

Oakland University Senate Minutes

May 12, 2016

Members present: Aloï, Andrews, Awbrey, Baxa, Berven, K., Berven, D., Chamra, Cheng, Clark, Corso, Daniel, Debnath, Dulio, Epstein, Estes, Goldberg, Gooren, Groomes, Guessous, Hansen, Harbin, Kubinski, Latcha, Lee, Leibert, Lentini, Margerum-Leys, Miller, Moore, Parkash, Petchauer, Ragheb, Reger, Roth, Rozek, Schartman, Sifonis, Thompson, Wells, Williams

Members absent: Beres, Chopin, Clason, Corsoran, Dallo, Dereski, Edwards, Eis, Folberg, Giblin, Golinski, Grimm, Hay, Knox, Mazzeo, Polis, Roumani, Townsend, Tracy, Walter, Westergaard, Weiter

Summary of Information and Action Items

Information Items:

Provost's Updates

Action Items:

OLD BUSINESS

Motion from UCUI to change the Residency Policy for admission and tuition purposes

NEW BUSINESS

Motion from the Steering Committee to recommend the proposed University Master Plan to the President and Board of Trustees

Procedural Motion to staff Senate Standing Committees

A. INFORMATION ITEMS:

- Provost Lentini updated Senate members on progress that has been made concerning the on-going searches. In particular, the searches for the positions of the Dean of the School of Nursing and for the AVP of Research are concluding, and are in their final stages.
- He noted that a Carnegie designation for community engagement is making headway. The process will begin in 2018 for those applications but we need to start now as far as figuring out how we want to co-ordinate, report and assess them. He indicated that the state of Michigan came close to putting community engagement in the funding area, so they may do so in the future and OU should be ready.
- He updated the Senate on discussions that have taken place with community colleges on enrollment trends, and observed that as we plot for growth in the future, we need to know where these numbers are coming from. Numbers for first year students are dropping, and these are not easy numbers to maintain. He indicated that 50% of revenue comes from transfer students but this year, applications are low.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of April 21, 2016

The approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 21, 2016, was deferred to the September, 2016, Senate meeting.

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. Motion from UCUI to change the Residency Policy for admission and tuition purposes (second reading)

The motion to recommend to the President and Board of Trustees a revised residency policy was discussed. David Archbold (ISSO) said that other universities have followed a similar path, and he respectfully withdrew his previous objection to this motion after reading and researching the policy change.

The motion was approved unanimously.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Motion from the Steering Committee to recommend the proposed University Master Plan to the President and Board of Trustees

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees a new University Master Plan (Daniel, Berven)

Scott Miller from the Hanbury Evans Planning Company was at the meeting to present his final overview of the new Master Plan.

He began his presentation by saying that the last nine months at Oakland University had been great, and that Oakland University is one of the more interesting campuses for which his company has prepared Master Plans. He thanked John Beaghan and Provost Lentini for leading a robust Master Plan process, noting that there had been between 75 to 80 meetings that took place during the year, with President Hynd, the Board, municipal entities, OU alumni, students and faculty, resulting in an inclusive process with good feedback. The overall goal of the Master Plan is to have a vibrant campus life that is in line with the Strategic Plan, with outstanding programs and a compelling physical presence. He said that these terms were used as a touchstone during the process of preparing the Plan which was data-driven, with the data showing an 11% growth by 2025 in enrollment projection. This anticipated growth means there will be space issues. The time of day classroom use is almost 100% presently, so there is a need for classroom space. He provided information about space, having calculated that current space is approximately 2,000,000 square feet whereas current space needs are for 2,318, 411 square feet, and in the future, the amount of space needed will be 3,070,011 square feet. He pointed out that there is a qualitative as well as a quantitative need for classroom space, but he said other areas are in a deficit as well.

Mr. Miller continued that his planning group had conducted surveys and had 2000 respondents which he said was a fantastic response rate. He summarized some of the results. According to the surveys, parking is the biggest issue for commuters, and another issue for commuters is that they need more options as far as where to go when they are on campus. On-campus students would like more options for where to go on weekends. He said that the campus needs are across the board. At peak times, the parking lots are highly utilized, and this observation resulted in an audible groan of agreement from

Senate members. Mr. Miller stated that housing is also an important issue. He observed that the Master Plan would make the campus more pedestrian-oriented as well as more residential to create a 24/7 environment. He asserted that the goal of the Master Plan as far as classroom space is concerned is not just to make more classrooms, but better active-learning environments, and to promote community engagement in a physical sense. He emphasized that the Plan is bold and long-term. He said that his team utilized the idea of a '5-minute walk' to connect buildings and reduce distances, to make it possible to walk everywhere on campus. He said the land use concept used by his team divided the campus into districts, such as the Academic District, Housing Villages, Athletics District, Mixed Use Development, Development Zones, Historic District, among others. He noted that each one of these districts should strengthen the Academic District. He observed that the visibility of the campus to the outside world along Squirrel Road should be more attractive. He said there are opportunities for the faculty subdivision, the remote southern campus, and also for keeping open natural spaces. The Plan would strengthen the gateways and create a new loop road to circumnavigate the east side of campus. He showed numerous slides to highlight the many projects that are envisioned (some near term, some long term), such as the Oakland Center addition, the south housing phase, renovations to Anibal Fitzgerald and Pryale, an addition to the School of Business, an addition to Lepley, a CAS-MTD concert and parking structure, a Welcome Center, an Alumni Center, a collaborative research building, an Environmental Science facility, a south dining hall, a south student center and recreation facility, facilities management and skilled trades, an addition to the library, a multi-disciplinary building, lower athletic fields with building support. The School of Medicine would be moving out of O'Dowd. He stressed that the Master Plan needs to have flexibility built into it to account for the future and changing needs.

