



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 8 March 1984
Sixth Meeting
Gold Rooms B & C

MINUTES

Senators Present: Appleton, Bertocci, Boganey, Burke, Bledsoe, Chapman-Moore, Chipman, Christina. Copenhaver. Downing, Easterly, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Edgerton, Eliezer, Evans, Feeman, Frankie, Grossman, Heubel, Horwitz, Hough, Ketchum Kleckner, McCabe, McClory, Moore, Moorhouse, Pine, Russell, Sakai, Scherer, Schimmelman, Schwartz, Sevilla Shichi, Snider-Feldmesser, Splete, Titus, Tomboulian, Witt, Workman.

Senators Absent: Barthel, Boddy, Boulos, Brown, Chagnon-Royce Champagne, Coppola, Federlein. Gerulaitis. Hamilton, Hammerle, Hartman, Howes, Lindell, Maloney, Stevens, Tracy.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

1. Minutes of 9 February 1984. Moved, Ms. Titus; seconded, Mr. Moorhouse. Approved.
2. Motion from the Research Committee to modify membership. Moved, Mr. Brown; seconded, Ms. Gerulaitis. Approved.
- 3 Motion from the Steering Committee to disqualify members of Senate standing committees from applying for funds to those committees. Moved, Mr. Edgerton; seconded, Mr. Eberwein. Deferred until vote on substitute motion, then approved.
4. Substitute motion to replace #3. Moved, Mr. Ketchum; seconded, Ms. Titus. Defeated.
6. Motion from the Steering Committee modifying the charge and membership specifications for the Academic Policy and Planning Committee. Moved, Mr. Downing, seconded, Mr. Moore. First reading.
7. Amendment increasing faculty membership on the APPC from six to seven. Moved, Ms. Scherer; seconded, Ms. Titus. First reading.
8. Amendment restoring the Vice President for Student Affairs to the APPC. Moved, Ms. Bledsoe; seconded, Mr. Feeman. First reading.
- 9 Motion from the Steering Committee modifying the charge and membership specifications for UCU. Moved, Mr. Splete; seconded, Ms. Titus. First reading.
10. Amendment to revise the wording of charge #2 to UCU. Moved, Mr. Appleton; seconded, Mr. Bertocci. First reading.
11. Motion from the Steering Committee modifying the charge to the General Education Committee. Moved, Ms. Eberwein; seconded, Mr. Moore. First Reading.

Before calling the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m., Mr. Kleckner drew the attention of his fellow-Senators to their new quarters: a cavernous room with some sixty chairs arranged "seminar-

style" behind a square of tables. He asked members to speak loudly when addressing the group and to monitor and report their reactions to the changed accommodations. He then began the business of the day by requesting response to the minutes of 9 February 1984. Upon motion of Ms. Titus, seconded by Mr. Moorhouse, these were approved without discussion.

So was the first item of business: a motion from the Research Committee to modify its membership as specified below (Moved, Mr. Brown; seconded, Ms. Gerulaitis).

MOVED that the membership of the Research Committee be: Eight faculty appointed by the Senate; Two faculty appointed by the Graduate Council; and The Director of Research and Academic Development (ex-officio and non-voting).

More controversial was the second motion offered by the Steering Committee, this on < disqualifying members of Senate standing committees from applying to their committees for funds . Mr. Ketchum reported that his apprehensions at the February meeting had not been assuaged by his conversations since then with a number of people. He no longer located the source of the acknowledged "mutterings" on campus in a conflict-of-interest problem, however, but traced them to inevitable frustration when applications so far exceed resources. Convinced that faculty members can handle the responsibility for establishing their own operating rules Independently, he offered a substitute motion (seconded by Ms. Titus):

MOVED that the Senate direct all standing committees to develop and publish operating procedures that govern the participation of committee members who apply to that committee for funds.

Parliamentarian Heubel ruled that this was, indeed, a substitute motion rather than an amendment. It should be discussed and voted upon first and, if successful, would preclude debate or vote on the original.

