Oakland University Senate

Fourth Meeting
Thursday, January 20, 1977
3:00 p.m.
128 - 130 Oakland Center

MINUTES

Members Present: Barren, Bertocci, H. Burdick, Burke, Coffman, Coppola, Eberwein, Freeman, Hampton, Henry, Keelin, Ketchum, Kuczynski, Liboff, Lilliston, Matthews, McKay, McKinley, Obear, Payne, Russell, Scherer, Schuldenberg, Schwartz, Stonner, Swanson, Swartz, Torch, Tower, Tucker, Warren, White and Witt
Members Absent: Allvin, Atlas, Barnard, D. Burdick. Chapa, Doane, Felton, Flynn, Gardiner, Genyea, Hammerle, Heubel, Hitchingham, Hovanesian, Johnson, Keegan, Moberg, O'Dowd, Pogany, Riley, Ruscio, Shacklett, Sponseller and Torongeau

Mr. Obear presided.

Mr. Obear opened the meeting with comments concerning the formula budgeting model now being used by the powers in Lansing to determine the 1977-78 appropriation. Funding will be determined by course level rather than by dominant enrollment. Messrs. Harris and Kleckner of Oakland University have served on the task force advisory to government in this matter.

Mr. Obear announced the appointment of Professor Robert Payne as Acting Dean of Education pending Dean Hetenyi's recovery from heart surgery.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of November 18, 1976, were approved by voice vote as distributed.

Attention was next turned to the formal agenda.

Committee Reports

1. ***Athletics Committee*** (Mr. Jackson)

Mr. Jackson reported that the Committee had held a total of six meetings in the fall semester and had acted upon several matters: Guidelines for eligibility for athletics now is such that a student must be registered for 12 credit hours, have completed 24 hours of work at Oakland, must not be liable for dismissal.

Mr. Jackson also explained that the new athletics fee was in effect, following approval by the

Board. He announced the $10.00 Pioneer Pass for faculty and staff. Mr. Jackson's remarks touched off a brief but vigorous set of queries concerning the scheduling of athletic events during exam week, athletic scholarships (if any?), admission fee and other matters. Mr. McKay, with the support of Mr. Matthews, suggested the Committee review all existing Senate legislation concerning athletics and, if needed, present new legislation pulling it all together to meet new conditions. Mr. Jackson agreed.

2. ***Research Committee*** (Mr.; Appleton)

Mr. Appleton reviewed the activity of the Research Committee during the last six months. Ten meetings were held during the fall semester. During September, the Committee met and completed a review of the call for proposals (guidelines) established deadline dates, and reviewed the draft of the proposed bibliography of faculty-staff publications (which is now in the process of being printed)

During the first round, 21 small grant applications were reviewed. There were 13 awards made to 17 investigators for a total amount of $6,721. There were .24 summer fellowship applications received. The Committee considered 18 during three meetings in November and December, making 9 fellowship and 1 special $1,000 award for a total amount of $26,880. Because of the technical nature of the remaining six proposals, it was decided to postpone further decisions on these until external referees had had a chance to respond. These will be considered at an early meeting.

In addition, there were two special proposals-considered. One was awarded $600 in special travel money; the other requested to resubmit in the regular call for proposals.

Gertrude White (English) has replaced Anne Tripp, who is on sabbatical. The Committee will meet to consider small grant proposals (due February 1), undergraduate proposals (due January 15), and to outline a new venture--a call for research equipment proposals from departments and department-like units. Each unit would be restricted to one proposal, requesting no more than $2,000. A departmental match of no less than 20% of total cost will be required.

3. ***Academic Standing and Honors Committee*** (Mr. Chipman - this Committee report was actually presented after New Business had been completed, but for convenience it is placed here in these minutes.)

Mr. Chipman reviewed the activity of the Committee during fall, 1976, with special emphasis first upon implementation ion of the new probation and dismissal policy. He noted that efforts were made to remind both students and faculty of the new policy which was going into effect, that work which had begun last winter with OCS (Office of Computer Services) was continued to develop programs to implement the new policy and that the probation and dismissal cases handled at the end of the semester might be summarized from the results of computer runs made available to the Dean of Student Services on December 23, 1976. These indicated:

Students enrolled prior to fall, 1976;

First level of probation 369
Second level of probation 153

Third level of probation 153
Liable for dismissal 263

Students first enrolled in fall, 1976:
Probation 387

(Recall that the new policy allows a student to become liable for dismissal only at the end of a probationary semester. Out of the above 387 students, 202 would have been liable for dismissal if they had been on probation from a prior semester.)

On the basis of these computer generated reports, all of the 263 students who were liable for dismissal were mailed letters of dismissal. These letters also informed these students that appeals could be made to the committee within ten days of the receipt of the letter: appeal forms were included in the letter.

