

Oakland University Senate Minutes

December 5, 2013

Members present: Andrews, Awbrey, Berven, D., Berven, K., Binkley, Cheng, Corcoran, Debnath, Dereski, Dulio, Dvir, Eis, Grimm, Groomes, Grossman, Howell, Johnson, Knox, Landolt, Latcha, Lentini, Licker, Lim, Maxfield, McEaney, Miller, Navin, Pelfrey, Penprase, Polis, Rigstad, Schuiling, Shablin, Switzer, Thompson, Tiegs, Tracy, Wharton, Williams, Wren

Members absent: Barber, Chamra, Cole, Corso, Estes, Folberg, Hankin, Hay, Hightower, Lee, Long, Meehan, Mitchell, Ragheb, Reger, Schartman, Singhal, Wells, Mazzeo

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

Summary of Actions

Information Items

Senate Archive Changes

Guidelines for Senate Action Items

Children in Library

Modification to Nurse Anesthesia Program Approved by Graduate Council

Modification to the Biomedical Diagnostic and Therapeutic Sciences program approved by UCUI

Modification to the Industrial and Systems Engineering program approved by UCUI

Don't Be Late to Graduate

Graduation Lists of Students

Provost's Update

New Business

- Motion from Steering Committee to revise the charge for the Senate Planning Review Committee
- Motion from the General Education Committee to recommend approval of the Michigan Transfer Agreement
- Procedural Motion to staff University Research Committee and Academic Standing and Honors Committee
- Election to Replace Steering Committee member

INFORMATION ITEMS

- Changes to Senate Archives: Ms. Daniel (Library) explained that the Senate archives website has its own collection. She illustrated for Senate members the two ways to find what one is looking for in the archives online, namely to search or to browse. She pointed out that it works best to put quotation marks around the subject one is searching for. She showed that it is possible to

browse a topic by subject and by date. She indicated that there is a handout available that provides a step-by-step explanation on how to search and browse the archives.

- Guidelines for Senate Action Items: Mr. Andrews presented *Guidelines for Senate Action Items* for discussion, the primary goal of which was to help the Steering Committee decide what types of items should be presented to the Senate for action in preparing the Senate agenda, and what types should be considered information items. He observed that the *Guidelines* would be flexible, and that topics that come up that do not exactly fit those listed in the guidelines would be put into one of the two categories at the discretion of the Steering Committee. Mr. Grimm asked for clarification of the process that was used for putting this topic as an information item at the Senate meeting instead of as an action item. Mr. Andrews replied that the *Guidelines* would come back to the Senate as an action item under 'New Business' in a future meeting, and that the decision to put this as an information item for the present meeting was for the purpose of getting discussion before it was put forth as an action item. Ms. Miller said she hoped that in the future when deciding what constitutes an action item for the agenda, the Senate will generally be more conservative than liberal in terms of the definitions of what constitutes a new program as opposed to a modification to an existing program.
- Children in Library: Ms. Lim (Library) explained that the reason for coming up with a policy statement about children in the library was part of the on-going effort to create a safe and effective learning environment in the library. The need came primarily from changes resulting recently from the 24/7 hours of operation. Since the library is open to the public, a policy is needed for when children are in the library late at night but are not well-supervised by an adult. Mr. Andrews asked what was meant by the phrase 'fully admitted' in the policy statement where it says 'Children who are not fully admitted into OU and who are under the age of 16 must be accompanied and supervised by an adult at all times while in the Libraries'. Ms. Lim said it would be better to change the word 'fully' to 'enrolled and registered', which she will do. Mr. Andrews then asked if the policy would address the problem of unaccompanied children. Ms. Lim replied that that might be more of a procedural than a policy level matter, in which the normal procedure would be to call the parents of the child. For the new policy, the problem being addressed was that parents are not supervising their children when they are in the library together. Mr. Andrews suggested that a line about unaccompanied children could be added to the policy statement, and Ms. Lim agreed.
- Modification to Nurse Anesthesia Program: Ms. Hrachok (SON) explained that the modification to the Nurse Anesthesia program was essentially to add 2 credits, so that the program would go from 40 to 42 credits for the certificate, and from 56 to 58 credits for the Master's program. A health assessment course needs to be added to the existing program, with a deadline of 2014.
- Modification to the Biomedical Diagnostic and Therapeutic Sciences program: Ms. Williams explained that Beaumont Hospital closed one of its hospital-based programs which had an impact on Oakland University's nursing program. The SON reacted to the new development by beginning to operate the program fully on our campus now instead of sharing it with Beaumont.

