



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 7 December 2000
Fourth Meeting

MINUTES

Members present: Abraham, Andrews, Braunstein, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Carter, Chapman, Coppin, Didier, Dow, Early, Eberly, Eberwein, Emrich, Esposito, Estes, Fink, Gardner, Gilroy, Grossman, Herman, Hildebrand, Kleckner, Kochenderfer, Laski, Long, Marks, McIntosh, McNair, K. Moore, Mosby, Nakao, Olson, Otto, Pfeiffer, Polis, Riley, Russell, Schochetman, Schwartz, Sen, Sevilla, Shablin, Sharma, Stamps Sudol, Wood
Members absent: Alber, Benson, Blanks, Downing, Haskell, MacKinder, Mayer, D. Moore, Moran, Rozek, Rusek, Sieloff

Summary of actions:

1. Motion to approve the minutes of November 16, 2000 (Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Polis) Approved.
2. Motion to endorse the Enrollment Plan: Draft Recommendation. (Ms. Moore, Mr. Schwartz) Second reading. Approved as amended.
 - 2a. Motion to amend the Enrollment Plan to increase the goal of residential students from 2500 to 4000. (Mr. Brieger, Mr. Stamps) . Approved.
 - 2b. Motion to approve in principle the Enrollment Plan: Draft Recommendation as amended subject to the availability of adequate resources to support and strengthen existing programs and as well as resources to provide substantial support for growth. Approved.
3. Motion to expand the western reserve natural area. (Mr. Russell, Ms. Wood) Second reading. Approved.
4. Election of Steering Committee members to replace Mr. Riley and Mr. Braunstein. Mr. Laski and Mr. Coppin elected.
5. Resolution to express the Senate's surprise and apprehension at the Board of Trustee's sudden reversal of carefully worked out building priorities at its meeting of Dec. 6th, 2000. (Mr. Brieger, Ms. Wood) First reading.

In keeping with the holiday season, the December meeting of the Senate began with a buffet of hearty appetizers and holiday cookies. The formal meeting was called to order at 3:20 by Mr. Esposito who opened with some information items. The academic calendar has been submitted to the President and is expected to be approved by the Board at its January 31st meeting. The latest revision has classes beginning at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, Sept. 4 and ending on Monday, December 10th. Winter commencement is scheduled for Dec. 22, four days after finals end. There will be no fall commencement. And in the winter 2002 term, classes will begin on Jan. 7. In response to Mr. Russell's question concerning consultation with the AAUP, Mr. Esposito stated that he hadn't been aware of that requirement but would certainly do so. The two Student Congress resolutions ([01-02](#) and [01-03](#)) that were attached to the

agenda were included at the request of Congress as information items for the Senate. Mr. Esposito then called for approval of the [minutes](#) which was accomplished with no corrections or changes following Ms. Eberwein's motion and Mr. Polis's second.

[Enrollment Planning Task Force](#)

Before proceeding any farther with the agenda, Mr. Esposito conducted the first roll call and then reopened the discussion on the first item of old business, a motion to endorse the *Enrollment Plan 1999-2010: Draft Recommendation*. Mr. Brieger, seconded by Mr. Stamps, offered the following amendment:

MOVED that the goal of 2500 students in residence on campus be raised to a goal of 4000 students.