The Committee met in all day sessions on January 3 and 4 and in morning session on January 11 to consider a total of 156 appeals. The Committee actions were:
Assigned to dismissal option program 95
Dismissal rescinded 20
Appeal denied 27
Action deferred 14

The number of people assigned to the Dismissal Option Program includes those who were in the program from previous semesters and had met the requirements of the program but still remained liable for dismissal. Almost all of the cases that were rescinded consisted of students who had not filed repeat forms for repeated courses. With these corrections made they were no longer liable for dismissal, it is too early to tell how the new policy is working. The most noticeable difference at the end of this first semester was in the increase of students assigned to the various probationary categories. This was not unexpected.

Mr. Chipman also considered the guidelines for appeals and indicated that during the fall semester the Committee reviewed its appeal process and developed a set of guidelines. These are available through the Office of the Dean of Student Services. Mr. Chipman also reviewed readmissions policy during the fall semester the Committee reviewed the readmission policy and proposed changes in administrative procedures to be effective in the fall of 1977.

The principle change is to provide automatic readmission for all those students who withdrew in good standing for a period of one full year following the semester of withdrawal. This change seems consistent with a growing number of students who attend school part-time and whose absence in a given semester is not prejudicial toward their progress to graduation. All other students will be required to file an application for readmission one full month before the beginning of planned semester of return. In the case of students who are in good standing but have been absent for more than a year, this time will be used to check for changes in requirements that may affect the student's program. In the case of students who were not in good standing, this time will be used for consultation members of the staff of the Dean of Student Services and consideration by the Committee whether to grant readmission.

As has been the policy in the past, in no case will the Committee approve readmission for a student who has been dismissed twice from the University. Mr. Chipman finished by outlining plans for the winter semester. In the winter semester, the Committee plans to review the policy on semester honors and continue to work on the computer implementation of the new policy.

Mr. McKay called for a round of applause for Mr. Chipman and his Committee. Mr. Chipman graciously underscored the important role of Mr. Keith Kleckner in the smooth functioning of the Committee.

II. Old Business:

None

III. New Business:

Mr. Tower, moved and Mr. Burke seconded Item I, Mr. Tower spoke on the Steering Committee's role and its activity's since October 21, 1976, on this matter. He commented upon the meeting between himself and Ms. Hitchingham with the Board subcommittee and brought the Senate up-to-date. Mr. McKay then moved (seconded by Mr. Hampton) to amend the main motion such that there be inserted between the second and third "Be it resolved" the following:

> BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE SHALL SUBMIT TO THE SENATE A PRELIMINARY REPORT WHICH SHALL INCLUDE A RECOMMENDATION, OR RECOMMENDATIONS, ON THE PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING FACULTY JUDGMENTS AND THE USES WHICH WILL BE MADE OF THESE JUDGMENTS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW AND FURTHER;

Mr. McKay felt that the main motion should not have been made procedural, but also felt that his amendment, calling for a report by the ad hoc committee to the Senate would overcome his objections. Considerable discussion followed concerning that status of the ad hoc committee and its relation to the Board. The present situation was compared to 1970 and the similarities and differences were explored.

Mr. Ketchum called the questions on the motion to amend which was adopted by voice vote with no opposition.

Mr. Torch (seconded by Mr. Tower) then moved to amend the main motion as amended by striking from the final "Be it resolved" paragraph the phrase

> "AS THE OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY FOR PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW PURPOSES."

Mr. Torch's intent was to obviate the possible impression that the *ad hoc* committee might be the only access to the faculty open to the Board. Ms. Schwartz called the question on Mr. Torch amendment, which carried by voice vote without opposition.
Ms. Scherer then called the question on the main motion as amended by McKay/Hampton and by Torch/Tower which carried by voice vote, without opposition as follows:

> **MOVED** THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ENDORSES THE PRINCIPLE OF FACULTY CONSULTATION IN THE REVIEW OF A PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY THEREFORE;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE REQUEST THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF EACH ORGANIZED FACULTY (INCLUDING THE FACULTY OF NURSING) AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL, THE FACULTY COUNCIL FOR GENERAL AND CAREER STUDIES, AND THE FACULTY COUNCIL FOR HEALTH SCIENCES EACH TO APPOINT ONE FACULTY PERSON TO MEMBERSHIP IN AN *AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW AND SO TO INFORM THE STEERING COMMITTEE, WHICH SHALL APPOINT A CHAIRPERSON FROM AMONG THESE, AND FURTHER;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE DEVELOP SUCH PROCEDURES TO GATHER FACULTY JUDGMENT OR JUDGMENTS REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW AS MAY BE NECESSARY OR APPROPRIATE AND FURTHER

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE SHALL SUBMIT, TO THE SENATE, A PRELIMINARY REPORT WHICH SHALL INCLUDE A RECOMMENDATION, OR RECOMMENDATIONS, ON THE PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING FACULTY JUDGMENTS AND THE USES WHICH WILL BE MADE OF THESE JUDGMENTS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW AND FURTHER;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE REQUEST THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO RECOGNIZE THE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE AND TO WORK WITH IT IN THE PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW PROCESS.

Upon a duly seconded motion by persons unrecorded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

GTM:jb
Office of the Provost
1/26/77 ,

Back to OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE Home Page