



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 26 September 1991
First Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Abiko, Appleton, Benson, Braunstein, Briggs-Bunting, DeCarlo, Chipman, Cowlshaw, Cramer, Dahlgren, Downing, Griggs, Grossman, Halsted, Hansen-Smith, Heintz, Hormozi, Hough, Kevern, Kim, Kleckner, Mabee, McKay, Mittelstaedt, Olson, Otto, Pierson, Rush, Russell, Schultz, Stamps, Stano, Urice, Wood.

Senators Absent: Bennett, Campbell, Cass, Eckart, Frankie, Garcia, Hartzler, Hovanesian, Jackson, Kheir, Pine, Porter, Reddy, Shepherd, Stevens, Swartz, Witt, Zenas.

Summary of Actions

1. Report on presidential search (Trustee Googasian).
2. Minutes of 11 April, 14 May, and 30 May 1991 (Chipman; Hough). Approved.
3. Move to close nominations (McKay; Stamps). Approved
4. Steering Committee election (Senate Elections Committee).
5. Nominations to Senate standing committees (Braunstein; Hormozi). Approved.

At 3:14 p.m., Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order, extending a welcome to all senators and especially to those beginning their service in that capacity. He noted that even the newcomers had quickly intuited the conventions of the order as shown by their disposition to avoid the front row of seats. he then began the business year by introducing Trustee Phyllis Law Googasian to report on the activities of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Presidential Search Process, which she chairs.

Ms. Googasian, explaining that she came at the chair's invitation to report on the current status of the search process, professed herself glad to see so many familiar faces and hoped for opportunity to renew acquaintance later with persons she had not yet met. Referring back to the June meeting at which the Board appointed Mr. DeCarlo to serve as Interim President, she expressed gratitude to those forthright members of the university community who confronted the Board that afternoon with their dissatisfactions. Their reaction resulted in several loosely organized meetings in which faculty members discussed their concerns with Board members, thus greatly improving communication. Trustees, who listened attentively on those occasions, now perceive much good coming out of an originally difficult situation. Her subcommittee colleagues, whom she praised as the hardest working, best prepared, and most thoughtful group with whom she has ever collaborated, have learned from that June meeting and are now convinced that the process to be followed is at least as important as the eventual appointment. By listening to people at this point, they hope draw up the best possible set of guidelines against which to measure candidates. They also intend to keep the community as well informed

as possible throughout the entire search.

She reported that Board Chair Sims launched the search back in June by naming Trustees Chunovich and Sharp to serve with her on an Ad Hoc committee. Since then, this diligent and dedicated group has been consulting Oakland University persons knowledgeable in search processes as well as chairs of University presidential search committees that have functioned over the last decade at other Michigan public universities. Meanwhile, Mr. Bunger has talked with the administrative persons most responsible for presidential searches at the same institutions in order to gain further perspective. After extensive consultation her subcommittee concluded that it would be wise to engage the services of an experienced search consulting firm. They shared their discoveries with the full Board at the July meeting. As soon as possible after classes resumed in September, they brought consultants to campus to talk with faculty members, staff, and students about their hopes and fears respecting the president to be recruited. That process resulted in a statement of criteria recently circulated, and she urged her auditors to make suggestions for improvement of that statement either at this Senate meeting or in writing by the subsequent day. She was bemused by the Oakland Post's criticism of the Board's haste, noting that members of her subcommittee feel they have advanced very deliberately, taking time to consult widely. They have been impressed by the volume of thoughtful responses they have received to their inquiries, both from inside and outside the campus community -- including a letter from Mrs. Trumbull, Oakland's generous friend, who encourages the Board to find a clone for Woody Varner.

Looking ahead, Ms. Googasian anticipated that her subcommittee would use the 9 October Board meeting to propose possible timelines (making the expected schedule public and reporting on completion of each target) and to secure that body approval for the criteria statement as a charge to consultants carrying out the search. They also hope to gain approval for a committee structure to be used in the process. She pledged that leading candidates would be invited to campus for the community to observe, question, and assess. Thanking all those who believed they would be heard and therefore took the time to communicate their views to the Board, she invited questions about the draft criteria statement, wondering whether it might be "too generic."

