

Oakland University Senate
October 15, 2009
Minutes

Members present: Aistrop, Awbrey, Bertocci, Berven (D), Berven (K), Connery, Doman, Eis, English, Free, Gillum (for Folberg), Gilson, Graetz, Grimm, Grossman, Guessous, Hightower, Jackson, Jhashi, Keane, Kim, Kruk, Latcha, Leibert, Lemarbe, Marks, Medaugh, Mili, Miller, Mitton, Moudgil, Osborn, Pedroni, Russell, Schweitzer, Schartman, Southward, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Tardella, Thompson, Tissot, Voelck, Walters, Wood

Members absent: Chen, Chopin, Cole, Giblin, Izraeli, Licker, Mabee, Meehan, Penprase, Piskulich, Polis, Riley-Doucet, Switzer, Tanniru, Tracy, Wells, Williams

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Item: Overview of Admissions/Financial Aid Fall 09 --Ms. Snyder
2. Approval of minutes of 9-24-09. Mr. Latcha, Mr. Bertocci. Approved.
3. Election of Steering Committee membe -- Elections Committee.
4. Motion to rescind motion of May 1, 2009 regarding discontinuance of the Senate Budget and Planning Review Committees and establishment of Senate Planning and Budget Review Committee. Mr. Grimm, Mr. Latcha. Approved.
5. Motion to staff Senate standing committees. Approved.

Mr. Moudgil called the Senate to order at 3:15. Noting that the calendar update would be addressed at a later meeting, he then invited Ms. Snyder to present an overview of Admissions and Financial Aid in Fall 2009. Her presentation featured the results of the recruitment season, and included data on admissions, financial aid, and retention. She thanked Laura Schartman, Tom Lemarbe, Cindy Hermsen, and Mary Alore for their assistance in providing information. Ms. Snyder discussed the FTIAC enrollment history in the past decade, noting the steep decline in numbers at sister schools in the state. Most of OU's growth in FTIACS came largely from students outside Oakland, Wayne, and Macomb counties. The number of transfer students has generally increased among state institutions, with OU seeing an 11.5% increase. Various charts were presented, including information regarding high school g.p.a., ACT scores, and numbers of underrepresented students. Retention and graduate rates were discussed; OU has a current 72% retention rate in the first year. Ms. Snyder also noted that retention rates have shown an increase as a result of the conversion of non-renewable scholarships to renewable for four years. Statistics pertaining to the institutional financial aid budget (applied, received, and disbursed) were outlined as well as information regarding need-based grants and merit grants. A summary slide highlighted the total average gift-aid award per student (need-based and/or merit) at \$4427 against a tuition cost of just over \$9000.

See the [full presentation](#) for specific aid allocations.

After the secretary carried out the roll call, a motion was made to approve the [minutes](#) from the September meeting by Mr. Latcha and duly seconded by Mr. Bertocci. The Senate approved without amendment.

Turning to Old Business, Mr. Moudgil invited Ms. Kraemer to present the Constitution of the Library for its second reading. She noted that the typographical errors pointed out by Mr. Grossman at the first reading were incorporated. Mr. Grossman then suggested that the language in the new faculty agreement calls for a change in the document, namely, the reference to a summer session rather than a semester. Ms. Jackson then raised an issue in Article 1 where reference is made to the library encompassing both faculty and staff. The preamble, however, refers only to faculty. Ms. Voelck stated that the intention was to acknowledge that the work of the Assembly impacts CTs and APs as well as faculty, thus, CT and AP representatives also sit on the Assembly. Ms. Jackson made the point that the Constitution speaks only to the roles, responsibilities, and privileges of the faculty and therefore the reference to the staff seems out of place. Mr. Moudgil supported the premise of Ms. Jackson's comments, noting that staff voices often have an impact in influencing decision making, even if they do not have a vote. Ms. Voelck decided that the document will go back to the faculty assembly for discussion and will be brought back for the Senate's review at a later date. Mr. Grimm then wondered whether striking the preamble would solve the issue. Mr. Bertocci then asked about what other representational implications may be raised by Ms. Jackson's observations relative to the intent of the Library faculty. Ms. Voelck indicated that this language had always been part of the Constitution and that the intention was simply to define who and what the Library is, but that she plans to take it back to discuss with the KL faculty and staff. Mr. Russell then mentioned article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, which refer to soliciting input of full-time staff in the appointment of administrators, and noted that this language seems highly appropriate and should be retained. Ms. Voelck responded that that particular issue was thoroughly vetted by the library faculty.