Mr. Sevilla, initiating discussion, saw an advantage to the substitute in terms of attracting volunteers for committee assignments. He thought a two-year exclusion from funding eligibility might quench the ardor to serve. Mr. Ketchum cited Mr. Winkler's statistics on recent Research Committee allocations to demonstrate that only a third of the proposals could be funded with available resources. He recognized the disappointment experienced by many applicants but traced their misery to budgetary constrictions rather than professional malfeasance. He expressed confidence in academic traditions of faculty self-governance and saw no reason to interfere with those traditions. Mr. Eberwein appreciated Mr. Ketchum's concern but hoped that nothing in the substitute motion would prevent the affected committees from excluding their members voluntarily. He noted that both the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Research Committee had already made such decisions. When Ms. Eberwein inquired when and how regularly Mr. Ketchum envisaged these procedures being published, Mr. Christina suggested that they could be circulated annually with calls for proposals. Mr. Ketchum agreed, assuming that committees would consider this matter annually before sending out their calls. Ms. Titus offered the thought that the Steering Committee could record current practice of each body when circulating its preference sheets. Such speculation left Mr. Heubel more convinced than ever that the original motion was correct. He preferred that operating rules be set before a person gets onto a committee and noted the untidiness of a system that allows for constant and unpredictable change. A voice vote on the substitute motion revealed the need for a closer count. The show of hands that

followed revealed fifteen supporters, twenty-two opponents, and the motion failed. The original motion then carried by a voice vote:

MOVED that the Senate adopt a policy that disqualifies any member of a standing committee from applying to that committee for funds during his/her period of service.

Committee preference sheets, to be circulated soon, will report this policy decision to prospective volunteers.

Having concluded the old business on the agenda, the Senate turned its attention to a cluster of three correlated motions regarding charges and membership for the APPC, UCUI and the General Education Committee. Mr. Downing, seconded by Mr. Moore, proposed the first:

MOVED that the Senate approve the following charge and membership specifications for the APPC.

Charge:

1. To recommend to the University Senate regarding academic policies and procedure relating to both graduate and undergraduate students;
2. To recommend concerning any changes affecting the academic organization of the University (i.e. schools, centers);
3. To receive reports on proposed new programs, program revisions, and reviews from UCUI, the General Education Committee, and the Graduate Council and to advise these bodies on the impact of program innovations or revisions on the University as a whole;
4. To work with the President and the Provost in the development and updating of University academic plans, goals, objectives, role, and mission;
5. To review proposals for introduction or revision of any academic programs in which students simultaneously pursue undergraduate and graduate degrees and to make appropriate recommendations to the Senate;
6. To receive from the Provost reports on the allocations of resources to the various academic programs and to advise the Provost on the priorities for such
7. To advise the Senate and its committees (UCUI, the Graduate Council, and the General Education Committee) on the University-wide academic and budgetary Implications of proposed new academic programs or the discontinuance or major reorganization of existing academic programs as may be proposed.

Membership; Six faculty-at-large (but not more than two from any one organized faculty) one of whom shall be chair; one administrative-professional; two students, one of whom shall be the President of the University Congress (or designee); the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies; the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies; all of the above being voting members. In addition, the following shall be *ex officio* and non-voting members: The Vice President for Finance and Administration (or designee); the Dean of the Library (or designee); the Director of Computer and Information Systems (or designee), and the Director of Institutional Research.

Mr. Kleckner apologized for the omission of a line from the commentary on page two of the

agenda and asked his colleagues to repair the error by revising lines five, six, and seven to read "The Steering Committee recommends assigning responsibility to the APPC for broad university-wide academic planning and policy issues and to the UCUI for all academic matters concerning undergraduate instruction." He explained the Steering Committee's desire to structure the Graduate Council- and UCUI as bodies with parallel responsibilities for graduate and undergraduate instruction and to establish the APPC more clearly as a committee with overarching policy and planning functions.