- Modification to the Industrial and Systems Engineering Program: Mr. Polis reported that the School of Engineering had updated their curriculum in response to the changing times, by updating their course descriptions in the catalog.
- Don't Be Late to Graduate: Mr. Shablin, Ms. Westergaard and Ms. Lindsay (Registrar's Office) were present to explain the 'Don't Be Late to Graduate' initiative. The point of the initiative is that although many students accomplish their ultimate goal of graduating, there are also some students who get close but who do not get all the way to graduation. 'Don't Be Late To Graduate' is to help those students who got close, and applied for graduation, but then subsequently walked away for various reasons. Ms. Lindsay explained that the Registrar now has a scholarship to provide assistance to those who are in this situation. Mr. Lentini expressed his thanks for these efforts, and pointed out that this initiative has gotten the attention and interest of Registrars at other Michigan universities who also have students in this category and who would also like to assist them achieve the goal of graduation.
- Graduation Lists: Ms. Eis informed the Senate that the Senate Steering committee had approved the list of graduating seniors on behalf of the Senate, noting that this detail will regularly be announced at Senate meetings from now on.
- Provost Updates: 1) Provost Lentini said that based upon discussions in the Senate and elsewhere in the university, Senate committee charges need to be examined to see if the committees are actually doing what their charges describe, and he invited comment from Senate members on this upcoming activity. One intention of looking at the charges is better communication between the President and the Provost. He indicated that in some cases, there would be a culture change to the way things procedures have evolved over the last few years. 2) He updated the Senate on his and Interim President Betty Youngblood's on-going visits to all the Schools in the university, reporting that these visits have been very useful. 3) He updated the Senate on the presidential search which is now in process. 4) He said that there is a significant enough decline in transfer enrollments to warrant creating a transfer enrollment center. 5) He said that OU has received a \$30,000 grant to participate in a Retention workshop. 6) The capital campaign is on-going. 7) Mr. Lentini told the Senate that he is looking into how to increase research expenditures, and discussing what will be the potential next steps in graduate education.

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES of October 17, 2013

The October 17, 2013 minutes were approved (Andrews, Eis), with clarification requested by Mr. Grimm that the fourth bullet point under 'Information Items' where it should state that he concurred with the previous three speakers that improving communication on campus is a huge challenge.

B. NEW BUSINESS

1. Motion from the Senate Steering Committee to revise the charge for the Senate Planning Review Committee

Moved that the proposed change to the Senate Planning Review Committee charge be adopted. (Mr. Tracy, Ms. Thompson)

Mr. Grimm pointed out that the word 'Senior' needed to be added before the phrase Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost in the proposed change under #2. He asked about the rationale in the change from the old committee charge #4 to the new committee charge #3. Mr. Lentini said the Steering Committee can always make recommendations, and therefore #9 of the old charge is superfluous, and regarding the change from the old #4 to the new #3, this should make the advisory role of the committee clear.

2. Motion from the General Education Committee to recommend approval of the Michigan Transfer Agreement

Moved that the Senate recommend approval of the Michigan Transfer Agreement (Ms. Eis, Mr. McEneaney)