Moving to New Business, Mr. Moudgil invited Mssrs. Mitton and Bertocci to conduct the election of one member to the Steering Committee to fill its roster. Mr. Mitton apprised Senators of the procedure and opened the floor for nominations. Mr. Keane nominated Ms. Osborne from the School of Education and Human Services. With no other nominations forthcoming, Ms. Osborne became the newest member of the Steering Committee.

The next item of new business was moved by Mr. Grimm and seconded by Mr. Latcha:

MOVED that the motion, adopted on May 1, 2009, that the Senate Budget Review Committee and Senate Planning Review Committee be discontinued and replaced by the Senate Planning and Budget Review Committee as a standing committee of the Senate, be rescinded.

Mr. Russell suggested that the second reading be waived so that the committees could get on with their work for the year. Ms. Berven explained that she abstained from the vote last May on the basis of not knowing enough about the issue. Mr. Russell summarized the arguments for and against joining the committees, and suggested that the Steering Committee carefully review the charges with a view to making sure that all work effectively, particularly in terms of reviewing budgetary issues that go beyond the task of considering proposed budgets of new programs. Ms. Jackson voiced her support, adding that the role of the committees could be more active regarding both program and budget review. Rather than just passively waiting for program proposals to consider, both committees could serve the university by being proactive. For example, the SPRC could be talking with the provost to identify academic goals and the Senate's role in supporting those goals. She also noted the problems in scheduling meetings for a

committee of six faculty (and additional staff members) and expressed fear that scheduling would be next-to-impossible for a larger committee. Ms. Jackson also believes that review of new program proposals will be more time consuming with one committee, as two committees can better focus on the issues that their respective groups need to address. Mr. Berven reminded Senators of Curt Chipman's comments put forward by Mr. Grossman at the Senate meeting last spring. It was on the basis of Mr. Chipman's opinion to keep the two committees separate that Mr. Berven cast his vote. Mr. Latcha then stated that he was in favor of the motion to rescind because in his view more time is needed to carefully deliberate issues in the Senate and in its standing committees rather than less. Mr. Sudol stressed that whether there is one committee or two, expeditious review of new programs is the real issue. Currently, new programs are reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committees, and UCUI or Graduate Council, after an 18-month period of review in the unit. In the College, a proposal is vetted by 50% of the faculty or their representatives, the Assembly, its Executive Committee, the Committee on Instruction, as well as the Dean. Budgets undergo intense scrutiny during this process, only to encounter a Senate committee that takes it upon itself to recommend putting something in or taking something out. A proposal could not make it all the way to the Senate, he noted, without being in accordance with the existing plan of the university. Mr. Sudol added that he would be in favor of keeping two committees if charges are clarified so as not to obstruct the movement of new program proposals.

Mr. Russell expressed his opinion that the committees need to be up and running to deal with the business coming this fall. Mr. Mitton asked about the role of the Budget Committee and whether it simply makes a recommendation or has the ability to stop a proposal from advancing. Mr. Moudgil replied that the committee does have the power to recommend a proposal not be moved further. Mr. Grossman clarified that the role of the committee is to make its recommendation to the Senate as a whole, with the Senate ultimately deciding to send the proposal back or to approve it. Mr. Leibert then offered his view of the situation with the following: do we want to be more democratic or autocratic? In his opinion, decisions made while he has been a faculty member seem to have been pushed through with little input from the departments, and that in principle he advocates more oversight. Mr. Moudgil reminded Senators that the original motion to merge the committees was generated by a group of faculty, not administration.

Mr. Grossman moved that the motion on the floor go on to second reading. The Senate approved, then voted to approve the original motion. One no vote by Mr. Lemarbe was noted.

The final item of new business was a motion to staff Senate standing committees. With a second from Mr. Latcha, the motion was approved, with the deletion of the Senate Planning and Budget Committee (until the Steering Committee can make the appropriate changes for the newly separated committees).

Mr. Moudgil then turned to the Good and Welfare. Ms. Jackson expressed her surprise upon seeing the signage for the OUWSOM on the exterior of O'Dowd Hall and wondered why all the names of the Schools and College do not appear on the facades of campus buildings. She outlined the unit names appropriate for the buildings and urged the Senate to support a resolution to present to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Grossman suggested that a substantial matter such as this

should come to the Senate as a carefully considered proposal at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Moudgil agreed and indicated he would bring it to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Grossman raised the issue of traffic congestion on campus, particularly around 5:00 p.m. Mr. Moudgil responded that the problems are being discussed at the President's cabinet, and that he will relay the concern to that group.

A motion to adjourn was approved at 4:25 p.m.

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