

Oakland University Senate

SIXTH MEETING

Thursday, March 15, 1979

3:15 p.m.

Gold Room, Oakland Center

MINUTES

Senators Present: Blatt, Burke, Chernow, Coon, DeMent, Eberwein, Ghausi, Grossman, Hampton, Hildum, Hohaus, Holladay, Hovanesian, Jackson, Johnson, Kleckner, Krompart, Matthews, McKay, Merz, Moeller, O'bear, O'Dowd, Osthaus, Ozinga, Pogany, Rogers, Scherer, Stransky, Torch, Tower, Twietmeyer, Wargo

Senators Absent: Allvin, Arnold, Bantel, Barry, Boulos, Braun, Butterworth, Coffman, Doherty, Edgerton, Evans, Felton, Goudsmit, Halsted, Heubel, Howes, Jones, Kohn, Riley, Russell, Schwartz, Seeber, Stanovich, Weiner, Williamson

Mr. O'Dowd presided.

Mr. O'Dowd commented as follows:

1. It appears the Governor will not order the budget reduction which had been feared a short time ago. But funding of new programs next year may be difficult, for there is fierce competition for funds at the State level.

2. A preliminary draft of the NCA Evaluating Team's Report has been received. It contains numerous but small errors of fact which will be corrected in the final version. It recommends continued accreditation for ten years at the baccalaureate and master's level, but calls for review of doctoral level programs in five, a reasonable stipulation. From Oakland's point of view, the Report is entirely satisfactory in substance.

5. Mr. O'Dowd had just returned from an accrediting review of the Air Force Academy. He commented upon the surprising academic strength of that institution.

Meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of January 18, 1979 were approved as distributed by voice vote upon motion of Mr. Torch, seconded by Mr. O'bear.

Attention was then directed to the Agenda.

A. Old Business:

None

B. New Business:

1. Motion from UCUI concerning date when students may withdraw from the University moved by Mr. Kleckner, seconded by Mr. Tower. Mr. Kleckner explained the purpose of the motion. Mr. O'Dowd wished to be assured that the dates be well publicized. Upon query of Mr. Ozinga, it was determined that the "last week" referred to meant the last five day academic week.

No amendments were offered.

2. Motion from the Graduate Council moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Tower concerning the Master of Business Administration degree.

Mr. O'Dowd pointed to the curious situation in which the Board has already approved the change, but contingent upon Senate approval. Mr. Johnson explained the need for haste in that certain students had postponed graduation in order to have the coveted Business Administration name on the diploma. Mr. McKay moved, seconded by Mr. Tower, that the Senate dispense with second reading on this motion. The question was called and this procedural motion was approved by voice vote. The main motion unamended being now eligible for final vote at this meeting was then called and approved by voice vote as follows:

MOVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE BOARD THAT THE NAME OF THE MASTER OF SCIENCE PROGRAM IN MANAGEMENT BE CHANGED TO MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

3. Motion from the Faculty Council for the School of Performing Arts concerning authorization to recommend primary appointments of faculty In the discipline of Dance moved by Mr. Chernov, seconded by Mr. O'bear.

Mr. Chernov referred questions to Mr. Eberwein, Chairperson of PAFCO. Mr. Grossman inquired about review procedures and criteria. Mr. Eberwein described the efforts of the Council's Personnel Committee to discover the practice of other universities (specifically, UMAA, WSU, WMU) in this area preparatory to developing satisfactory criteria for review of faculty in Dance (as well as other Performing Arts areas); It is a difficult field in all institutions. Mr. Grossman wished to know whether the review would go through Arts & Sciences CAP: Mr. Eberwein replied that the review would be within the SPA under governance of the Faculty Council and its Personnel Committee, the equivalent of a CAP. Mr. Burke inquired whether, if this motion were approved, someone would be appointed this year. Mr. Eberwein replied 'yes', if funding for a position is forthcoming; further, one faculty person, currently located in SHES and being reviewed in that faculty, would be transferred to SPA, but not reviewed by SPA this year. Mr. McKay inquired whether power of appointment in SPA was being sought at this time simply to accommodate a given individual. Mr. Matthews assured him that this was not the case; PAFCO is seeking the power in order to further the development of the Dance program; certainly if power is granted, the individual in question would incidentally be affected; undoubtedly this power, if granted, would be regarded as a step in the direction of developing a degree program in Dance. Mr. Dement wished to know whether such program, together with contemplated moves involving Music and Theatre would be considered by the Senate. Mr. Matthews answered that all such matters would be submitted to the Senate if and when they happen.

No amendments were approved.

4. Motion from the Graduate Council concerning establishment of a Specialist in Education graduate degree program, moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Coon.

Mr. Johnson referred questions to Messrs. Briod, Coon and Splete of the SHES.

