



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 13 March 1986  
Seventh Meeting  
Rooms 128-130 Oakland Center

### *MINUTES*

**Senators Present:** Barclay, Barnard, Barthel, Bertocci, Blankenship, Boganey, Burke, Cass, Chapman-Moore, Chatterjee, Chipman, Copenhaver, Dahlgren, Diltz, Downing, Eberwein, Edgerton, Faber, Feingold, Frankie, Gerulaitis, Heubel, Hildebrand, Hough, Ketchum Khapoya, Kleckner, Metzner, Pettengill, Righter, Rozek, Russell, Schimmelman, Srodawa, Straughen, Swartz, Terry, Tripp

**Senators Absent:** Appleton, Bingham, Blatt, Cardimen, Champagne, Clatworthy, Evarts, Garcia, Grossman, Hamilton, Hartman, Herman, Hightower, Horwitz, Liboff, Lindell, Monahan, Moore, Pine, Reddy, Strauss, Witt.

#### Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 13 February 1986 (Tripp; Gerulaitis). Approved as corrected.
2. Motion to amend the constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences (Copenhaver; Grossman). Approved.
3. Motion regarding catalog requirements for concentrations and minors (Eberwein; Gerulaitis). Approved.
4. Motion to modify policy on catalog applicability (Eberwein; Gerulaitis) Approved.
5. Motion to approve a M.S. degree in Health Sciences (Dahlgren; Russell). First reading.
6. Motion regarding emeritus faculty rank (Hough; Righter). First reading.
7. Motion to extend time for passage between classes (Chipman; Downing). First reading.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m. with the intent to proceed expeditiously through a lengthy agenda. He called for approval of the minutes of 13 February 1986, noting that Senator Righter's name should be moved from the absent column to the present one. Ms. Tripp moved approval of the minutes, so corrected; and Ms. Gerulaitis seconded her motion. The Senate then approved the record of its sixth meeting without comment.

The first item of old business was the amendment to the constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences to provide for the addition or deletion of standing committees not envisaged in the original document (Messrs. Copenhaver and Grossman). No discussion ensued, and the amendment carried with unanimous support. The following language will, therefore, be presented to the President and the Board for inclusion in the College constitution as Article IV.v.:

In addition to the standing committees provided for herein, the Assembly, in

consultation with the Dean, shall establish such other standing committees as it deems necessary. Motions to establish standing committees must have two readings, on two separate meeting days, before the Assembly and require a two-thirds vote of all Assembly members for passage. Motions to abolish or to alter the composition or charge of any standing committee created by the Assembly under this provision must have two readings, on two separate meeting days, before the Assembly and require a two-thirds majority of all Assembly members for passage. Article IV. vi. Same as present Article IV. V.

This action cleared the way for discussion of more controversial topics in the form of two motions from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction.

Mentioning that last month's single motion from UCUI had been recast (on Senate advice) as two motions, Mr. Kleckner turned to Ms. Eberwein for comment. She thanked the Senate for its helpful counsel at the last meeting and pointed out how the new motion on catalog requirements for concentrations and minors reflected that advice (Moved, Ms. Eberwein; seconded, Ms. Gerulaitis). The proposal now allows rather than requires academic units to require students pursuing their minors or concentrations to file approved plans of study. Those that wish to do so must specify that requirement in the *Undergraduate Catalog*. The motion also provides, however, that a student has a right to negotiate such a written plan of study even if none is demanded by the sponsoring unit and establishes that that contract would be binding on both parties. In cases where no written plan of study is filed, the motion specifies that the catalog the student chooses for her/his major will apply also to concentrations and minors. She hoped that the Senate would look with favor on this motion as one that recognizes the varying practices of different academic units, offering flexibility for advisers and coordinators while building in protections for students--especially transfer students. Citing her own experience as one who literally inherited responsibility for a concentration upon the death of its coordinator, she emphasized the great value of clear written records. Before deferring to Ms. Chapman-Moore as a source of information for Senators with questions, Ms. Eberwein also mentioned the importance of this motion as one that plugs an existing policy gap in the catalog with respect to these non-major programs.