Several questions arose about specific charges. Mr. Copenhaver took the language of charge 2 to mean that the APPC would make recommendations about the establishment of new schools or centers rather than about internal reorganization within existing academic units. Such is the intent, although Mr. Russell hoped that the APPC would show an interest if the College should choose to abolish a department. Mr. Kleckner thought that it well might. When Mr. Russell then asked whether the APPC would report to the Senate only on matters pertaining to both undergraduate and graduate students, he found that to be the case and concluded, on that basis, that the committee is misleadingly named. Both the Graduate Council and UCUI should also be considered academic policy committees. Mr. Ketchum raised questions about charge 6, wondering what sequence of events was envisaged. It developed that the language is meant to say that the Provost will inform the APPC about how money is being spent and accept advice from that body about funding priorities for the future. He tells the committee what is and learns from it what ought to be. This pattern puzzled those who thought the APPC should play a direct role in budget allocations but made sense to Mr. Feeman, who saw a close association between the APPC's advisory role in charge 6 and its planning role in charge 4. He envisaged the committee as engaging itself in ongoing CAMP-style planning.

Mr. Christina raised broader issues in questioning the reason for the changes encompassed in this series of motions. When Mr. Kleckner indicated that these proposals emanate from requests to the Steering Committee by the APPC and UCUI (now a subcommittee of the APPC) for clarification of their respective duties, Mr. Christina inquired about the current relationship between the two committees. Mr. Russell, recent chair of the APPC, reported that, although UCUI acts on its own for some purposes, any recommendation from it to the Senate now goes through the APPC. Mr. Chipman, current chair, noted that confusion exists because of overlapping committee roles when both must review new programs. Neither body, at present, knows just what it should be looking for in program proposals. He suggested that the proposed charge 7 to the APPC and charge 4 to UCUI might clarify the intended distinctions. Mr. Kleckner indicated that both committees would still have something to contribute to such reviews (simultaneously rather than sequentially if these motions pass), with UCUI inquiring whether the proposed program is a good thing to do and APPC asking whether Oakland University should do it. Mr. Chipman drew attention to the existing articulation between the Graduate Council and the APPC, by which the APPC considers the budget impact of programs that the Council scrutinizes for academic merit. Mr. Hough thought this degree of overlap useful to ensure full review.

When Mr. Bertocci wondered whether a separate UCUI is necessary at all, in view of its existence thus far as an APPC subcommittee, Mr. Feeman called a point of order to note that the UCUI motion was not as yet on the floor. Mr. Moore, however, returned to the issue, suspecting the proposals before the Senate of representing a move to create one more committee involving additional faculty and acting as an extra buffer between UCUI or the Graduate Council and the Senate. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that the current UCUI, although a subcommittee, has only one overlapping member with the APPC and already calls upon the

services of as many faculty as are envisaged in the proposal on the floor. It is the purpose of this legislation to allow UCUI, like the Council, to go directly to the Senate with its recommendations rather than channeling them through the APPC. Mr. Moore's apprehensions, as Mr. Downing pointed out, describe the current state of affairs rather than the reformed one. Mr. Russell commented that the motions on the floor are meant to shift some responsibilities away from the APPC, thus allowing it to fulfill the broad-scale planning part of its charge more faithfully.

Depending on their sense of the weight of these charges to the APPC, Senators proposed various changes in the recommended membership. Ms. Scherer, concerned that faculty dominance of so important a committee be preserved, felt that seven faculty members rather than six should be assigned. Even when Mr. Kleckner pointed out that these six already represent an increased faculty contingent over current practice, she wanted more and, seconded by Ms. Titus, offered an amendment to increase the number of faculty members to seven. When Mr. Russell inquired whether she would then allow three rather than two from one organized faculty, she expressed no concern about the actual distribution. Mr. Downing mentioned that the Steering Committee had thought six faculty representatives a workable number and had preferred six to seven simply in order to limit the total committee to a manageable size, but he had no firm objection to such expansion. Opposition came instead from Mr. Horwitz, who objected on principle to any increase in faculty time devoted to committees. Rather than add faculty representation to assure proper academic balance, he would cut administrative members. Mr. Copenhaver agreed that the Oakland University governance system places a substantial drain on faculty energies. He noted the dissipation of political energy entailed in CAP, FRPC, Senate, Assembly, and committee responsibilities and thought that the answer to Ms. Scherer's concern would prove bigger than the immediate issue of the number of faculty on any one body. Mr. Bertocci, agreeing that faculty are overburdened, nevertheless maintained that the widespread, significant effect of APPC decisions justified making that committee as representative as possible.

