

SENATE PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE  
ANNUAL REPORT  
1994-1995 ACADEMIC YEAR

I. Committee Members:

J. Curtis Chipman(Chair), Carole L. Crum, George Dahlgren (as Chair of GC), Robert T. Eberwein, Joel W. Russell, Heather Nicholson (Fall), Ravi Parameswaran, Michelle C. Piskulich, Anandi P. Sahu (as Chair of UCUI), Raissa Slywka (Winter).

II. Principal Concerns and Accomplishments

During the 1994 -1995 academic year, the Senate Planning Review Committee(SPRC) met nineteen times (cf. Appendix B for minutes) on items related to its charge (cf. Appendix A). Four of these meetings were joint meetings with the Senate Budget Review Committee (SBRC). The principal advisory meeting with Interim President and Vice President for Academic Affairs Russi took place (jointly with the SBRC) on April 20. Issue related both to academic and non-academic resources were discussed.

The committee's formal products for the year consist of a series of memoranda sent outside of the committee (cf. Appendix C). They address issues concerning priorities for university and academic resource allocations, strategic planning, and proposed new programs. For resource allocations, the memoranda to Interim President and Vice President for Academic Affairs Russi of March 24 and May 10 are the key documents. The committee's recommendations on the strategic plan's implementation are given in the May 23 memorandum (which also refers to the May 1 memorandum). The committee took an advisory position on Charter Schools in a memorandum of May 23. Finally, in a series of additional memoranda, the committee supported the administrative relocation of the Honors College to the Office of the Academic Vice President, supported proposed new masters programs in Accounting and Software Engineering, and strongly opposed a proposed framework for the development of future doctoral programs in the School of Educational and Human Services.

The committee was also involved in the presentation of the strategic plan to the University Senate for its formal endorsement. Until final action was taken at the University Senate meeting of January 12, this issue consumed a great deal of the committee's time and energy.

III Suggestions for Follow-Up Activity

It's not very good form to lay down chores for a new chair to pick up after, so I won't. I do believe though that the next several years will be interesting ones for Oakland University's tradition of shared governance. During the last three years, major developments have provided items that previous planning committee believed they lack. The first is presidential access with an opportunity to formally advise not only on academic, but non-academic resource allocations. The second is a strategic plan with fairly specific implementation options endorsed by the Senate and supported by the Board. Consequently, there is not only a wider advisory role, but a real context within which to exercise it. I wish the committee well in carrying out its responsibilities. I believe Oakland University will be strengthened by its efforts.

IV Issues for Steering Committee Attention

I ask that the Steering Committee to consider the following items.

- a) First, I sing an old song by repeating lines from the previous two annual reports.

*I strongly urge the Steering Committee to take the necessary steps to support the continued cooperation between the SBRC and the SPRC as we move through the natural transition of chairs. Certainly each new chair should be briefed by the retiring chair. The Steering Committee might wish to consider meeting jointly with both chairs at the beginning of each academic year to review committee reports and assess, for themselves, the level of positive interaction from the previous year. Because of the different perspectives you have charged these two groups to take on major issues before this university, there is always going to be a natural tension between them. Due care must be taken to assure that this tension continues to be a constructive one, as it has been during this initial year.*

- b) This is the first year that the SPRC is functioning without the automatic communication link with the GC and UCUI provided by the chairs of those two groups also serving on the SPRC. The Steering Committee should see that the substitute provided by the regular exchange of minutes (as directed in the new committee charges) is working effectively.

- c) When the Senate endorsed the Oakland University Strategic Plan: 1995-2005, the Comment section of the main motion stated that in succeeding years, the "Senate would be kept apprised of the implementation's progress and successes by the Senate Planning Review Committee." The Steering Committee needs to determine the specifics of how this will be accomplished.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Curtis Chipman, Chair

APPENDIX A - COMMITTEE CHARGE  
APPENDIX B - MINUTES  
APPENDIX C - EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS