



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Thursday, 13 November 1986
Third meeting

Minutes

Senators Present: Appleton, Barclay, Barnard, Barthel, Bingham, Blatt, Burke, Champagne, Chipman, Clatworthy, Copenhaver, Dahlgren, Downing, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Feeman, L. Gerulaitis, R. Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hartman, Haskell, Heubel, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Hough, Ketchum, Khapoya, Kleckner, Pettengill, Pigott, Pine, Rozek, Russell, Srodawa, Stamps, Straughen, Thomas, Swartz, Terry, Tripp, Wedekind, Wilson, Witt.

Senators Absent: Blankenship, Boganey, Cardimen, Cass, Coffey, Diltz, Faber, Frankie, Garcia, Hamilton, Herman, Hightower, Liboff, Lindell, Moore, Reddy, Righter, Stinson, Willoughby.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 16 October 1986 (Tripp; Hough). Approved.
2. Motion to amend the constitution of the School of Engineering and Computer Science (Wedekind; Hartman). Approved.
3. Motion to approve a new constitution for the School of Nursing (Lindell; Wilson). Approved.
4. Resolution concerning review of the president (Downing; R. Gerulaitis). Approved.
5. Motion recommending inclusion of an ethics component in undergraduate major programs (J. Eberwein; Burke). First reading.

Mr. Kleckner called the Senate to order at 3:12 p.m., proceeding with dispatch to consideration of the minutes of 16 October 1986. Approval of these having been moved by Ms. Tripp and seconded by Mr. Hough, they were accepted without discussion. As expected, the first order of business was a motion from the School of Engineering and Computer Science to amend its constitution (Messrs. Wedekind and Hartman). With neither debate nor dissent, the Senate bestowed its blessing on the following motion:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the new constitution of the School of Engineering and Computer Science be approved.

Prompt achievement of this business encouraged the body to proceed to the second item of old business: a motion from the School of Nursing to approve a new constitution (Mesdames Lindell and Wilson):

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the new constitution of the School of Nursing be approved.

Mr. Kleckner called his colleagues' attention to a statement accompanying the agenda that detailed a number of changes made in the proposed constitution since the previous meeting. Most of these were introduced to clarify the differences of responsibilities of the organized faculty, the Faculty Assembly, and the Committee on-Instruction. The Nursing constitution now resembles that of Engineering and Computer Science in the way it handles these matters. Ms. Wilson pointed out that the new language eliminates some redundancies. It also adds a new item to the list of NCAP duties to indicate that body's role in advising the FRPC on appropriate personnel matters. The Senate then approved the motion before it, and Mr. Kleckner pointed out that both constitutions must now win Board ratification before becoming official governance documents.

In order to provide time for President Champagne to report to the Senate before leaving for another engagement, Mr. Kleckner then revised the order of business announced in the agenda to move to a proposed resolution from the Steering Committee, introduced by Mr. Downing and seconded by Ms. Gerulaitis:

MOVED that the University Senate adopt the following resolution:

Whereas the University Senate endorses the principle of faculty consultation in the review of the President of the University, and

Whereas the Board of Trustees is in the initial steps of a review of the President of the University, therefore

Be it Resolved that the University Senate request each organized faculty to appoint as soon as possible 1 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 Senate requests the Board of Trustees or a committee of the Board to meet with the *ad hoc* Committee as soon as possible to consider the most effective means of gathering judgments in the presidential review process, and further

Be it Resolved that the *ad hoc* Committee shall submit to the Senate a report on the procedures for gathering faculty judgments and the uses which will be made of these judgments in the presidential review.

