



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Seventh Meeting
Monday, April 30, 1990
Gold Room C, Oakland Center

MINUTES

Present: B. Abiko, S. Appleton, M. Arshagouni, D. Braunstein, D. Bricker, J. Briggs-Bunting, P. Cass, M. Coffey, G. Dahlgren, G. Dillon, R. Eberwein, R. Edgerton, I. Eliezer, W. Fish, S. Frankie, W. Garcia, J. Grossman, B. Hamilton, P. Hartman, A. Hormozi, J. Hovanesian, K. Kazarian, K. Kleckner, K. Kulig, A. Liboff, B. Murphy, R. Pettengill, J. Rosen, K. Salomon, M. Sherman, R. Tracy, A. Tripp, J. Urice, T. Weng, R. Williamson, H. Witt, S. Wood, C. Zenas
Absences: V. Allen, K. Beehler, P. Bertocci, K. Berven, F. Cardimen, J. Champagne, J. Chipman, J. Cowlshaw, J. Eckart, D. Herman, R. Horwitz, V. Larabell, A. Lindell, F. Mili, A. Meehan, D. Miller, R. Olson, G. Pine, V. Reddy, P. Schieber, J. Schimmelman, R. Schwartz, L. Stamps, B. Theisen, B. Winkler

The meeting was called to order by Provost Kleckner at 1:37 p.m., the agenda being the second reading of items introduced at the April 12, 1990, meeting.

Old Business:

A. Motion from the Committee on Human Relations to recommend emendation of the University's Equal Opportunity Policy (Mr. Hovanesian).

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President that the University's Equal Opportunity Policy be amended by replacing the word "sex" with the words "gender, sexual orientation".

Second Reading: Debatable, amendable and eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Mr. Murphy, Chair of the Committee on Human Relations, emphasized the Committee's new wording of this motion, the original version's "sexual preference" being replaced by "sexual orientation". This improvement so pleased the Senate that there was an immediate move to vote; the motion carried unanimously. This change will now be advanced to the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

B. Resolution from the Committee on Campus Development Environment (Ms. Stamps) (See [Agenda](#) for text).

Second Reading: Debatable, amendable and eligible and for final vote at this meeting.

Mr. Bricker called attention to an article in the *Oakland Press* quoting Interim Vice President Cardimen regarding proposed development of a convention center in the natural campus area and requested clarification regarding the intent of the University in this matter. Mr. Kleckner replied that a feasibility study by an outside firm is currently under way, and many people are being asked their opinions.

Mr. Bricker followed by asking what was being surveyed and whether faculty would be interviewed, and Mr. Liboff expressed concern that outside firms sometimes overlook academic concerns when making their recommendations. Mr. Bricker thought it may be too easy to jump from "feasible" to "desirable". Mr. Liboff wondered whether the present planning is considering only on-campus conference facilities or is cognizant of other facilities in the local area. Mr. Bricker again cautioned that an economic feasibility study is not enough, that more will have to be done to determine the desirability of such an endeavor, and that these further deliberations should include faculty input. Mr. Kleckner reassured the Senate that nothing would be built on the campus without much more discussion and input; there is no commitment to build a conference facility anywhere on campus at this moment. Mr. Dahlgren stated that department chairs and deans were scheduled to be surveyed by the outside firm.

Questions arose regarding the clout of the Senate on issues of this nature, to which Mr. Kleckner responded that the Senate has a recommending role. Ms. Garcia sought Mr. Bricker's recommendation on voting for the resolution at hand, to which Mr. Bricker recommended support. Upon a call of the question the resolution carried unanimously, after which Mr. Kleckner offered to check on the survey firm involved and the comprehensiveness of the survey.

C. Resolution on environmentally sound purchasing policies from the Committee on Campus Development and Environment (Ms. Stamps) (see [Agenda](#) for text).

Second Reading: Debatable, amendable and eligible final vote at this meeting.

Hearing no wish for further discussion at this, the second reading, Mr. Kleckner called for a vote, and the resolution carried unanimously.

D. Resolution from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee to endorse the [Strategic Guidelines for Oakland University](#) (Ms. Tripp) (see Agenda for text).

Second Reading: Debatable, amendable and eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Mr. Tracy noted the attachment to this Senate agenda of the petitions regarding research from several faculty groups, as Mr. Edgerton had requested at the last meeting. Questions arose regarding Appendix A and resolution concerns over funding; e.g., will focus monies come from:

- 1) new resources only; or
- 2) redirection of old funds?

Mr. Kleckner invited the Senate to offer its suggestions on how funding decisions should be made in our efforts to focus. Mr. Edgerton stated that he wanted the faculty petitions circulated so as to highlight the role of research at OU, in contrast to the muted role he believes the *Strategic Guidelines* give research. Mr. Tracy responded that the *Guidelines* call for

maintenance of OU's research efforts and for commensurate research support services. He stated that the faculty survey data collected by the APPC showed no overriding thrust in either direction (teaching or research) ; most people thought that the split between research and teaching was "just about right". He further noted that the call to emphasize research more heavily comes from a small but vocal group of faculty and was not perceived by the Committee to be representative of the entire faculty. He reminded the Senate that the need to focus and to be cognizant of economic realities were consensus items in the faculty survey data analyzed by the Committee to produce the *Strategic Guidelines*.

Mr. Liboff was disturbed by these statements of Mr. Tracy's, claiming that the 80 faculty signing the petitions is a substantial, important segment and that the sciences feel disenfranchised. Ms. Rosen asked for clarification, to which Mr. Liboff responded that budgeting factors and the draft *Guidelines* combine to raise strong feelings of disenfranchisement. At this point Mr. Dahlgren reminded the Senate that detailed unit plans for implementation of the *Guidelines* had not been prepared yet. Nonetheless, Mr. Liboff indicated his belief that the *Guidelines* imply that OU cannot do both teaching and research. On the other hand, Mr. Tracy emphasized his belief that the document does not hold that teaching and research are dichotomous. He continued that, in putting the document together, the APPC attempted to recognize the different perspectives of departments and units.