Mr. McClory, also concerned about representation, wondered why the number of students should be reduced from four to two. Mr. Downing explained that the current APPC had urged cutbacks in the total membership of the revised committee in order to facilitate meetings. Mr. Kleckner added that the Steering Committee had registered its concern for faculty dominance and also its awareness that no more than two students had ever attended an APPC meeting in recent years. Mr. McClory rejoined that student membership is more substantial on other Senate committees than it is likely to be on this one, and he criticized the proposal as diminishing their role. He recognized the reasons for concern about student inactivity on standing committees hitherto but pointed out that the Congress (led by Senator Boganey) is now working actively to appoint students and see that they participate. Although he concurred with those who saw merit in reducing the total size of the APPC, he objected to doing so by halving student representation. Rather than cut administrative membership in injurious ways, Ms. Bledsoe, seconded by Mr. Feeman, proposed an amendment to reinclude the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Mr. Christina, more radical in his approach to the problem, suggested reducing the responsibilities of the APPC to the point of rendering such tremendous representation unnecessary. He proposed killing it off. Mr. Moore, like-minded, wondered why academic policy and planning matters could not be brought directly before the Senate to take advantage of its obvious representativeness. Experience reminded Mr. Russell that the APPC has traditionally met for two hours a week, every week, simply in order to do part of its existing

business. He thought that, if the Senate should take over such burdens no one would agree to run. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that, subsequent to APPC deliberation, these matters do eventually come to the Senate for action. When Ms. Titus inquired about the possibility of instituting separate policy and planning committees, Mr. Kleckner reminded her that two such bodies had existed in the past but had been merged in 1978 in an effort to streamline governance. As Ms. Scherer recalled, a separate budget committee had also been subsumed into the APPC. Thus apprised of the issues that confront it in modifying so complex a body, the Senate turned its attention to the related question of UCUI.

Mr. Splete, seconded by Ms. Titus, put the following motion on the floor:

MOVED that the Senate approve the following charge and membership specifications for UCUI.

Charge:

1. To recommend to the University Senate academic policies and procedures concerning undergraduate education and, when necessary, seek advice from other appropriate bodies concerning the impact of these policies and procedures;
2. To review petitions of exception regarding University-wide undergraduate academic requirements;
3. To make recommendations to the University Senate and to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies regarding proposed and existing undergraduate programs, including recommendations for program modification, suspension, or discontinuance;
4. To advise the Academic Policy and Planning Committee concerning proposed new undergraduate programs;
5. To cooperate with the General Education Committee in overseeing undergraduate instruction throughout the University;
6. To ensure review of all undergraduate programs in timely fashion and report findings to the APPC and the University Senate;
7. To evaluate ongoing and proposed undergraduate programs for their consistency with University academic policies and mission and to monitor catalog copy to ensure compliance with all such policies; and
8. To advise the Senate on all matters that body may refer to it concerning undergraduate instruction and the general requirements within which the specific undergraduate degree programs function.

Membership: The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, who presides as chair and shall also represent UCUI on the APPC; one faculty member from each organized faculty, appointed to staggered two-year terms by the Senate upon nomination by the Steering Committee, each of whom shall represent UCUI to the Committee on Instruction or equivalent group in her/his academic unit; the Director of Academic Advising; and two undergraduate students designated by the University Congress; the above to be voting members. In addition, the following shall serve *ex officio* and non-voting: The Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee) and the Registrar (or designee)

Mr. Kleckner explained that this motion, if passed, would set up the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction as a standing committee of the Senate rather than as a

subcommittee of the APPC. Its members would be elected by the Senate, with responsibility for communicating with committees on instruction, rather than being name to UCUI by and from committees on instruction. There have been problems of late in keeping track of shifting membership, when these school curriculum committees keep shifting their delegates to UCUI. This proposal is intended to establish membership in timely fashion and to Increase the committee's responsibilities.

Mr. Grossman led off discussion by inquiring about the wording of charge 5, specifically the implication that the General Education committee shares responsibility for overseeing undergraduate instruction. Mr. Kleckner indicated that its responsibility was limited to one specific area; it is mentioned in this charge only to assure complementary functions. Mr. Burke thought it would be best to amend the charge to make UCUI responsible for undergraduate instruction throughout the University except for general education, though he hoped not to forfeit the idea of cooperation entirely. This line of questioning raised a problem in Ms. Easterly's mind about avoidable overlaps between these two committees. She wondered whether the General Education Committee ought to continue reporting directly to the Senate and suggested that it report to UCUI instead, thereby keeping that body in charge of undergraduate instruction overall.