Mr. Kleckner launched discussion of this issue by furnishing some historical background. He reported that the Board has initiated the process of presidential review and recurred to the matter the day before this Senate meeting. That body will meet again next Thursday to consider the issue. Although Board members have not as yet determined precisely how to proceed with this review, they have decided to seek faculty counsel. Mr. Downing then explained that the impetus to this Steering Committee proposal came from a number of professors who directed questions to Steering Committee members about presidential review: whether such a process was happening or would soon happen, whether faculty would be consulted, and--if so--how? The Steering Committee, with laudable respect for tradition, recurred to its records to model the committee envisaged here on one convened some years back to assist in review of then President O'Dowd. Membership of the committee pretty much

follows the earlier design, although the charge varies somewhat in that it does not call for the new committee to establish a procedure for presidential review but instead proposes its acting harmoniously with the Board as that body formulates its plans. He mentioned that there had been some discussion on the Steering Committee about the wisdom of restricting membership from any one organized faculty to a single person. Mr. Khapoya then requested a definition of "organized faculty": a term drawn from the Senate Constitution to designate those faculty members from the College, each of the several schools, and the Library who are eligible to participate in University-level governance. Mr. Chipman wondered what timeframe was anticipated. Mr. Kleckner indicated that the first step would be to form this committee and notify the Board of its readiness to serve whenever summoned. He understood that the Board had not as yet fixed a calendar for its proceedings in this area. When Ms. Tripp asked whether this motion could receive a final vote at this meeting, she was assured that--as a procedural motion--it would be eligible for vote after one reading. Procedural motions are generally used for appointment of committees. Thus reassured, the Senate unanimously approved this resolution by voice vote.

At this point, Mr. Kleckner yielded the floor to President Champagne for a report on the just-announced capital development campaign. The President initiated his presentation by calling attention to a booklet that appeared in faculty mailboxes on Monday to announce the campaign and identify both its objectives and its groupings of key people. He then provided a brief historical background, reminding his fellow-Senators that the original feasibility study that was conducted in 1982-83 by the firm of Brakely, John Price Jones had determined that Oakland University was ready for some sort of major fund-raising effort. Encouraged thereby, the Board of Trustees in 1983 authorized a capital campaign to be conducted by the OU Foundation. This action set various efforts in motion, the first being to assemble a committee of community leaders that functioned initially as an ad hoc steering committee without a chair but has gradually been transformed into the Campaign Committee identified by name and corporate affiliation in the pamphlet. Eugene Miller, president of Comerica Incorporated, now serves as chair of that body--all of whose members are distinguished for their professional accomplishments and community service. During a one-and-a-half to two-year process of forging a marketable campaign, President Champagne met with every faculty assembly to keep them informed of emerging plans. He pointed out that a long silent period of preparation is necessary for clarifying goals in such an enterprise and for beginning the fund-raising process. A goal of \$15 million was established early and has been maintained. A long list of potential donors has been assembled and screened. Corporate screening has been accomplished also. Following Mr. Miller's acceptance of the chairmanship about a year ago, solicitation committees have been formed to carry on the work. Mr. Champagne invited Senators to read the brochure outlining the committee structure and promised a more elaborate campaign publication still to come.

Describing the campaign, the President pointed out that it has two major thrusts. The first of these objectives is to raise capital for specific purposes such as expansion of the Kresge Library for which \$4.5 million must be raised to match the state appropriation of \$7 million, purchase of scientific and computer equipment to meet widely felt needs for equipment upgrading to the amount of \$3.5 million, and amassing a \$2 million University Fund to channel gifts reflecting other specific donor values and to accommodate unrestricted gifts such as the McGregor Foundation's generous contribution (which has since been committed by the University to the Humanities). The second thrust or objective is to strengthen the ongoing funding process of the University by trying to increase the annual level of giving by an average of \$1 million a year

for a total of \$5 million. Associated with this goal is the Opportunity Fund that provides a broad-based way of increasing current support.

Concluding his presentation with a status report, Mr. Champagne indicated that the campaign was officially announced on Tuesday and already has many achievements to its credit. Support for the Kresge Library now totals \$3.5 million in gifts and pledges, including a gift of \$1 million by a family not yet publicly identified. He related a brief history of the University's negotiations with these benefactors by way of demonstrating how long it takes to secure a firm gift. Experience has confirmed Brakely's estimate that a three-year interval should be anticipated between the formal decision to launch a campaign and its public announcement. So far, \$7.1 million have been contributed toward the \$15 million goal, and contributions reflect support for all aspects of the campaign. This week's public announcement now allows University representatives to approach somewhat smaller donors, some of whom may want this year's tax benefits for charitable largesse.