During the question and answer period, Senate members posed a variety of questions and observations. Ms. Guessous noted that there would be a new building added near the Engineering Building, and she asked if there would also be more parking spots added. Mr. Miller replied that having a parking lot next to a parking deck is not good land use, and he said that parking will be closer to the perimeter but that there could be underground parking. Ms. Townsend said that sometimes open space is too open, and she asked if there will be pathways, noting that the majority of the academic year is during the cold season. She also noted that the east and west sides of the campus should be better connected, perhaps by opening the road that is presently closed. Mr. Miller replied that the Master Plan uses a balanced approach, and there could be covered walkways. He said that the overall notion of infill will make the walks shorter. He pointed out that the closed road is a service road that is not available for general use. Mr. Chamra observed that along Squirrel Road there is a huge parking lot, and he suggested the possibility of putting the parking structure behind, with the Academic Building in front, so that the view from the outside of campus would be of a great building. Mr. Miller replied that there are ways to make the parking deck look great. Mr. Leibert brought up the parking problem around Pawley Hall, and wondered if the parking problem will be even tougher with the building nearby. Mr. Miller replied that there are multi-pronged solutions, and said they want to incentivize people not to drive. He said there may be a parking fee, and re-emphasized that parking will be more on the perimeter. Mr. Leibert asked whether traffic flow can be controlled. Mr. Miller replied that there will be other gateways and changes in traffic flow, including other ways to get off campus. Mr. Leibert asked if it would be possible to get rid of the stop sign on Ravine Road. Mr. Beaghan said that this is a safety issue, and the stop sign makes it

safer at that intersection. Mr. Leibert asked how the determination was made as to how classroom space is used. Mr. Miller replied that OU data was used. Ms. Wells said that there is a need for an auditorium in Pawley Hall, and she asked if this idea was given consideration. Mr. Miller replied that the Master Plan is at a higher level and so he could not speak to that matter, but there is an overall goal to create this type of building. Mr. Noiva asked if there had been any thought to solve the problem of getting onto campus for students who live off-campus close by, across the street. Mr. Miller replied that bridges and underpasses would be good, but these are big ticket items. Also, he noted that bike paths would be good, and there is a need to work with the local community to make it safer for off-campus students. He said that regarding parking and circulation on campus, the Master Plan reflects the suburban feel of the campus. He noted that there were traffic consultants on the planning team, and the ultimate goal is to get utilization rates down, perhaps by having parking permits and also by making transit shuttles more reliable as well as creating more efficient traffic loops. Ms. Townsend suggested there could be faculty parking areas. Mr. Lentini said that the Master Plan moves towards a culture change, and the faculty parking option is on the table, but the culture change has to be slow. Ms. Miller noted that so many of our students work, and so they don't just use cars to get to class, and she said that the parking discussion was making her nervous because it is a really big problem and she was not sure the Master Plan was solving it. Ms. Townsend agreed that we are primarily a commuter school, but the traffic flow seems like it is for a residential university that does not take into consideration that our students are coming to campus and leaving campus to go to work. Mr. Miller said that the Master Plan provides more spaces on the perimeter but the Plan does not want cars coming into the middle of campus because the core of the campus should be about an academic environment. Mr. Lentini said that these are good questions and we need a measured way to deal with the issue, but he noted that some students park in three places on campus during the course of a day, and so we need to change behaviors in a positive way. Ms. Hansen said we should have covered bus stops and be a stimulus for public transportation in the area. Mr. Miller concurred that this was a great observation. Mr. Lentini added that there are robust discussions going on with city managers on partnering for transit issues, and he agreed that it would be a benefit to have a transit system that would work overall. He noted that what we see in the Master Plan is a schematic possibility. Ms. Hansen asked if there is an E-space where Senate members can see the entire Master Plan. Mr. Miller replied that the document is near completion. Ms. Hansen said there should be a section in the Plan devoted to landscape, open spaces and natural spaces.

Mr. Lentini thanked Mr. Miller for his presentation of the Master Plan, and stated that it had been great working with Hanbury Evans throughout the year, rethinking the possibilities for the future of the campus.

Mr. Cheng moved to waive the second reading. This motion was seconded by Mr. Andrews. The motion was passed, with two abstentions (Townsend, Miller).

Returning to the original motion, Mr. Goldberg said that it was hard for him to vote in favor of the motion because there were big pieces of the Plan missing.

The motion to recommend the proposed Master Plan to the President and the Board of Trustees passed. Those opposed included Parkash, Miller, Latcha, Aloji, Goldberg, Townsend, Sifonis, Gooren and Hansen. Mr. Lentini thanked the Senate and said that the input would be taken seriously.

2. Procedural Motion to staff Senate Standing Committees

MOVED that persons listed be appointed to the committees or positions designated (Andrews, Guessous)

Honorary Degree Committee

Ganesan, Subramam (SECS) 2016-2017 replacing Chris Clason (CAS) for his sabbatical.

The motion carried.

E. GOOD AND WELFARE

Michelle Piskulich thanked Patrice Howard for providing refreshments.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Dikka Berven (secretary)