Mr. Appleton then requested explanation of charge 2. He wondered just what university-wide undergraduate academic requirements UCUI would monitor when reviewing petitions of exception. At present, school and college committees on instruction act c petitions for waiver of university-wide credit requirements and such. What he hoped to avoid was a situation in which a student might have to petition two or even three different committees?to the benefit only of the lumber industry. Mr. Kleckner responded that there is a difference between acting on petitions and reviewing such actions. This legislation is intended to entrust to UCUI responsibility for monitoring varying practices in the several academic units in keeping with UCUI practice in past years as it has tried to achieve a reasonable degree of consistency in applying university standards. Mr. Appleton's next inquiry dealt with the role of the General Education Committee in this area. Would it act, instead of the committees on instruction, on petitions of exception related to general education requirements? It would. In that case, he recommended revising the wording of the charge to UCUI by adding the words "except for general education requirements" so that overlapping jurisdiction could be avoided. Ms. Titus suggested replacing the words "to review" with "to look at practices." Mr. Appleton, seconded by Mr. Bertocci, then proposed an amendment changing the introductory infinitive to "to evaluate and monitor."

Membership of this committee drew little comment except for the issue of the administrator who would be its chair. Mr. Horwitz wondered why there should not be a faculty chair, why an Associate Provost was needed. He failed to note symmetry between the organization of the Graduate Council and the proposed UCUI in point of leadership. Mr. Kleckner reasoned that a great deal of administrative work must be done between meetings to ensure successful operation of this committee and that such burdens could best be assumed by an academic administrator. He pointed out that the proposed Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies would be a newly appointed person with specific responsibilities closely tied to UCUI's concerns.

Attention then turned to the third of these corollary motions, this one proposed by Ms. Eberwein and seconded by Mr. Moore:

MOVED that the Senate's charge to the General Education Committee be expanded to read: "To recommend to the Senate general policies and requirements for undergraduate general education, to function as a curriculum committee for a university-wide program of general education, and to respond to petitions of exception relating to that program, in accordance with Senate authorizations."

When Mr. Moore inquired the meaning of this legislation, Mr. Eberwein indicated that it simply added to the existing committee charge a specific reference to petitions of exception related to general education. This power may be read into the existing language about serving as a curriculum committee, but the current of the General Education Committee have raised questions about whether they or UCUI ought to be reviewing such petitions, and the Steering Committee chose to vest specific responsibility in the committee that directs the general education program. Ms. Chapman-Moore wondered what would happen if a particular school should set general education requirement beyond the University norm and was told by Mr. Kleckner that those would be school rather than University requirements and would still be handled by the affected unit's committee on instruction. Mr. Moore wondered where the B.G.S. program fits in the proposed governance scheme and learned from Mr. Kleckner that the B.G.S. Faculty Council is not a Senate Committee.

With business thus concluded so far as it could be accomplished in a series of first readings. Mr. Kleckner then called for private resolutions affecting the Good and Welfare of the group. None were proposed. He then informed the Senate that at least two items of business now being reviewed by committees would be presented for a first reading at the scheduled April meeting, thereby necessitating an extra session for the second reading. The Steering Committee proposes that the additional meeting be scheduled for Monday, April 23, the day winter semester grades are ultimately due. When he inquired the preference of his colleagues for a morning or afternoon session, he found opinion divided and therefore decided to set an early afternoon meeting time. He wondered how Senators like their new accommodations. Judgments on acoustics split, with Mr. Grossman finding it harder to hear colleagues at tremendous distances across the room and Mr. Tomboulian noticing less interference from the ventilation system. Ms. Titus appreciated greater airiness, but Mr. Eberwein denounced the placement of tables as psychologically disastrous. On the basis of such responses, Mr. Kleckner determined to hold the next meeting in the same room but with a different seating arrangement. Anticipating some sort of surprise in April, therefore, the Senate adjourned at 4:40 p.m. upon the motion of Mr. Burke.

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

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page