Mr. McKay, who introduced himself as one of the university's first faculty appointees, approved the document, which impressed him as well written and perceptive. Its authors, he judged, had understood what they observed on campus. Ms. Googasian acknowledged that some persons worry that the statement makes no reference to the Meadow Brooks and the Technology Park, both of them to be acknowledged in a prefatory descriptive statement about the university, which she read to the Senate. Ms. Briggs-Bunting then thanked her for being so open and responsive to faculty concerns, and Ms. Googasian reciprocated her statement of appreciation.

Ms. Eberwein commented that faculty members she had consulted seemed pleased with the statement, though some wished assurance that the Board seeks a scholar-teacher for our president. Inquiring what might be meant by "an earned doctorate or its equivalent," she wondered whether there was any possibility of choosing someone not qualified for appointment as a tenured professor in an existing Oakland University academic unit. Ms. Googasian replied that consultants and contact persons at other universities that have recently completed presidential searches advised strongly against closing doors in advance. Although members of her subcommittee share the faculty's desire for qualified academic leadership (a desire shared by the business community as well), they deliberately decided not to specify the

Ph.D. or tenure status in case exceptionally strong qualities might be discerned in someone with a different background. Woody Varner, she reminded people, lacked the Ph.D.

Mr. Stamps also admired the document, though he was glad to learn that it was still in draft form. His concern was that the person described seemed larger-than-life: He had not known that God was out of work and seeking academic employment. He reiterated Ms. Eberwein's point about tenureability and worried about a pool that might not be made up of persons with recognizable academic qualifications. Having come later to Oakland than Mr. McKay, he had missed the pleasure of knowing Chancellor Varner, but he supposed that times had changed in thirty years; nor did he judge experiences of other institutions necessarily applicable to us. Ms. Googasian assured him that the Board is quite aware of Oakland's distinctive qualities among Michigan universities.

Mr. Edgerton wondered how the various criteria were to be weighed. Would experience with building maintenance equate with academic leadership? He would like to see priorities clearly demarcated. Ms. Googasian thought some of that would be intuitive. She preferred not to follow Mr. Dahlgren's suggestion of asking for a show of hands to find out how many senators thought a listing of priorities would be useful, indicating that she would share Mr. Edgerton's suggestion with her subcommittee. The Board might find it difficult to rank specific concerns, given its condition of not as yet being ready to approve a long-range plan for Oakland University. She noted that the authors of the criteria statement followed the one available guideline, the university's mission statement, which assigns equal weight to teaching, research, and service. Mr. Edgerton advocated establishment of clear priorities among criteria before actual candidates get considered.

Mr. Chipman, questioning whether that was a good idea, then redirected discussion by inquiring just what decisions the Board expected to make at its October meeting. Ms. Googasian replied that they would decide on the structure of the review committee and on the charge to the consulting firm and possible timeliness. They also hope to approve the statement of criteria (a revised draft of which should be available for each member's perusal a week in advance of the meeting). She stressed that the presidential search is a very serious responsibility and indicated that her subcommittee wants to be completely open with everybody throughout the process, subject to the necessity of preserving confidentiality of candidates to the extent allowed by "sunshine laws". Those who advise her subcommittee have stressed that the final choice is likely to be a person already happy in a position, whom we need to recruit actively but who may not wish present colleagues to know of her or his interest in moving.

Mr. Kevern asked if this sheet would be given to candidates. Learning that it would, he called attention to the statement on building maintenance, fearing that it might alienate some of the very candidates we would most like to see. Ms. Googasian mentioned that the statement in question responded to problems of deferred maintenance on all Michigan public campuses in this period of restricted resources and limited construction. Pointing to the condition of Oakland's buildings, she indicated the Board's concern that the president be someone committed to keeping this place intact. The idea struck her as a good one and appropriate for such a document, though perhaps infelicitously phrased. She then completed her presentation with an invitation for all community members interested in the presidential search process to attend the next Board meeting. She appreciated the increasingly cooperative environment she sensed on campus, pleased to discern less "them against us" thinking and more attention to

"What are we going to do?" Mr. Kleckner, noting that Ms. Googasian has been spending more time at the university than at home these days in her efforts to develop an open and effective search process, thanked her for her valuable presentation.