Ms. Feingold inquired about the word "negotiate" in the motion, wondering how much latitude it might give an adviser or coordinator to create an independent program apart from catalog specifications. Ms. Eberwein understood negotiation to mean that the coordinator and student could work out alternatives for required courses that are irregularly offered. Mr. Kleckner suggested that such agreements would frequently involve classification of transfer courses. Ms. Chapman-Moore assured her colleagues that any such negotiations would have to be based on catalog requirements for an existing minor or concentration. When Mr. Barthel wondered whether it would help to change the language to read "negotiate modifications or changes," Ms. Chapman-Moore judged the existing language preferable in that it allowed the student to clarify catalog statements and affirm them in writing as well as to make plans for alternatives. Mr. Kleckner stressed that no plan exists to let anyone create a whole new minor or concentration through such agreements. With these concerns quieted, the Senate approved the motion:

**MOVED** that effective Fall 1987 any department or concentration committee may require that a student file an approved plan of study for a concentration or minor in order to complete the requirements for that concentration or minor. This plan of

study may be based on any catalog in effect at the time the plan of study is filed, but not one predating the student's matriculation to Oakland University. Any academic unit requiring this documentation shall so state in the undergraduate catalog as part of its minor/concentration description.

A student may, for his/her clarity, negotiate a minor or concentration in writing with the program coordinator. This is particularly encouraged for those students using transfer courses to satisfy some portion of the program.

Changes to an approved written plan of study require prior authorization from the coordinator.

In the absence of a plan of study establishing the individual requirements of the minor or concentration, the student is bound for purposes of the minor or concentration to the catalog which he/she selects for the major.

Ms. Eberwein then introduced the second motion from UCUI, this one modifying the current policy on catalog applicability (Ms. Eberwein; Ms. Gerulaitis). This motion also, she pointed out, had been modified in response to Senate advice. New wording now highlights the one substantial policy change: introduction of a two-catalog option for all students by which they may separate university requirements from those of the major. She noted that existing policy had been retained on other points: the temporal duration of catalog applicability and the right of an academic unit to require students transferring into its programs to follow the catalog then in effect or substitute a later one to fulfill the requirements of the major. She also noted that the revised motion classifies distribution requirements (as yet, only characteristic of Arts and Sciences) as part of the major program rather than as general education. Ms. Eberwein hoped that, as this motion refrains from establishing catalog language (leaving that to the Provost's Office, advised by whatever legal and stylistic counselors it recruits), Senators could concentrate their attention on the policy issues for which they have principal responsibility. She then deferred to Senators Chapman-Moore and Downing as members of the subcommittee that formulated this motion.

Ms. Terry wondered whether the Records Office knew that this policy would go into effect this very semester and whether the staff there felt able to handle the materials for persons who have already applied for graduation. Ms. Chapman-Moore reassured her that the Registrar serves on the subcommittee that formulated this motion, that he knows the pressures it could impose on his office and feels confident that the policy can go smoothly into immediate effect. Mr. Kleckner hoped that prompt application of the two-catalog policy could stave off an otherwise probable onslaught of petitions of exception. With this matter clarified, the motion carried without objection:

**MOVED** that effective Winter 1986 a dual catalog policy be established to allow students to complete requirements for the major from one catalog, and the university and general education requirements from a second catalog. (University requirements are currently defined as the residence requirement, G.P.A. of 2.0, 32 credits at the 300 level and above, the writing proficiency requirement, and for students who have enrolled since September 1985 would also include general education). Neither catalog can be more than six years old at the time of graduation or predate the student's matriculation at the university; although a student

changing major may be required by his or her new academic unit to follow, for major courses only, a catalog no earlier than that in effect at the time of admission to the new major program. A student changing major must satisfy general education requirements associated with the new major. Distribution requirements for any school or college (currently only the College of Arts and Sciences) are considered, for these purposes, major requirements, not general education.

Mr. Kleckner then thanked UCUI, Its chair, and the Senate for this apparently satisfactory resolution of a thorny academic issue. He commended everyone concerned and judged the two-catalog policy a good step forward.

With old business dispatched, Mr. Metzner proceeded to lighten the burden of new work pressing upon the body by withdrawing the new constitution of the School of Engineering and Computer Science from the agenda. This document had been approved by the school's Assembly, but faculty members discovered problems with language when it reached the referendum stage. The faculty, therefore, chose to withdraw the matter from Senate consideration at this time in order to look over the disputed section more carefully. No objections to this decision having been voiced, the Senate moved with dispatch to the next item of business: a motion from the Graduate Council. Mr. Dahlgren, seconded by Mr. Russell, introduced the following motion:

**MOVED** that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of an M.S. program in Health Sciences to be offered by the School of Health Sciences.

Given the floor by Mr. Dahlgren, who had reported Graduate Council endorsement of this proposal, Mr. Russell offered a brief history of its emergence, dating back to a fall 1984 study group. He asserted that the School of Health Sciences hopes to provide a valuable public service to the health community by helping teaching hospitals build a strong scholarly component into the education of physicians. He reported that his colleagues had benefited greatly from the advice of that community in developing the proposal that had circulated to the Senate.