Stressing that the purpose of a campaign transcends immediate raising of money, Mr. Champagne placed high value on the extension of the circle of persons who are committed to the University and concerned about its well-being. This objective has been fostered over the last three years by a barrage of publicity on faculty research and by a substantial buildup of the President's Club. Average alumni contributions have also been increased so that Oakland's level of such support now exceeds the national average for public universities. He pointed out that the Alumni Association has already raised \$300,1000 toward its million-dollar commitment. Alumni support fostered through this campaign will mean much to Oakland University in the future. The President declared himself convinced that we can meet or even exceed our goal, though confessing some surprise at the slowness of the preliminary process. He noted that our campaign places us in competition with several other worthy institutions within our region (including the University of Michigan) all of whom address their appeals to many of the same benefactors.

With questions invited from the floor and Mr. Rodwell identified as being present to assist with providing information, Mr. Stamps inquired what our status is with respect to other campaigns for educational institutions in Michigan. Mr. Champagne said that we are behind the University of Michigan in announcing its \$160 million goal and that Central has slowed down its campaign. Mr. Rodwell noted that Michigan Technological University has a \$40 million Champagne expected Michigan State University to launch its campaign shortly. Mr. Barnard then wondered whether Oakland's representatives had met any success in enlisting first-time donors with no previous record of major benevolence within the state. Mr. Champagne indicated this was the case in some instances. He noted that, when he came here, it was the Meadow Brook enterprises that motivated the bulk of annual giving to Oakland University; whereas the current campaign is targeted almost exclusively toward the academic side of the institution. This emphasis should be reflected in subsequent giving patterns and in new community appreciation of the teaching and research that go on here. He concluded the discussion by promising to keep the faculty posted and by assuring the Senate that cash gifts to the campaign will be spent, not banked, so that their effect may be promptly noted. Undesignated gifts will be put to appropriate use based on advice provided by the Provost and Deans. Mr. Kleckner then saluted his colleagues by observing that people limit their gifts to enterprises in which they have confidence: the institution has to be good. Oakland University faculty should be heartened by this recognition of institutional quality.

Mr. Kleckner then returned to the remaining item of new business on the agenda: a motion from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction recommending the inclusion of an ethical component within the undergraduate major (Moved, Ms. Eberwein; seconded, Mr. Burke):

MOVED that, since the study of moral values and issues is a fundamental part of a liberal education, each department or school offering an undergraduate degree should see that its majors are receiving adequate instruction in the analysis of moral issues relevant to its discipline. This instruction should entail at least a substantial component of a course (or the equivalent grouping of components of several courses) meeting one or more of the three criteria below, depending on the nature of the discipline:

1. critical evaluation of the reasoning employed on moral issues, with the aim of finding the most rational resolution of the issues;
2. historical or social-scientific analysis of moral dimensions of society, with the aim of showing how moral values arise and how they influence human behavior;
3. exploration of moral dimensions of the human condition through literature or the arts, with the aim of appreciating the variety and ambiguity of moral commitment in individual cases.

Where applicable, attention should be given within the departmental courses meeting this recommendation to the kinds of ethical decisions graduates are likely to face in the professions they are preparing to enter. Faculty members teaching these courses should make presentations of material as -- students the general attitudes prevailing within their disciplines.

Ms. Eberwein reminded her fellow-Senators that they had first heard about this proposal at the September meeting and reported that an open hearing later that month to glean reactions to an earlier draft had led to several discoveries that are reflected in the current motion. She noted that the hearing and other statements of opinion that reached UCUI demonstrated widespread support for the inclusion of ethical reasoning in undergraduate courses, although some persons preferred to think of it in terms of general education rather than the major. UCUI thought it more appropriate to the major although beneficial at earlier stages of education as well. Considerable objection was voiced to the monitoring function assigned to UCUI in the previous draft with the result that the offending language has been expunged from the current motion. There are no plans for weighing and measuring specific course components or approving catalog statements. This motion calls for a statement of shared purpose to include ethics in the undergraduate curriculum as part of the student's major, and it defines what we mean by the ethical instruction appropriate to an institution of higher learning. By its references to objectivity, it also indicates what we do not mean by this term: i.e. indoctrination. Passage of the motion by the Senate would pave the way for additional efforts to strengthen ethical instruction, such as presentation of workshops for faculty and invitation of visiting lecturers. For fuller discussion of the sponsors' intent, she deferred to Mr. Burke, who had chaired the *ad hoc* Committee on Ethics in the Curriculum.