Mr. Brieger argued that Oakland was never designed as a commuter campus but simply developed as such over time. He stated that campus life is enhanced by having increased numbers of students in residence and that 2500 is too modest a target. Mr. Olson responded that the Enrollment Planning Committee had considered higher numbers but had opted for the goal of 2500 which would almost double the number of resident students because of concerns about housing availability. Mr. Polis noted that adding residential students means building dorms. He indicated that there are already problems with the growth Oakland is experiencing and the concomitant need for additional faculty, academic facilities and supplies and services and he expressed concern about putting more resources into student housing. Mr. Sevilla responded that student housing would be self-financed and self-supporting and indicated his support for the increase since it represents a goal. He agreed that OU would be more desirable as a residential campus, that everyone would benefit from the amenities that would accrue from this change. Mr. Gardner thought the higher goal a good idea but added that we might not be able to attract that many more students. Mr. Sevilla noted that one of the goals is to increase the numbers of out-state, out-of-state and international students. In response to Ms. Shannon's query about the need for additional residential space, Mr. Esposito replied that we had around 150 students this fall who wanted to live on campus but that couldn't be accommodated in the dorms at Oakland. Mr. Olson reported that the consultant that was hired felt that a reasonable residential number would be 10% of the total enrollment and argued that we shouldn't push ourselves. The proposed amendment was then voted upon and **approved**. [Members voting in favor: Andrews, Braunstein, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Carter, Chapman, Dow, Early, Eberly, Estes, Fink, Grossman, Laski, McNair, K. Moore, Nakao, Otto, Pfeiffer, Riley, Russell, Schwartz, Sen, Sevilla. Members voting against: Abraham, Eberwein, Emrich, Gilroy, Kleckner, Olson, Polis, Shablin, Sharma]

Mr. Grossman asked for comments about the plan to increase the size of the Honors College. Mr. Murphy, Director of the Honors College, responded that it would mean a different kind of Honors College program than currently exists and that additional honors courses would need to be created in the various departments and schools. The current scheme has been in place for a number of years and involves offering 6-7 honors courses a year. He indicated that this is a good time to look at the program since he is planning on stepping down as director at the end of the year. There will be a search for a new director and both he and the Associate Director of the Honors College would work with the new director to create an expanded Honors College program. In response to a query by Mr. Stamps regarding the rationale for this proposed increase, Mr. Olson stated that now, when a student becomes a major in Health Sciences, they cannot be an honors student. With this change, the unit will develop honors courses and a student pursue an honors degree. It is hoped, this option will attract a number of honors students to Oakland.

Mr. Esposito questioned the need to focus on numbers and suggested that we look at the underlying principles and general goals of the recommendations. Ms. Moore wanted to make sure that the motion would be forwarded to the Board with the reports from the various committees since they address the critical issue of resources. Mr. Esposito agreed that the reports would certainly be included. Ms. Moore then proposed the following amendment:

MOVED that the recommendations have to be backed up with adequate resources to support existing programs and that adequate resources need to be provided to support the proposed growth.

The amendment was approved unanimously. However, Ms. Didier questioned the use of the word adequate, given that in many cases budgets are not now adequate, and wondered if we could come up with a stronger word than adequate. Ms. Eberwein suggested "to support and strengthen existing programs as well as provide substantial funding to support the proposed growth." This was accepted as a friendly change and the motion, as revised

MOVED that the Senate endorse the *Enrollment Planning 1999-2010: Draft recommendation* subject to the following conditions:

- a. that the goal of 2500 students in residence on campus be raised to a goal of 4000 students.
- b. that the recommendations have to be backed up with adequate resources to support and strengthen existing programs as well as provide substantial funding to support the proposed growth.

was approved unanimously.

Expansion of existing natural reserve area.

The second item of new business, a motion to expand the existing natural reserve area, was then discussed. Mr. Russell distributed a [map](#) of the area showing the existing reserve previously voted upon by the Senate and the proposed addition on the south end. He noted that the area is primarily woods and Ms. Wood added that, even with this addition, there is still lots of room for development in the extreme southwest corner of campus. Questions were raised about the number of acres this would involve with no one knowing the answer. Mr. Stamps asked for an explanation of what the R & D park would look like, i.e. office buildings, laboratories? Mr. Polis indicated that it hasn't been defined yet but the intent is that companies must have a link with the university. The motion was then approved with a majority vote. [Voting against: Carter, Early, Gardner, Nakao, Olson, Polis]

Senate Steering Committee Election

The Senate Elections Committee (Mr. Kleckner, Mr. Brieger) conducted an election for two Steering Committee members to replace Mr. Riley who is retiring and Mr. Braunstein who will be on sabbatical next term. There were just two nominations, Mr. Laski and Mr. Coppin and with no further nominations forthcoming, Mr. Olson moved that the nominations be closed and Mr. Laski and Mr. Coppin were declared the new Steering Committee members.

