

Oakland University Senate Minutes

December 15, 2016

Members present: *Aloi, Andrews, Arnold, Awbrey, Ball, Berven, D., Berven, K., Chamra, Cheng, Corcoran, Dallo, Debnath, Dereski, Didion, Dulio, Edrisinha, Eis, Epstein, Estes, Evans, Goldberg, Golinski, Gooren, Grimm, Hansen, Harbin, Hay, Howell, Hranchook, Keller, Knox, Lee, Lentini, Long, Margerum-Leys, Mazeo, Miller, Parkash, Parsons, Reger, Roth, roumani, Schartman, Sifonis, Thomas, Thompson, Tracy, Weiter, Wells*

Members absent: *Baxa, Chopin, Daniel, Edwards, Folberg, Giblin, Groomes, Guessous, Latcha, Leibert, Mathieson, Polis, Ragheb, Rigstad, Townsend, Williams*

Provost Lentini called the meeting to order at 3:10 P.M.

Summary of Information and Action Items

Information Items:

- Parking Update
- Revised ESL Policy
- Provost's Updates

Action Items:

OLD BUSINESS:

- Approved motion to endorse the Oakland University Strategic Plan metrics

NEW BUSINESS:

- Motion from the Graduate Council to recommend approval of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing to a Doctor of Nursing Practice—Nurse Anesthesia Track in the School of Nursing

INFORMATION ITEMS:

Parking Update: Scott Kunselman and Police Chief Gordon were present to update and answer questions about parking. Before introducing Mr. Gordon, Mr. Kunselman informed the Senate that they were there to cover the broader topic of parking, not just parking as it related to the new dormitory. Mr. Gordon provided a brief history of parking on campus and told senators about the kind of data the police department collects. He observed that parking has always been a problem on campus and said that campus police officers count available parking spots during the first two weeks of classes for which there is always an uptick. He stated that parking capacity is 95% to 100% at the present time, and sometimes exceeds 100%. He said that parking eases up as the semester goes on but this year that did not happen because we are now beyond demand. At the beginning of the school year, cars were circling campus as people looked for parking spots and at one point there were only 42 available spots out of more than 8000 total. He told the Senate that 57% of the residence students have cars on campus, and that the spots to be filled are always on the south end of campus. He noted that overnight parking lots that will support the new parking facility include P32 (1244 spaces) and P35 (427 spaces). P31 A and B

are proposed (61 and 48 spaces, respectively). Calculating everything, he estimates that they need about 428 spaces if statistics stay the same. He showed a campus map that indicated the proposed and existing location of the parking areas. Mr. Tracy expressed his concern about the impact that the new residence hall is going to have on parking for faculty during the day on campus, and he suggested that there has to be a prohibition on overnight parking unless you have a permit in P32, 36, 24, 34 and 26. Mr. Gordon said that there is already a prohibition for overnight parking in some areas. Ms. Dallo asked why we are thinking about parking lots and not considering parking structures. Mr. Kunselman replied that the new Master Plan is our guide and there are 3 parking structures planned for the future, but not for right now. He said that the parking problem will grow when there are incremental students, not just existing students, and he emphasized that the Master Plan group had explained that we should be operating at no more than 90% of parking capacity whereas we are at 95% to 100%. By next fall to meet needs, he stated that it will be necessary to build surface lots, but he explained that we need to look at both the supply side and the demand because we do not want to build too much parking. He observed that the Bear Bus can also be a solution to carry students from a far lot, and said that the target number is somewhere near 1000 spots to be created. Mr. Tracy inquired how it made sense that since 1000 spaces are needed, they are proposing to provide 109 new ones in surface lots in the fall. Mr. Kunselman replied that the dormitory will be opening in 2018 and so the new spots will be available in 2017 to address present parking needs. Mr. Andrews stated that in connection with the new residence hall, P32 needed to address the overnight parking demand because it is heavily used by students and faculty and is a covered lot, and therefore is an especially choice parking option. He noted that demand is being created with the new dorm area that was not there before. Ms. Berven asked about the possibility of connecting P35 to 31B. Mr. Kunselman replied that eventually they will be connected. Ms. Miller said that if she were a student, she would park in P32 and this means that the people who will wind up in P31 A and B will be mostly faculty and commuters. Mr. Kunselman replied that they are open for input on the issue. Mr. Lentini closed the discussion by saying that when it comes to campus satisfaction and the parking issue, there is obviously some frustration but they are working towards solutions.

Revised ESL Policy: Mr. Lentini noted that there is a revised ESL policy on campus, with information available on espace.

Provost's Updates: Mr. Lentini reminded Senate members that commencement would be taking place this weekend and despite weather reports that had predicted a heavy snow fall, the show would go on no matter what.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the November 17, 2016 Senate meeting were approved.