Mr. Ozinga inquired what the need for such a program might be? Mr. Briod replied that it was a modest program designed for largely local teachers who already have master's degrees, but who do not intend to go on to doctoral level research degrees; in the school districts there are powerful financial incentives for teachers to continue beyond the master's level. Mr. Coon reinforced this assessment by pointing to the high demand for this degree. Mr. Dement wondered whether the 7.18 faculty required represented new faculty? Mr. Coon asserted that the figure did not represent a net increase of faculty In SHES, only the number required for the program; staffing would be accomplished largely through internal shifts. Mr. McKay, noting the board curricular design, inquired as to why it is called a specialist's degree. Mr. Briod explained that each perspective in the curriculum represented a way of evaluating, and that evaluation was the special emphasis. Mr. Coon pointed out that the term Education

Specialist was a generic one in education meaning simply a degree beyond the master's but less than the doctorate.. Mr. McKay wondered about the lack of statistical skills, useful in evaluation in the curricular design. Ms. Blatt pointed to the availability of statistical courses in the Reading PhD program which could be used. Mr. Dement wondered whether non-teachers could be admitted? Mr. Briod replied that two years of teaching and an undergraduate certification would be required. Mr. Ozinga then returned to the burden of his initial question: What happens when the market collapses? Mr. Moeller wanted to know how the figure 80 initial students was arrived at. Mr. Coon said that OU education masters students and school administrators had been surveyed and indications were favorable. Mr. Hovanesian wanted to know what enrollments were like elsewhere. Mr. Splete said that WSU admitted about 45, which was low because of the PhD program there. Mr. Hovanesian asked for a survey of enrollments in such programs around the state. Mr. Briod agreed to supply such at next meeting. Mr. Torch inquired whether the courses listed on p. 8 of the summary were currently taught? Mr. Briod replied that all except the 700 level courses were listed; the 700 level courses would be new. No amendments were offered.

5. Concurrent Resolution concerning University policy in regards affiliation of local fraternities and sororities with national organizations, moved by Ms. Rogers, seconded by Ms. Eberwein.

Mr. McKay expressed surprise that such a matter was before the Senate. It was his understanding that some years ago, with the creation of University Congress as a student governance body, the Senate had gotten out of the business of developing policy in the area of student social life. Mr. O'Dowd stated that he has asked several bodies—University Congress, the Administrative Council, the AP Assembly, the Alumni Board—to advise him on this matter: he believes the faculty ought to give an expression of opinion on the desirability of taking this step and asked the Steering Committee for aid; the Committee responded in the form of the Concurrent Resolution before the house; he had not seen the Resolution before it appeared on the agenda. Ms. Eberwein affirmed she had invented the idea of a Concurrent Resolution at the Steering Committee meeting of February 27; Mr. Matthews claimed responsibility for the form in which it appears.

Mr. McKay formulated a Substitute Resolution designed to reaffirm that the Senate recognized University Congress as the body responsible for rendering formal advise in matters concerning student life. The Substitute failed to gain a second.

Mr. Chernow wanted to know whether the President thought this matter of great importance? Mr. O'Dowd replied that he thought a University policy permitting local fraternities and sororities to be affiliated nationally, was somewhat different than policies in regards to dormitory hours, for example, matters not acted upon in recent years concerning the Senate. Mr. Chernow wondered whether the Senate, having gotten out of the *in loco parentis* role years ago, should now get back in? Mr. O'Dowd replied that he was not sure the Senate ever fully abandoned concern for parietal rules, but in any case, he felt he needs to know faculty opinion in this matter before making a decision. He turned to the Senate which while not exclusively a faculty body, nonetheless is the only all University body with predominant and widely representative faculty membership. Mr. O'Dowd continued by stating that the issue is not shall we permit fraternities or sororities (for we already have several—some with Greek letters) and short of a policy forbidding all social organizations, there is no way not to permit them so long as they meet established guidelines; the issue is shall the University, as a policy, recognize a national affiliation. It being the case that national fraternal organizations will not recognize locals until the University adopts a positive policy in this regard. Mr. Scott Porter and Ms. Both McGrath, students, spoke pointing to certain advantages to their organizations which would derive from national affiliations a step which cannot even be started without official University sanction. Discussion continued from several sides, all pointing to the Senate's discomfort with the Concurrent Resolution, and to some degree of reluctance to address the substantive issue.

Ms. Rogers and Mr. Tower, for the Steering Committee, withdrew the Concurrent Resolution with no opposition from the house.

In committee of the whole session, discussion continued with expressions of distrust of national fraternal organizations from several faculty. Mr. Chernow feared that regardless of public statements to the contrary, fraternities might be vehicles of discriminatory practice unofficially. Mr. Porter denied this to be the case with present non-affiliated fraternities on campus; Mr. McGrath pointed to the fact that at least one was sexually neutral in membership even though Title IX explicitly excludes fraternities and sororities from its purview. Mr. Hildum wondered whether some faculty (including himself) might not be voicing ancient prejudices derived from undergraduate experiences 20 or even 30 years old; fraternities have changed and seem to serve a very useful function on some campuses today. Ms. Rogers expressed the view that indeed times had changed and that the University could easily see to it that discriminatory practices were not allowed to take root.

Discussion became diffuse leaving the Steering Committee very little guidance as to what to do next.

Upon motion properly made and duly recorded, meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.