



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 20 September 1984
First Meeting
128, 129, 130 Oakland Center

MINUTES

Senators Present:* Appleton, Boganey, Burke, Butler, Bledsoe, Cass, Champagne, Chapman-Moore, Chipman, Christina, Copenhaver, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Edgerton, Eliezer, Evans, Federlein, Frankie, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hammerle, Hartman, Heubel, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lindell, McCabe, McClory, Moore, Moorhouse, Pine, Russell, Schimmelman, Shichi, Snider-Feldmesser, Strauss, Tomboulion, Tripp, Williamson.
Senators Absent: Bertocci, Boddy, Brown, Coppola, Downing, Evarts, Feeman, Hamilton, Hough, Howes, Scherer, Schwartz, Splete, Workman, Windeknecht, Tracy.

*The secretary, in a fit of absent-mindedness, forgot to circulate the traditional attendance sheet. This roster has been prepared, therefore, on the basis of communal tradition and folklore. Should any Senator be misrepresented on this listing, that worthy need only call the Provost's Office to have the record corrected.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

1. Minutes of 12 April 1984 (Lindell; Cass). Approved as corrected.
2. Minutes of 23 April 1984 (Grossman; R. Eberwein). Approved.
3. Steering Committee Election (Mr. Arnold). Linda Hildebrand elected.
4. Motion to confirm certain faculty to fill vacancies on standing committees (Edgerton; Tripp). Approved.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m., welcoming his colleagues back to the second half of the term. He introduced Dean Butler from the School of Engineering and Computer Science as a new Senator and observed that three members?Senators Burke, Hammerle, and Tomboulion?have been serving this body (at least intermittently) since the Senate first convened in January 1960. He noted with interest that the minutes of that historic occasion recall that Chancellor Varner began the meeting with a request that future gatherings begin on time. This not being an introductory meeting, it necessarily began with consideration of the minutes of the meetings that ended the 1983-84 academic year. The minutes of 12 April 1984 were approved as corrected in a memorandum from Mr. Chipman (Moved, Ms. Lindell; seconded, Ms. Cass) and those of 23 April accepted without comment (Moved, Mr. Grossman; seconded, Mr. Eberwein).

No old business remained from the previous year to be transacted, so attention turned at once to the first item of new business: election of a Steering Committee member to replace Nadia Boulos, who is on leave. Harvey Arnold conducted the election for the Senate Elections Committee, ably assisted by Ms. Schimmelman. After two names were submitted from the

floor, Ms. Gerulaitis (seconded by Ms. Cass) moved to close nominations, a suggestion that incurred no opposition. Linda Hildebrand was elected to the position.

The remaining item of new business on the agenda was a motion to elect faculty members to certain standing committees, thereby filling vacancies caused by departures and leaves (Moved, Mr. Edgerton; seconded, Ms. Tripp). The following committees acquired replacement personnel and/or leadership:

Academic Policy and Planning Committee

Brian Sangeorzan to replace Elizabeth Titus (1984-86)

Lynne Williams to replace Oded Izraeli (1984-85)

Academic Standing and Honors Committee

Mary Sherman to replace Richard Rozek (1984-86)

General Education Committee

William Fish to replace Jean Easterly (1984-86)

Teaching and Learning Committee

Harvey Burdick to serve as chair (1984-85)

Margaret Pigott to replace Joan Rosen (1984-85)

William Hoffman to replace William Bryant (fall 1984)

Robert Schwartz to replace Janet Krompart (fall 1984).

Several Senators raised questions, though none proposed actual motions, for the good of the order. Mr. Strauss inquired what had happened to several fleeting issues that might have been expected to crop up on the agenda. He specifically wondered about consideration of undergraduate admissions standards (to come before this body shortly in terms of the Commission on University Excellence report) and bookstore pricing (to be placed on the agenda by the Steering Committee). Mr. Williamson wondered which fee, admissions or registration, had been doubled this year from \$20.00 to \$40.00 and learned from Mr. Kleckner that it was the registration fee. Both he and Mr. Christina urged fee reduction on a sliding scale for students who enroll in one-to-three-credit workshops. They argued that these offerings, mainly provided for teachers, serve as recruiting devices and hoped that applicants would not be discouraged from sampling Oakland University academic programs by a prohibitive registration fee. Mr. Burke then inquired about the mysteries of off-campus charges, asking why students should be assessed higher tuition off campus for a lower level of services. Mr. Kleckner responded that such persons pay no fees so that their total costs figure out about the same as those for on-campus students. He also pointed out that the University pays rental for those classrooms and provides on-site registration, advising, and bookstore services. When Mr. McCabe assumed that there must be a sliding fee scale for on-campus courses, he was urged to consult each semester's schedule of classes for information. Ms. Chapman-Moore then concluded the good and welfare section of the meeting on a gracious note by thanking faculty for their active and helpful participation in summer orientation sessions.

By way of information, Mr. Kleckner notified the Senate that the Steering Committee has staggered the terms of UCUI members, as noted on the agenda, to the effect that Ms. Cass and Messrs. Briod and Sidaway will serve one-year terms, while Messrs. Cramer, Downing, Rozek,

and Wagner will carry on their efforts until 1986. Length of term depends on the laws of chance.