Anne Hitt (Biology, and Chair Gen Ed committee) was present to explain the Michigan Transfer Agreement. She informed the Senate that the MTA has been put in place by the Michigan legislature with the 2012 Community College Appropriations Bill, and so therefore this is a mandated revision. She observed that the MTA has no impact on requirements for the majors, that students can still transfer a block of General Education requirements, and that students must still complete a Knowledge Applications course, a Capstone course and a Writing Intensive course in the major at OU. She pointed out that the university has been using MACRAO prior to the new MTA which will be a bit more rigorous than MACRAO was. Mr. Grossman observed that there were some loopholes—for example, students were supposed to have a Capstone course under MACRAO, but they have been able to replace the Capstone with a Knowledge Application course, and he asked whether this is still a loophole under the MTA. Ms. Awbrey responded to this question, noting that the second Knowledge Application course should have been okay only for five years after the new Gen Ed program was launched, but this option should be removed from the catalog at this point. Mr. Grossman also asked if the Writing Intensive and Writing Intensive in the major are the same thing, and Ms. Hitt replied that they can be. Mr. Berven asked since this is to take effect as of Fall 2014, was there urgency to get this approved by the Senate, to which Ms. Hitt replied affirmatively. Mr. Berven then made a motion to waive the second reading. Ms. Miller then inquired if the MACRAO is going to disappear, and Ms. Hitt said it will disappear eventually. The motion to waive the second reading was then passed unanimously.

The motion to recommend approval of the MTA passed unanimously.

3. Procedural Motion to Staff Senate Standing Committee

Moved that the person listed be appointed to the committee designated. (Ms. Thompson, Ms. Johnson)

University Research Committee: Tianxu Chen, SBA, 2013-2014 (Replacing Marilyn Chilers, SON)
Academic Standing and Honors: Kelly Berishaj, SON, Winter 2014 (Replacing Joi Jiang)

The motion to staff the Senate committees passed unanimously.

4. Election of a member of the Senate Steering Committee (1 member for Winter 2014 replacing Andrea Eis)—Senate Elections Committee.

Ms. Williams took nominations and conducted the election of a new member of the Senate Steering Committee for Winter 2014 to replace Andrea Eis. The Senate elected Anne Switzer (Kresge Library).

C. GOOD AND WELFARE

Mr. Shablin reminded Senate members that Fall 2013 grades are due December 16.

Mr. Crabill encouraged Senate members to attend the Retention Conference in February.

Ms. Miller expressed her concern that the Board of Trustees had announced that the presidential search committee would include only one faculty member. She distributed a handout summarizing the September 19, 2013 resolution approved in the Senate calling for the inclusion of several faculty members of the presidential search committee. She then proposed the following resolution:

“The university community is deeply concerned about the absence of faculty members who can represent the broad and complex constituency of Oakland’s academic culture. The next president will need to lead a complex community where many voices are represented. Those voices all need to participate in this selection process. As it stands now, that is not the case. We request the President to invite Trustee Michael Kraemer to attend the January meeting of the University Senate so that he can discuss the process for selecting the next president of Oakland University.” The resolution was seconded by Mr.

Polis. Mr. Grossman observed that the Student Congress was also upset that they did not have a voice on the committee. Ms. Shea noted that the Senate should convey to the BOT that it is not right that faculty members were asked to participate in the Capital Campaign, but they have not been represented adequately on the presidential search committee. Mr. Rigstad expressed his support for the resolution, and said he would like to see two more faculty members on the search committee. Mr. Polis stated that the BOT needs to be educated about shared governance because faculty members are very concerned about lack of adequate faculty representation. Ms. Wren said that she supported the resolution in principle, but questioned whether there might be another mechanism to get a BOT member to come to a Senate meeting. Ms. Miller replied that the reason the invitation was included in the resolution is that a member of the BOT was invited before, but the invitation was not accepted. She noted that there had been no announcement to the university community about the composition of the search committee, and yet we all have a vested interest in it. Ms. Williams expressed her sympathy to the idea of the BOT wanting to keep control, but she pointed out that the BOT comes and goes, whereas faculty members stay here their whole lives so she agreed that the faculty should be better represented. She observed that better representation on the committee is not a challenge to the authority of the BOT. Mr. Dvir questioned whether the new resolution would change anything, since the matter had already been brought up at a previous Senate meeting. He wondered whether the Senate should make a statement

instead of an invitation. Mr. Latcha responded that there is importance in being persistent, and that if the member of the BOT does not come to the Senate, there should be another resolution in January. The resolution was passed unanimously.

D. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Dikka Berven (secretary)