B. OLD BUSINESS

**1. Motion from the Steering committee to endorse the Oakland University Strategic Plan metrics.
(Mr. Tracy, Ms. Eis)**

MOVED *that the Senate endorse the Oakland University Strategic Plan metrics (second reading)*

Mr. Grimm expressed his concern that there was not enough information from the Task Forces represented in the Strategic Plan. He reminded Senate members that he had asked about this at the previous Senate meeting, and he said that before he felt comfortable about moving ahead to approve the Plan as presented, it needs more detail about the implementation of it. He stated that all of the Task Forces had included the importance of transparency but that there have been changes to the Plan that are relatively un-transparent—changes that have taken place between the Strategic Plan Committee and the final Plan. He recommended that we need to be cautious and rational about this matter. Ms. Miller concurred that she shared a lot of Mr. Grimm's concerns. She said that looking at the metrics, she does not have a strong opinion and she added that there were reasonable changes that had been made, but she was concerned that there were no explanations. As an example, she pointed out the ratio of academic advisers to students, and she asked how this would be implemented, how we would increase retention and reduce the faculty student ratio. She said that the devil is in the details. Mr. Lentini agreed with the thought about the devil and the details, but said that the goals and targets have been set. The target is to get the ratio at 300 to 1, and as to how we improve retention, he noted that there are people working on that problem every single day. He said that setting the goals with realistic peer input is what the approval is about. He asserted that there have been many communications back and forth about the Plan, and he reminded the Senate that the purpose of the Strategic Plan is to be a living document that shows that we need to get to certain places. He emphasized that after a year, reports will be written to assess if goals are being met, and he pointed out that it would be an ominous task, or maybe an impossible one, to say exactly how the Plan would be implemented because it is a living document with goals that can be altered as we move ahead. Mr. Andrews suggested that we compare this process to the Master Plan back in May because in both cases of the Strategic Plan and the Master Plan, we have had to decide what would be a reasonable amount of detail to include. He said that with regards to the Strategic Plan, we are being presented with a document that has strategies and metrics and so it is a reasonable amount of detail, as is, for the Senate to endorse it. He noted that at other institutions, there may actually be no numbers at all in their Strategic Plan document. He agreed that there will need to be more numbers to add in the future, but he thought there was a reasonable amount of information in the document as it now stands. Mr. Grimm agreed that there is plenty of detail. But he re-asserted his concern about the absence of recommendations by the Task Forces, and re-stated his belief that a firmer commitment is needed to those recommendations. He was concerned, for example, that the original goal of increasing the number of full-time faculty has now become reducing faculty to student ratio. He said that the work of the Task Forces was supposed to be paramount to the process of the Strategic Plan. He was puzzled that it was not clear how the reports from the Task Forces would be incorporated into the Plan. Mr. Lentini replied that the Task Force reports were reviewed and he said that they will go back to those reports again. He expressed his appreciation for Mr. Grimm's point of view, and re-affirmed his assurance that the Task Force reports would be incorporated but the procedures for implementation are more detail than we can do at the beginning of this process. He re-emphasized that none of the goals are completely fixed and can be changed as time goes on. He agreed that more faculty members need to be hired but he said it is difficult to attach a number as to how many. Mr. Aloï then requested that a

secret vote for approval be done (second by Ms. Hansen). Mr. Andrews said that since the Senate had adopted Robert's Rules of Order, secret votes are antithetical and contradictory to the established rules of the Senate. Mr. Lentini then ruled the motion to be out of order. Mr. Lentini called for a vote on the original motion, and the motion was approved with 4 nays (Grimm, Miller, Hay and Howell).

Mr. Lentini added that he wanted to make sure that everyone understood that it is in our collective interest to make sure that the work of the Task Forces is considered. Mr. Andrews expressed his appreciation to the Task Forces and the Strategic Plan Committee for all of their work. Mr. Lentini agreed that this expression of appreciation was very appropriate.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. Motion from the Graduate Council to recommend approval of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing to Doctor of Nursing Practice – Nurse Anesthesia Track program in the School of Nursing (Ms. Williams, Mr. Andrews)

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees approval of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing to a Doctor of Nursing Practice – Nurse Anesthesia Track program in the School of Nursing.

Ms. Hranchook presented the proposal. Mr. Ball commended her for the proposal. Ms. Berven asked now a Nursing Anesthesia degree is different from a Medical School degree in anesthesiology. Ms. Hranchook explained that although the work they would do is similar, the anesthesiologist with the medical degree would have a different level of responsibilities than the nurse with the anesthesia degree.

Ms. Golinski moved to waive the second reading (Mr. Ball seconded). The motion carried. Mr. Andrews asked if there are new faculty lines needed for this program. Ms. Hranchook replied that the current faculty is sufficient for the program and there are no added faculty lines in the 5-year budget. Mr. Ball said that all faculty will have to have doctorates, and she replied that they all will have doctorates by the time the program is up and running.

The motion was approved unanimously.

D. GOOD AND WELFARE

Ms. Hoag addressed the Senate in her role as chair of the Campus Development and Environment Committee, reporting on the strong concern of her committee for the removal of trees and the impact on the campus environment resulting from their plan to create more parking lots. Her report can be found on the Senate space. Mr. Thomas said he wanted to present an opposing view from a student standpoint, that while there really is a bad parking problem on campus, if it takes \$30 million for parking structures, this money comes from the students, and that it is possible to replant trees. He acknowledged that it is important to preserve the wetlands on campus, but said that he thought the recent proposal under review was the best solution so far. Mr. Berven pointed out that there are other possible locations for the proposed parking lots, and he provided an alternative to the location of the

new proposed parking in an area that had already been dug out which would not require taking down any trees at all that would not be less distant, and Mr. Lentini said they would follow up on looking at his idea. Mr. Ball concurred with Ms. Hoag's committee report that it is important to preserve the beauty of the campus, because he stated that the beauty of the campus was a factor that attracted him to his job. He added that from his office in the new Human Health Building, he looks out at a sea of cars, but there is one beautiful tree and he said that the existence of that tree is important.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dikka Berven, Senate secretary