Mr. Burke, confessing that he had not as yet perused the entire document, wondered whether an ethics course was envisaged for these doctors. Mr. Russell replied that ethics would not be encompassed among the core courses but was under active consideration as an elective. No further discussion ensued immediately, leaving Mr. Kleckner to wonder whether his fellow--Senators had been suffocated in paper or whether, instead, the issue facing the group was simply too clear-cut for debate. Just as he considered setting the matter aside for the day, however, Mr. Copenhaver called for a more detailed rehearsal of the review processes to which this proposal had been exposed. Mr. Russell replied that it had been reviewed first by his school's Curriculum and Policy Committee before advancing to the Assembly, which called for several improvements. once through the Assembly, it went to the Graduate Council, where he purposely delayed its advance during his service as Interim Dean of Graduate Studies. The Graduate Council referred the proposal to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee, which raised a number of questions to which the Graduate Council then attended. Mr. Russell declared himself impressed with the thoroughness of the reviews that had been conducted and reported with satisfaction that all of these studies had resulted in approvals. The most significant modification in response to APPC and Graduate Council advice is to be found on the

budget pages of the proposal. The School of Health Sciences has been given two years to obtain external funding to support a second physician faculty member, and its Dean voiced optimism about prospects for grants.

Ms. Blankenship then inquired who would be the students. Mr. Russell estimated that virtually all of them would be physicians, as normal entrance requirements demand either an M.D. or D.O. degree along with a license to practice medicine in this country. He thought the program would attract hospital residents, mainly, but would have some appeal as well to physicians already in practice. He noted that the program could be completed in one year by full-time students; although few such degree candidates are expected. Mr. Downing later asked whether any review body had considered the overall effect of this program on University enrollments and what the impact might be of adding this special group of students. Mr. Dahlgren felt confident that the Graduate Council had examined this matter closely and established that these would be entirely new students. No losses to existing programs are expected.

Mr. Ketchum then probed to find out how much of this program would be offered and controlled on campus and what proportion would be handled by hospitals. Initially, according to Mr. Russell, the program would be conducted entirely on campus; provision exists, however, for some courses to be taught eventually in hospitals to reach a more extensive population. Academic governance would always be under Oakland University control. When Mr. Ketchum wondered whether our faculty would be going to hospitals to conform offerings to medical schedules, Mr. Russell responded that the hospitals had expressed willingness to free up time for degree candidates among their residents to come to the University--probably to the Health Enhancement Institute. Mr. Ketchum then inquired how this program fits into hospital accreditation requirements and learned that it would strengthen their ability to demonstrate the necessary scholarly resources--especially in research design. Mr. Chipman reassured his colleagues with his assertion that the APPC had carefully reviewed the issue of Oakland University control of this program and felt satisfied with its findings.

Ms. Gerulaitis asked what attraction there might be in a master's degree following upon a doctorate. She wondered why this program had to be envisaged as leading to a degree. Mr. Russell indicated that the medical marketplace is changing in ways that make this a most attractive credential, especially for residents aspiring to eventual hospital fellowships. Speaking for his colleagues in Biology, Mr. Ketchum asked about the academic rigor of these courses. He doubted whether they would add sufficient depth to undergraduate offerings and questioned whether they would stimulate students already in possession of doctorates. Mr. Russell noted that the course descriptions in the proposal are very preliminary--subject to much filling in by curricular specialists. He felt confident that the curriculum would be adequately rigorous, especially as new medical doctors often lack the research skills of our most advanced science undergraduates. On that promising note, discussion of the Health Science proposal terminated for the day.

The next agenda item emerged from the deliberations of the ad hoc Committee on Emeritus Faculty Rank that was formed by the Steering Committee last fall in response to a Good and Welfare initiative in the Senate. Mr. Kleckner remarked on the rapid progress of this group, chaired by Mr. Matthews, and called the attention of his colleagues to the record of previous Senate action on the issue that accompanied the agenda. Mr. Hough, seconded by Mr. Righter, placed the motion on the floor:

MOVED that, upon appropriate nomination and recommendation, the title and status of professor emeritus(a) may be conferred upon any eligible member of the Oakland University faculty upon retirement.

a. To be eligible for nomination to this honor, the faculty member must be tenured at the time of retirement and have had continuous full-time service as a member of the faculty for at least 15 years prior to retirement; those whose initial appointments were at the level of associate professor or professor must have been tenured at Oakland University for at least 10 years.