Good and Welfare

Mr. Sen opened the good and welfare section of the meeting by expressing concern about

Academic Computing Services and problems that are sometimes resolved and sometimes not. He cited the recent loss of e-mail files as an item of particular annoyance, but thought the real problem seemed to be a lack of communication and responsiveness from ACS. Mr. Sharma and Mr. Dow both related similar concerns, problems with getting software, problems with email. Mr. Carter noted that these technology infrastructure problems dovetail with the whole idea of strategic planning and and raise concerns, in particular, with Oakland's movement to offering web based courses and our need to address technology issues. Mr. Polis pointed out that the e-mail loss was because of a system failure, not because of anything ACS had done or not done. Mr. Esposito encouraged everyone to contact ACS about any concerns and problems or to bring them to the attention of the Senate's Academic Computing Committee.

Mr. Russell then brought up the capital outlay priorities that the Board of Trustees switched at their December meeting when they approved an automotive technology building instead of a performing arts facility and asked why. Mr. Esposito responded that the Board didn't agree with the University's recommendations and felt that the technology building was more important and more likely to be funded. Given the amount of work that went into making the recommendations, Mr. Gardner stated that it is hard to understand why they would make such a change without consulting with those involved in the planning process. In response to Mr. Sevilla's query about the purpose of an automotive technology building, Mr. Polis indicated that he wasn't sure what was intended but that the building would serve not only engineering but also business and health sciences. A space study has shown that the School of Engineering and Computer Sciences is anywhere from 50-75% below norms regarding space and labs and has a critical need for additional space. He acknowledged that performing arts also has a critical need for space and thought the Board simply made a judgment call. Mr. Gardner felt it was the principle of the thing, that this will delay the performing arts facilities and that a major decision was made without campus consultation. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea spoke in favor of additional facilities for the performing arts, pointing out that SBA and SECS have new facilities and argued that the performing arts facilities are in need of renovation and expansion. She felt that there was a tendency to prefer the professional schools over arts and humanities and stated that the Senate should send a signal to the Board. She proposed a resolution which was seconded that expressed the Senate's concern over the change in building priorities made by the Board without consultation with campus groups.

Mr. Grossman commented that he didn't have enough information about this to vote and Ms. Wood then suggested that we table the resolution until the January meeting and ask for additional information. Mr. Polis pointed out that the performing arts facility as a first priority was a recommendation that came out of the presidential retreat, not the Senate. Mr. Stamps commented about the importance of strategic planning and master planning so that we know where we are going. He also expressed concern that two buildings have been recently completed and one now hears they are inadequate. Mr. Polis noted that Engineering only got 10% of the new space in SEB. The two areas that have the greatest space needs are engineering and performing arts, agreed Mr. Esposito, and added that the Board was responding to the economic needs in the state and choosing the project that would be more likely to be funded. Mr. Brieger, seconded by Ms. Wood, then offered the following substitute resolution, which was accepted by the movers of the original resolution:

Resolved that the Senate express its surprise, apprehension and concern over the sudden reversal by the Board of Trustees of carefully planned building priorities without consultation at its December 6th 2000 meeting.

Mr. Andrews asked if the Campus Development and Environment Committee had been included in any of the discussion about the projects. Mr. Esposito indicated that they had not been involved. Mr. Andrews thought it might seem odd to have a Senate resolution on this issue given that the Senate usually isn't involved in setting building priorities. If the Senate wants to express concern now, it should also have been involved at an earlier stage of the planning process. Mr. Riley thought it might be appropriate for the Dean's Council or Academic Council to send a memo to the Board expressing concern over the change and the lack of prior consultation. Mr. Grossman wondered about the phrase "without consultation" and asked, consultation with whom. Mr. Esposito counseled that it was better to leave it vague. Mr. Brieger agreed, stating that the resolution addresses the process and the process should have involved consultation before the priorities were changed. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea wondered if the Senate is the right body to express concern. Mr. Andrews thought that the Senate shouldn't complain on behalf of other groups and proposed treating the resolution as a first reading and taking it up again in January, after we have seen whether or not the people who developed the building priorities have taken any action. That suggestion was acceptable to all and was immediately followed by a motion to adjourn.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

2/13/01

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page