with the committee member. At this meeting the committee member will receive a copy of the chair's request and be given a choice of formal responses:

- *The committee member may resign from the committee. If this option is taken, reference to the removal may not appear in subsequent review letters.*
- *The committee member may rebut the charges and request a review by the Senate Steering committee.*

In the event that the committee member requests a review, a meeting with the committee member, the chair of the committee, and the Senate Steering Committee will take place. The committee member may request that a university employee be present as an advocate. Witnesses may be invited to help verify or disprove statements. If witnesses are to be invited, the Steering Committee must be given sufficient notification so that the principals can be informed in advance of any witnesses that will appear.

If the Steering Committee decides that there is insufficient cause for removal, it will inform the committee chair and the committee member in writing. If the Steering Committee agrees that it is appropriate to remove the faculty member, it is authorized to do so, and will proceed to fill the vacancy using normal procedures. In the event that the committee member resigns or is removed from the committee, future Senate Steering Committees may refuse to consider the faculty member for service on Senate committees.

Mr. Grossman raised the issue of what ‘subsequent review letters’ meant, and whether it refers to C1, C2, C4 personnel reviews, and further, how that could be enforced. Mr. Moudgil remarked that if a person is removed under due process, the person under promotion review has the option of excluding the service from the dossier. Mr. Pedroni inquired about the definition of inappropriate conduct, and expressed concern that such empowerment of a committee chair could lead to abuses. Mr. Tracy then observed that all faculty have served on committees and can determine what constitutes a petty issue, and that a list of such issues would not be fruitful.

Turning to the Good and Welfare, Ms. Awbrey mentioned that Full-Year Registration began on March 15 and that the process is moving smoothly and the early numbers look good. Ms. Hanif announced that it was European Night in the OC, and that festivities were taking place until 8:00 p.m. in the Banquet Rooms. Ms. Voelck then mentioned the upcoming Authors at OU event in Kresge Library. Lastly, on behalf of the Senate, Mr. Grossman expressed support for the men’s basketball team and their upcoming game in the NCAA tournament. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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

posted 4/15/2010