Mr. Burke, confessing himself a bit afraid that the current version might not make enough

difference from what we are already doing to justify its enactment--given the deliberate omission of any sort of monitoring mechanism, professed himself satisfied on the basis of his committee's survey of faculty practices and attitudes that considerable ethical concern is already exemplified in Oakland University classes and that this benefit is accomplished without indoctrination. He hoped that approval of this motion by the Senate would cause departments to consider formally whether their majors are now getting sufficiently systematic exposure to the ethical thinking appropriate to their disciplines. Citing the recently released Carnegie Report that points to such instruction as desirable in undergraduate education, he noted that this proposal calls for something in addition to whatever a student might find in the general education program. The motion attempts to strengthen what is already being done.

Mr. Ketchum expressed support for the measure's intent but reservations about the means taken to achieve it. He wondered whether the Senate would be setting a precedent for legislating the specific content of an academic discipline. He suspected this body might be intruding too much into the classroom and the sensitive area of faculty prerogatives. Remarking that "There is content, and there is content," Mr. Kleckner pointed to the general education system as an instance of the Senate's declaring what a student should study. Mr. Copenhaver interpreted the language of the motion as exhorting something but not requiring and specific action. Nonetheless, Mr. Ketchum worried that the urging would come from a governance body beyond the departmental level. He feared pressure on faculty to deal with controversial moral issues that they might find difficult to present and had not been trained to teach. He cited a number of specific examples of biological issues that would be challenging to handle in a large introductory lecture and mentioned cases in other states of teachers being subjected to community pressure to teach "creation science" in their courses. Ms. Eberwein maintained that the motion calls for professors to introduce their students to a manner of thinking in respect to ethical questions rather than to teach any particular topics. The advantage of including this educational component within the major program rather than general education, she argued, is that instructors need not accomplish everything in one large lecture class for freshmen but can introduce ethical thinking into a number of classroom and laboratory situations that are likely to put them in regular contact with the students actively interested in their own fields. Mr. Copenhaver mentioned an issue of research ethics as an example of non-controversial moral thinking pertinent to Biology.

Still expressing concern, Mr. Ketchum suggested that the sponsoring committees delete reference to departments and schools from the motion and assign responsibility to individual instructors. Mr. Burke objected that the intention is precisely to vest responsibility in an academic unit, whichever one is closest to the course being taught. That caused Ms. Tripp to wonder, whether a department or school could ever tell an individual professor what to include in her/his courses. She objected to the motion as setting an unfortunate precedent. Indicating a measure of comfort with this particular proposal, Mr. Ketchum still wondered whether this is the way we want to go in reaching the goals we all share. Mr. Stamps said that he too felt some of Mr. Ketchum's concerns about professorial autonomy in the classroom and therefore preferred this proposal to earlier drafts in that it keeps control at the departmental level, close to the classroom. He also liked the sponsors' restraint in not requiring everything to be accomplished in one class but indicating that a major should be challenged to think about such issues over a prolonged period.

Mr. Khapoya took a radically different approach to the matter by voicing a preference for requiring each student to take a separate class in moral philosophy that would be taught by

faculty specifically educated in that field of study. He recalled with gratitude such a course that he had taken in college. It was his conviction that "Ethics is ethics" for persons studying in any discipline or headed toward any profession. While applauding the idea of introducing ethics into the curriculum, he thought such instruction the realm of philosophers rather than political scientists or business faculty. Mr. Burke thought otherwise: even if we could require every student to take an actual ethics course, he thought the result would be less satisfactory in that a Political Science major is likely to be more interested in what people working in his or her own field think than in the reflections of philosophers. Ms. Bingham mentioned the discovery several years ago that we could not find a way to fit a separate ethics course into each student's curriculum, and Mr. Burke recalled that efforts to incorporate such a requirement into general education had encountered frustrations. Mr. Clatworthy supported the motion for its presumed benefit in starting a healthy dialogue across the university and likened it in that respect to the goal of writing across the curriculum.