Special Provision (expires 30 June 1987)

Academic units may nominate colleagues who retired between 14 August 1981 and 14 August 1985 and who met the eligibility requirements stated above, but who were not awarded emeritus(a) title and status. For these cases as for all others, the procedures laid down in c, d, and e below should be followed. b. In exceptional and rare circumstances, and for demonstrated good cause, emeritus(a) title and status may be awarded to a tenured faculty member who resigns (as distinct from retires) his/her appointment for purposes of accepting academic appointment elsewhere, or for other honorable purposes. The case for such exceptional award must be documented powerfully by the nominating academic unit and be found persuasive by the President and the Board of Trustees.

c. Nomination should be initiated by the eligible retiree's primary academic unit (college, school, department, center) by procedures established by the academic unit itself.

d. The nomination should be made in writing to the appropriate Dean by the academic unit. In the event an academic unit fails to nominate an otherwise eligible retiree within one year from the announcement of intent to retire, the Dean may request a recommendation. A negative recommendation must be accompanied by a strong statement of cause. The Dean may not veto a positive recommendation except for matters of fact, such as length of service and the like; he/she may insist upon review of a negative recommendation.

e. The Dean forwards the nomination, with his or her recommendation, to the Provost and the President. Emeritus(a) status is effective upon action of the Board of Trustees.

f. A professor emeritus(a) shall:

- Be listed in the appropriate University catalog, if he/she so wishes;
- Be listed in the University Telephone Directory, if residence in the nearby area is maintained and if he/she so wishes;
- Receive a proper identification card indicating the emeritus(a) title and status;
- Be invited to attend all University ceremonials, processions, commencements, and convocations;
- Have the right to attend meetings open to the faculty, but without the right of vote on any matter, unless specifically empowered;

- Enjoy such additional rights and privileges as Oakland may determine.

Mr. Hough summarized the earlier Senate policy that limited award of the emeritus title to very special circumstances and called attention to the sponsoring committee's insightful and delightful presentation of its recommendations. Mr. Kleckner explained that Mr. Matthews would be unavoidably absent from this initial reading of the motion and then looked in vain for the three Senators who served on the committee. Their absence left him and Mr. Hough to explain the mysteries of this proposal.

Mr. Ketchum asked the definition of "intent to retire," wondering how formal an announcement would be expected. Mr. Kleckner explained that retirement is either mandatory or early (with application dates set in the contract). The language of this motion means the formal declaration to Oakland University of intent to retire. Mr. Ketchum then pursued his questioning with an inquiry about who would conduct the review that might be requested by the Dean. According to Mr. Kleckner, It would be the originating unit or (more accurately) the one that had failed to initiate a positive recommendation. When Mr. Ketchum remarked that he doubted the functional merit of such a system, the Provost suggested that the unit might or might not change its mind when invited to reflect. Mr. Burke, observing that the intent of the legislation was obviously to be very liberal, could not imagine how a department could have a negative recommendation. He requested an example of such a case. Mr. Kleckner expressed reluctance to spin out a scenario. He thought it conceivable that a department that had not submitted a recommendation might, when asked by the Dean to conduct a review, say no upon due consideration. Mr. Swartz pointed out that the Dean is under no obligation to call for a recommendation; he thought it conceivable that a person might not be reviewed and might never be declared emeritus. Mr. Hough, noting that the motion would place a difficult burden on departments that would like to let the issue slide by in any particular case, recognized that decanal action could force a negative recommendation. On the other hand, he presumed that a simply worded favorable recommendation would go forth as a matter of course. Mr. Downing noted that the Dean could let the matter drop quietly simply by not requesting a review.

Mr. Copenhaver, having been startled recently by the discovery that the College of Arts and Sciences is not classified within the Faculty Agreement as an academic unit, hoped that item 3.c. ensured that the College would be part of this process. Messrs. Kleckner and Ketchum, however, interpreted the diction to establish that the department rather than the College would carry out reviews. The smallest administrative home that shelters the faculty member would have primary responsibility. That news prompted Mr. Copenhaver to suggest deleting the word college from the motion.

It occurred to Mr. Ketchum that this policy would create as many sets of criteria for emeritus status as the University has departments. There would be no uniformity to begin with but only reliance on local practice until precedent and upper-level administrative decisions gradually exerted their unifying influence. Mr. Kleckner referred back to the committee's recommendation that this title and status normally accompany retirement if rank and length of service prove satisfactory. The policy allows for occasional non-recommendation for this honor but does not suggest negative decisions as normative.