Helen Schwartz then addressed the Senate with an interim report from its Academic Computing Committee, whose members call attention to alarming problems with the Honeywell mainframe computer and warn that the University's time to respond to a predictable emergency is rapidly diminishing. She pointed out that increased academic use of the mainframe has resulted in service snarls in the second week of this semester that would normally not develop until late in the term. The equipment is often under repair with its power wasted on housekeeping. Overloaded telephone communication capacities discourage dial-in use from homes and offices and thereby prevent persons from taking advantage of the sophisticated equipment newly available for homes. Faculty require more space and better processing speed for their research. She itemized three options available to the University: (1) making no fundamental change but settling for band-aid expenses; (2) switching to a new system and computer company, recognizing that transfer would entail at least a year of reduced function; and (3) upgrading our current multics system with a 70% increase in processing power and 50% increase in main memory while adding 32 additional lines into the computer. The third option, preferred by the committee, conforms to Mr. Morschek's five-year plan for system upgrading and was assigned highest priority by last year's Academic Computing Committee. She advised that system upgrading must occur during the winter break in order to help next semester's classes and prevent disruption of teaching / learning functions. When Mr. Edgerton asked what help she requested at this stage, Ms. Schwartz urged Senators to lobby on this issue but proposed no actual resolution. She read names of committee members and requested Senators to express their concerns to her or her colleagues.

President Champagne then took the floor to present his own report to Senate colleagues, commenting beforehand in response to Professor Schwartz's Senate statement that he is well aware of computer needs and costs but recognizes a need to strike a balance between this expenditure and another seven-million-dollars-worth of projected costs that beset the University. He expressed appreciation for the committee's advice before moving into a more general report that showed the parameters within which Oakland University operated in planning the 1984-85 budget, its first to show a deficit.

To give a feel for the basic fiscal picture, Mr. Champagne pointed out the proportions of our budget now funded by the state (less than half), by tuition (more than half), and by other revenues (comparatively little). He then demonstrated the breakdown of major expense categories, with compensation proving substantially the largest budgetary factor. Then, with a series of fifteen slides, he demonstrated Oakland University's decline in state funding since 1977 by contrast to comparable public colleges and universities; we are now approximately in twelfth place in terms of state appropriations per student. Given the complexity of our academic offerings, no curricular justification can now be offered to excuse such disparity in support. We have been the victims of unfunded enrollment growth. Since our expenditures are closer to those of comparable institutions than are our state allocations, tuition has increasingly been called upon to make up the difference until this year's gubernatorially mandated tuition freeze. Until last year, however, the increase in Oakland University fees always lagged behind the consumer-price index, and it is again back below that index for 1984-85. In - employee compensation per Fiscal Year Equated Student (FYES), this University lagged behind other institutions until 1983-84 but has since made progress to the effect that its compensation levels now approximate the state system average except for the three biggest universities. On the other hand, work-load statistics are less gratifying; Oakland has fewer

employees per student than have the twelve comparable state schools, and its personnel (APs as well as faculty) cope with the heaviest workload in the state. Despite enrollment growth since 1977, particularly impressive by contrast with declining population almost everywhere else, our funding level vis-a-vis other institutions has remained about the same with the consequence that we now live with a funding imbalance equivalent to 1400 unsupported FYES while other institutions are paradoxically being supported to educate nonexistent students. At this point, the President estimates that this University is underfunded relative to other Michigan colleges to the extent of nearly four-million dollars.

The solution Mr. Champagne sees to our problem is eventual return to formula funding to correct an imbalance that could make Oakland University increasingly non-competitive. In his efforts to inform the community about Institutional needs, he presented this slide report to the Board last summer and now brings it to the Senate. He has also had spread-sheets prepared to make Oakland's case for Governor Blanchard's Commission on Higher Education; these sheets demonstrate graphically that the average increase in state allocations since 1977 has been twice as great to schools that declined in enrollment as to those that grew. The citizens of Michigan, he averred, need to understand the absolute inequity, even irrationality, of the current lack of system in budgeting for higher education. To remedy public ignorance, he and three other university presidents testified this week before the gubernatorial Commission. He expects a positive report (with a proposal for formula funding) from that body, and he anticipates that its members will address themselves actively to the need for capital improvements. With more guarded enthusiasm, he anticipates the Commission to concern itself as well with role and mission statements for each institution?at least to the extent of requesting legislation to initiate a process of self definition affecting curricular offerings.

The immediate budget problem we face?consisting of a half-million-dollar deficit projected for fiscal 1984-85?results from two executive orders (one by Governor Milliken and the other by Governor Blanchard) that appear officially as deferrals in funding legislation. Oakland University has not joined some other schools in using this sum to balance our books at the end of the year; nevertheless, the state owes us a debt of one-and-a-half-million dollars. If that money ever comes in, we will use it for high-priority needs such as upgrading the Honeywell system; but there is little reason for optimism about its arrival. With pressure exerted from Lansing to prevent a tuition increase this year, Oakland has had to adopt its first deficit budget. The possibility exists that enough money can be cut here and there for the University to end the year without an actual deficit. There will be no money to carry over into 1985-86, however; so, if similar tuition restraints are imposed, a deficit approaching two-million dollars may be projected. The President applauded the generosity of this year's state appropriation increase to higher education, noting that Governor Blanchard has raised our base appropriation, but observed that the tuition freeze created a serious problem.

In discussion following this presentation, Mr. Edgerton inquired about another gubernatorial commission: the one on the infrastructure. Mr. Champagne knew too little about its work to comment so early in its period of service. He introduced the subject of Proposal C (Taxpayer's Choice) on the November ballot and announced that the Board has called a special meeting in early October to consider its appropriate response. There is no way that Proposal C, if passed, can help Oakland University. Specific injuries to be dreaded cannot yet be enumerated, but experience shows that higher education must be expected to suffer significantly from a massive decline in state revenues. Thus Informed and having discharged its modicum of business, the Senate adjourned (upon motion of Mr. Copenhaver) at 4:28 p.m.

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



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E