Mr. Chipman then introduced a modest word for bureaucracy, asking how anyone could hope to find out in a few years how this policy is actually working out. He would like to anticipate some sort of progress report. Mr. Kleckner thought it reasonable to assume that academic units might be asked occasionally what they were doing. He thought it unlikely that implementation of an academic policy would go entirely unreviewed. Mr. Hough suggested a biennial report from the Provost on ethics in the University. Mr. Burke preferred inclusion of this policy in the regular program review cycle.

A puzzling parliamentary question was raised by Mr. Grossman, who wondered why this proposal reached the Senate in the form of a motion. He thought a resolution more appropriate in stating an academic policy without provision for its enforcement. How, he inquired, does writing across the curriculum actually work? Mr. Copenhaver declared that a resolution expresses intention or desire. Noting that a resolution, unlike a regular motion, requires only one reading before a deliberative body, Mr. Burke argued that this issue merited full discussion on two occasions. He therefore preferred to have it presented as a motion even though legally a motion is no more binding than a resolution. Mr. Copenhaver suggested recasting the proposal in the graceful rhetorical form of a resolution while agreeing to abstain from voting on its initial presentation. Mr. Barthel thought it might be better to express the three itemized categories of ethical instruction as several alternatives among others instead of the only options. He also urged that departments be required at some point to formulate the ways in which they mean to accomplish the goals identified in this motion and to respond to some central group about what they are doing. Mr. Burke assured his colleagues that the intent of the motion would be achieved in whatever form the measure might pass the Senate. Once approved, it would become a part of the University's academic policy, and departments would be expected to take appropriate action. He liked Mr. Barthel's suggestion of options. Ms. Bingham pointed out that accreditation requirements provided extra incentive to cooperation by several academic units. Concerned about excessive tinkering with the committees' proposal, Mr. Stamps urged retention of the "shoulds" as a means of evading bureaucracy.

When Mr. Kleckner invited those desiring to encounter this proposal next month in the form of a resolution to make known their hopes to the Steering Committee, Ms. Eberwein objected that introduction of academic policy in the form of a resolution would violate Senate precedent. Her survey of the Senate Compendium indicates that this body has passed resolutions of thanks and of welcome but has never passed significant legislation in such a form. She worried about the precedent that might be set for acting on policy matters in one reading. Mr. Grossman inquired how many Senate motions feature the verb "should." Mr. Copenhaver

evaluated a resolution as legislatively the weaker of the two possible forms, and Mr. Stamps decided that he was prepared to reverse his earlier stand and support a softer reading. Mr. Burke maintained that a motion would have greater legal force than a resolution in that it directs each academic unit to perform an action. Ms. Terry suggested rewording the motion to establish a request rather than a demand, phrasing the matter as "each unit is asked to.." Mr. Hough thought that "will" or "shall" might substitute for "should." Ms. Bingham pointed out that the phrase "should examine" empowered a unit to conclude that it should not be doing anything at all by way of ethical instruction, but Mr. Ketchum rejoined that such latitude of interpretation conflicted with the intent of the motion. With Mr. Russell urging advance to the Good and Welfare section of the meeting by way of abbreviating this discussion, Mr. Kleckner predicted that the issue would recur on the December agenda in its current form, open to amendment at that time.

Mr. Barthel opened one final line of reasoning by asking whether "ethical" and "moral" are to be understood as synonyms. Mr. Burke thought they functioned so in practice even though Mr. Barthel indicated that "There are people out there worrying about morals who don't ever think about ethics." Mr. Copenhaver remarked that he would consider himself deeply educated if Mr. Barthel would explain to him the difference. According to Mr. Burke, philosophers tend to define practices as morals and reasoning about those practices as ethics; within this motion, however, the terms are used interchangeably. Mr. Copenhaver observed that academic institutions tend to appoint learned worthies to professorships of "moral philosophy" rather than "ethical philosophy."

Thus edified, the Senate adjourned hastily--upon motion of Mr. Hough--at 4:50 p.m. Immediately thereafter, Mr. Straughen requested the Secretary to notify the Senate of Mr. Faber's election to the presidency of the University Congress; he asked that his information be recorded in the minutes.

Respectfully submitted:
Jane D. Eberwein
Secretary to the University Senate

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E
Home Page