Mr. Willoughby expressed surprise at finding no criteria for excellence in this proposal. He asked whether he was laboring under a false assumption in supposing that an emeritus/a should be distinguished within his or her professional field. Mr. Kleckner hoped to corral some

committee members to speak to that point at the second reading. Mr. Hough, however, found evidence of committee thinking in the section of the report that cited the *Oxford English Dictionary* as defining an emeritus as one who has completed a long term of service without public scandal. Mr. Kleckner reported that several persons, including committee members and himself, have been investigating practices elsewhere and have found no consistency. University of Michigan officials simply assume that any faculty member there is obviously so distinguished as to deserve this rank. On the other hand, Mr. Dahlgren spoke recently with an administrator of another university in a neighboring state who indicated that her institution is now switching from a policy of universality to one of restriction in awarding this title. The dictionary, Mr. Kleckner noted, defines emeritus as meaning retired. Mr. Copenhaver then volunteered his Latin learning, in the absence of Mr. Matthews, who would have been prepared to handle this issue. He explained that emeritus constitutes the passive perfect participle of the verb *emeritor*, which is simultaneously the root of the English words merit and meretricious. Mr. Willoughby was not, therefore, out of bounds in associating qualitative impressions with the adjective then in question. A Roman *emeritus*, however, was simply a soldier who finished twenty years of service without disgrace. The Senate, thus enlightened, deferred further inquiry until its next meeting.

Mr. Chipman then introduced the final item of new business with the following motion (seconded by Mr. Downing):

**MOVED** that the class scheduling matrix be modified to allow a 13-minute interval between classes.

Considering the motion as self-explanatory, he stood ready to answer any questions on behalf of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee. Mr. Kleckner mentioned that the issue emerged from the University Congress, which responded with particular concern to difficulties of handicapped students. He pointed out that the APPC had studied the Congress recommendation on scheduling and discerned general advantages in extending passage time to thirteen minutes. The issue was a familiar one for the Senate, having been anticipated last fall by Mr. Carbone, and elicited no discussion.

When Mr. Kleckner called for private resolutions or statements of concern for the good of the order, Ms. Tripp raised a question about why the University closed evening classes on Monday, February 17. Her colleagues wondered what procedures exist for reaching such decisions and notifying students- many of whom received conflicting signals from various university offices with the result that some persons drove great distances to find closed doors. As closing night classes frequently has the effect of eliminating a full week's instruction, she thought it would be better to clear parking lots early in the day and commence business at noon. When Mr. Kleckner responded that "We closed classes that day because I screwed up" and offered to turn over his snow-sage duties to anyone who wanted them, Ms. Tripp replied that she didn't really want to know that. Nonetheless, the Provost proceeded to detail the events of that unfortunate day. Heavy snow through the night, combined with the flu outbreak that kept some crew members home, prevented clearance of the lots by early morning. Weather reports predicted intense cold that would freeze the slop irretrievably. Mr. Catton's critical requests to close the University were rebuffed; but, when it became apparent that snow closings throughout the area meant that most off-campus evening classes were prevented in any case, the decision was made to close all evening classes--on or off-campus. Given the change of weather that brought mild temperatures late in the day, this decision proved a faulty one that resulted in Oakland's snow



emergency starting after everyone else's was over.

The issue, according to Mr. Kleckner, is how to plow more efficiently, especially in windy conditions. Hindsight told him that he should have stalled on that morning's action. He explained the normal procedures for making snow day decisions, explaining that most such judgments are made, in effect, by Mr. Catton, who drives here from near Flint and assesses road conditions along the way as well as the situation he finds on campus. Standard procedures exist for notifying the media. Once classes have started on any given day, however, the Provost finds himself involved in decisions. Declaring himself as concerned as anyone for the academic integrity of evening classes, he regretted that day's hasty decision and deplored the rumor mill that prevented news from getting out in the properly planned sequence. When Ms. Tripp asked whether the University could establish a telephone number all students could call for a recorded announcement, he welcomed her suggestion as a good idea. It was his hope that snow emergencies had ended for this winter--a notion obviously not shared by many of his auditors, who, he warned, would be trudging through lots of snow before the University would close again.

With that issue clarified, Mr. Kleckner presented a few brief information items. He projected that this would be the penultimate Senate meeting with the regular April 10 session the conclusion of the governance year, but he advised his colleagues against erasing the April 17 backup date from their calendars as yet. He then reported on construction plans, expressing hope that the library project might be expanded through the development campaign to build an endowment for acquisitions--thereby beginning to fill the shelves that would be constructed with state funds. The science building is now in a rough planning stage. The University hopes to get a preliminary proposal to Lansing soon to jar loose some money for formal planning. Such promptitude might speed up consideration of that building by a year, so quick though deliberate progress is to be encouraged.

Mr. Willoughby then called for adjournment, and the Senate concluded its business at 4:23 p.m.

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

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**SENATE**

*Home Page*