With the day's special report concluded, the chair then directed attention to the regular agenda, beginning with the minutes of 11 April, 14 May, and 30 May 1991. Mr. Chipman, seconded by Mr. Hough, moved that all three records be approved as received. With no discussion ensuing, the Senate then voted to confirm those statements of its history.

This action cleared the way for introduction of the first order of new business: election of a new Steering Committee for 1991-93. Mr. Arnold, veteran chair of the Senate Elections Committee, accepted nominations from the floor, then distributed, counted, and collected ballots with Mr. Brown's assistance. Ten names were placed in nomination, two withdrawn by the nominees, and six persons duly elected after Messrs. McKay and Stamps moved that nominations be closed. The new Steering Committee consists of Jane Briggs-Bunting, Jane Eberwein, Robbin Hough, Mary Otto, Catherine Rush, and George Stevens, all of whom Mr. Kleckner invited to remain behind after the meeting to establish a meeting schedule.

While ballots were being counted, Mr. Braunstein (seconded by Mr. Hormozi) advanced nominations from the outgoing Steering Committee to fill vacancies that developed over the summer on Senate standing committees. He and Mr. Kleckner assured Mr. McKay that all those listed on the agenda as nominees had been contacted by Steering Committee members, who ascertained their willingness to serve. Senators then elected Gloria Blatt to replace Julia Dorminey on the Academic Standing and Honors Committee for 1991-93, Gopalan Srinivasan to replace K. C. Cheok on the Research Committee for the same two-year period, and Gary Moore to replace Rita Gallagher for the 1991-92 academic year on the Academic Computing Committee. Ms. Gallagher's departure left the chairmanship of that committee vacant; so the Senate approved Kenneth York's appointment to provide leadership in 1991-92.

With all formal business satisfactorily dispatched, Mr. Kleckner then announced the Good and Welfare portion of the meeting. Prompted by the secretary, he informed new members that this portion of the agenda affords senators the opportunity to raise suggestions informally for the Senate to refer to the appropriate committee (standing or ad hoc) or bring before the Senate as a whole for discussion. It represents an open slot on the agenda for introduction of eventual new business. Questions on the other hand, belong to the final segment of the agenda. Since no Good and Welfare items arose at that point, the chair moved ahead to Information Items.

Mr. Kleckner began by inviting Ms. Mabee to make a brief presentation about the Curriculum Transformation Workshop planned for 24 October. Everyone should have received an announcement of this event, which has been organized in response to concerns raised at April Senate meetings about classroom dynamics related to cultural diversity. Two well qualified sociologists will conduct the workshop. Ms. Mabee urged faculty members to participate either for the full day or part of it, holding out the incentive of a free lunch for those who register promptly. All are welcome as well at a pre-workshop planning session on 4 October. Inquiries and applications should be directed to Barbara Hamilton or Susan Haworth Hoepfner.

Mr. Kleckner called attention to newspaper publicity for a document, *Designing Your Future*, which has just been released by the (Michigan) Presidents' Council of State Universities to advise high school students, their parents, and counselors about curricular choices that will

prepare students for college. This is the second version of the document and differs from its predecessor by stating that particular courses (3 years of science, 4 of English, a specific sequence of mathematics) are required rather than recommended. The report causes consternation at small schools that are unable to offer the full panoply of college preparatory courses to the few students with academic aspirations and raises concerns as well among persons who detect in it the germs of a statewide core curriculum. Some object to measurement of educational progress in terms of years rather than output measures of learning, and the academic vice presidents intend to revise the document periodically to reflect changes in how schools actually go about their work. The intent is to qualify students for college work at the time of their matriculation. These requirements make no change in Oakland University's admissions criteria, since all the specified coursework is already required here. Mr. Pierson reported that the previous booklet had been appreciatively received by students and school representatives with whom his staff has worked on College Days. He anticipated that the new edition would also prove useful and hoped it would soon be available.

There is no blockbuster news to report about construction projects. Mr. Kleckner referred back to last year's Senate discussions of a possible conference center but announced that there would not be any active consideration either of a center or of a second golf course during this academic year. If these projects should be resuscitated under new university leadership, the report of the Senate's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Conference University Center Planning will be transmitted as a guide to discussion. Further progress has been made toward construction of a new science building, and Squirrel Road remains in its familiar rustic state.