Mr. Braunstein felt the *Strategic Guidelines* to be sufficiently supportive of research to enable recruitment of future faculty researchers, but Mr. Edgerton disagreed. At this point Mr. Liboff asked Mr. Edgerton's intention regarding the introduction of an amendment to append the faculty petitions to the *Strategic Guidelines* for transmittal to the Board. Mr. Edgerton so moved, and the discussion shifted to his amendment.

Ms. Tripp noted that the APPC had these petitions in their hands during their deliberations, yet chose not to include them with the *Strategic Guidelines*; either all background materials or none should be appended. Mr. Fish believed that to some faculty the petitions were offensive, suggesting that they appear to have been generated by self-interest. Mr. Liboff reiterated that they represent eighty faculty, speaking together, who feel disenfranchised. Ms. Briggs-Bunting noted that there were over two hundred faculty not in agreement with the petitions. Mr. Kleckner cautioned senators not to perceive the University as a monolith; different departments may choose to move in different focused directions.

Mr. Braunstein asked what will happen to the petitions if the amendment is defeated, to which Mr. Kleckner replied that all material approved by the Senate would be transmitted to the President, with background materials available to anyone wishing to read them. If this amendment passes, the petitions would be formally transmitted to the President along with the *Strategic Guidelines*. Mr. Williamson questioned the appropriateness of the petitions for ultimate transmission to the Board, pointing out the difference between a research university and a university which does excellent research. Mr. Liboff emphasized that the view presented in the petitions should go to the Board.

Mr. Downing noted that there were two iterations of the *Strategic Guidelines* and asked for clarification regarding receipt by the APPC of the petitions. Mr. Tracy responded that the petitions came at the end of February or beginning of March and were included in the APPC's materials for at least two weeks prior to the final draft of the *Strategic Guidelines*. Mr. Weng stated his hope that if the amendment were defeated the petitions would be forwarded

anyway. Mr. Hovanesian suggested they could constitute a minority report, to which Ms. Tripp responded that there could be many minority reports if such a possibility were opened. She noted her belief that the petitions were self-serving. Mr. Braunstein argued defeat of the amendment, noting the efforts of all Schools and the College, each in their own way, to promote research and scholarship and arguing that passage of the amendment would not help boost the aspirations of all units.

Mr. Kleckner questioned whether the *Strategic Guidelines* were seen in any way as an impediment to research efforts. Ms. Rosen noted citations in the document in support of research, stating that the APPC took great pains not to produce a self-serving document. She spoke against creating a minority report.

At this juncture, the question was called, upon which the Edgerton amendment was defeated by voice vote.

Returning to the main motion, Mr. Liboff urged a "no" vote on the *Strategic Guidelines*, viewing them not to be supportive of the entire faculty's interests. Mr. Downing wondered how Appendix A (focusing) would be implemented. Mr. Kleckner responded that each academic unit will be asked, beginning in September 1991, to develop very clear goals and plans based on the *Guidelines*. These will be reviewed by both the administration and the APPC with regard to sharpness of focus. Mr. Liboff reminded the Senate that we have all done these sorts of activities previously and that the unit goals to be called for will have to be set in the context of scarce resources. He argued for an *a priori* statement of some overall direction, a signal of what units can do. Mr. Kleckner agreed with the constraint of scarce resources, but felt that choices should begin to be made at departmental/unit levels instead from the top down.

Mr. Fish believed Appendix A to be an adequate statement regarding focusing and suggested that units' proposals would need to include detail on how they proposed to accomplish what they set out to do. Mr. Liboff restated his preference for more direction from the administration. Considerable discussion ensued regarding how the process of focusing would occur. Mr. Liboff sought clarification about how this process would differ from past planning procedures, and Mr. Tracy gave his view of how the new process will function:

1. Academic units will develop their own plans for focused activities,
2. The APPC will evaluate these plans for congruity with the Strategic Guidelines,
3. The administration will determine the foci to receive incremental economic support, and
4. Evaluations will be conducted based on outcomes criteria for each focus.

Mr. Tracy then gave several examples and illustrations contrasting this planning activity with previous ones. At this point discussion came to a natural end and, upon chair's call for a vote, the resolution carried by voice vote.

New Business:

None.

Good and Welfare:

None.

Informational Items:

A. The appropriations process continues to unfold in Lansing. No funding "breakthroughs" are anticipated .

B. The new science/technology building project still has not moved forward to its next stage in Lansing. The meeting of the Joint Capital Outlay Committee to approve funding for second-stage architectural design is now expected to take place on either May 10 or May 17.

C. There is no news to report on the widening of Squirrel Road. Discussions continue with the City of Auburn Hills regarding price and road alignment.

Upon Mr. Kleckner's invitation of other questions, Mr. Liboff sought clarification on the Chrysler Technology Center project. Mr. Kleckner responded that the project is going forward as planned, though slightly delayed. The sale of the building and subsequent lease-back to Chrysler changes the form of the project's financing but not the calendar. Responding to Mr. Edgerton's question about the accords on multicultural concerns, Mr. Kleckner answered that work will continue over the summer to implement the provisions and to develop programs to support improved multicultural relations. Mr. Williamson inquired as to what the University's "payoff" has been from the adjacent technology park. Mr. Kleckner responded that there were various views of what constituted a "payoff", but that the University had received furniture and equipment donations, scholarship monies, grant dollars, assistance on specialized studies, small contracts, etc.

Upon proper motion, the meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Penny S. Cass

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page