The chair then yielded the floor to Interim President DeCarlo to report on budget developments in Lansing. Mr. DeCarlo, declaring himself pleased to be with the Senate and looking forward to future meetings, indicated that he would happily respond to any questions. He recurred to earlier announcements, assuring his audience that academic programs would be stressed and indicating that a second golf course had no priority for him. He intended to look more closely at the operations of the current one to see if it could produce more money to be channeled into academic programs. He judged the conference center idea neither necessary nor viable at this point, considering it an unwise diversion of resources and energy. So far as state building projects are concerned, he regretted that Lansing's resources had been sopped up by prisons. All state institutions report construction needs. He trusted that our projected science building remains a construction priority and thought that it would be likely to be considered for funding, if the legislature raises the bonding cap for construction.

So far as budget appropriations are concerned, Mr. DeCarlo reported receiving a call this week from Senator Schwartz, who chairs the Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education Appropriations. It appears that the senator has pretty much succeeded in equalizing appropriations for all public universities so that each should receive a 4% budget increment. Fears that other state agencies would succeed in diverting recommended funding increases from higher education have not been realized, and Governor Engler has held firm on providing increased support. The legislature, in fact, recommended somewhat higher levels of funding than the governor. Mr. DeCarlo cautioned, however, that nobody in Lansing will give any assurance that we will actually succeed in keeping the appropriated increase, as a takeout is possible later in the fiscal year. Asserting that "We can survive that," he declared himself not displeased with what the state has done for us.

When Mr. DeCarlo invited questions, Ms. Briggs-Bunting asked what projections he could

make about timing of the science building. If the legislature lifts bonding caps by \$5 million in October, as projected, he thought there might be some action in January but doubted we could hope for authorization to proceed to the next stage of planning before spring. He foresaw universities and community colleges fighting like piranhas over whatever funding might become available. When Mr. McKay asked what prompted the state to add community colleges to the competition, since they already have their own tax base, Mr. DeCarlo pointed to their legislative influence. He saw no evidence of clear policy on educational funding in Lansing, just political rivalry. Mr. Olson wondered when the state might attempt to take back budgeted funds and anticipated that we could already have spent our allocation by the spring, if that was when bad news should arrive. Mr. DeCarlo pointed out, however, that we would know in advance about threatened cutbacks.

Mr. McKay introduced a new line of questioning with an inquiry about the current hiring freeze. Mr. DeCarlo responded that the freeze was part of his response to a startling \$3.8 million deficit (in addition to deficits in the university's auxiliary enterprises). The tuition increase helped, but it was also necessary to effect substantial savings. His consultations with the cabinet and deans resulted in the decision to respond to this emergency as we have done in the past by imposing freezes on equipment, out-of-state travel, and hiring. So far as academic cutbacks are concerned, he has given deans some discretion about how to effect savings. Declaring himself open to suggestions about how to balance the budget, he reported that he is monitoring the financial situation on a monthly basis; once necessary savings have been achieved, he pledged to steer available funds to academic needs. He stressed that no general fund money would be deployed for support of auxiliary enterprises and that specifically designated gift funds have never been frozen. Ms. Otto then asked for clarification about gifts designated for equipment or travel and received his reassurance that they could be spent for their original purposes. Undesignated gifts, by contrast, remain frozen.

Mr. Olson, wanting to be clear about what he as a dean should tell his faculty, asked when the freeze would be lifted. Could he thaw the freeze as soon as he figured out how to return the necessary money to university coffers? Mr. Kleckner, indicating that bills to individual units would go out the very next day, said that the freeze would be lifted once the units identify their portions of the requisite savings.

Concluding the meeting on a more hopeful note, Mr. Stamps wondered when a report would be available from a Senate committee rumored to have been at work last year looking into the possibility of establishing a faculty club. Mr. Kleckner, who knew nothing of such Senate-sponsored activity, promised to make inquiries and refer the matter to the new steering committee for inclusion on the Senate agenda.

With present business thus dispatched and future topics of discussion assured, senators welcomed Mr. Urice's call for adjournment at 4:54 p.m.

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

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page