



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 18 February 1993
Fourth Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Abiko, Andersen, Appleton, Bennett, Benson, Braunstein, Chipman, Cowlshaw, Cramer, Dahlgren, Downing, Dunphy, Eberwein, Eckart, Edgerton, L. Gerulaitis, R. Gerulaitis, Goslin, Grossman, Hamilton, Hartzler, Hormozi, Horwitz, Hough, Hovanesian, Kheir, Mabee, Masters, McKay, Mittelstaedt, Moore, Olson, Otto, Pine, Pipan, Rush, Schultz, Shepherd, Stamps, Stano, Wilczynski, Yates, Workman.

Senators Absent: Burdick, Fish, Frankie, Gamboa, Halsted, Hansen-Smith, Haworth Hoeppner, Jackson, Kevern, Kim, Packard, Peterson, Pierson, Porter, Reddy, Stevens, Urice, Witt, Wood, Zenas.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 10 December 1992. Approved.
2. Procedural motion to waive second reading of #3 (Downing; Grossman). Approved.
3. Motion from UCUI and the Steering Committee to establish a University Committee on Assessment (Grossman; Chipman). Approved
4. Motion from UCUI to establish a university-wide system of baccalaureate program reviews (Otto; L. Gerulaitis). First reading.

Mr. Horwitz called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m., pleased that so many senators remembered to come after a two-month interlude. He then directed attention to the minutes of 10 December 1992. When no questions were raised or corrections offered, he declared those to be approved as distributed.

With no old business lingering from December, action began on the first item of new business. Mr. Grossman, seconded by Mr. Chipman, introduced a motion from the University Committee on Instruction and the Steering Committee to establish a new standing committee of the Senate to carry on the work initiated by the *ad hoc* Assessment Committee that has functioned for three years as a subcommittee of UCUI:

MOVED that the Senate establish a University Committee on Assessment with charge and membership as follows:

Charge:

1. To coordinate and advise on the planning and implementation of assessment by academic units;
2. To prepare an overall University Assessment Plan which meets the requirements

of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and to consult with the staff of that Association, as appropriate, to insure that the Plan and its implementation continue to meet Association standards;

3. To advise and cooperate with the General Education Committee in planning and carrying out assessment of the University's general education program;
4. To advise the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, and the Graduate Council on the findings of the assessment program and their implications for specific program reviews and for maintaining and improving the quality of undergraduate and graduate instruction in general; and
5. To report to the University Senate and the Assemblies of the organized faculties on the findings of the assessment program and their implications for maintaining and improving the quality of undergraduate and graduate curricula and instruction at the University.

Membership: Three faculty members from the College and one from each School, appointed to staggered two-year terms by the Senate upon nomination of the Steering Committee, which shall designate one of these as chair; one student designated by the University Student Congress; the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee); and one Oakland University alumnus(a) designated by the Alumni Board on nomination of the Director of Alumni Relations.

Mr. Horwitz announced that Senator Appleton, chair of UCUI, Professor Miller, chair of the current ad hoc Assessment Committee, and Professor Grimm, chair of the General Education Committee, were present to respond to any inquiries. Ms. Gerulaitis then launched that activity by asking why the membership list included an alumni representative. Mr. Appleton responded that he had thought, when establishing the current subcommittee, that a graduate would have good perspective on student achievement. That intuition has been confirmed over the past three years by Marge Neubacher's dedicated service as alumni representative. An alumnus(a) is likely to be someone without an axe to grind and with real interest in the university. Mr. Miller concurred with these points, adding that he anticipates the university's escalating need for alumni involvement in the years ahead.

Mr. Kheir then asked what thought had been given to articulation between assessment and reviews (often rigorous) to which many units are subjected by external accrediting bodies. Mr. Appleton replied that the intent was to accommodate that model of assessment, and Mr. Miller mentioned the School of Nursing as an example of a unit that had an assessment system already in place as a result of meeting expectations of its accrediting board. When Mr. Kheir wondered whether the proposed committee would accept the volumes of data his school develops for ABET accreditation rather than requiring the Engineering faculty to repackage information in some new format, Mr. Appleton doubted that the Assessment Committee would need that detailed a report. It simply needs to know that each unit is assessing student achievement and is reviewing and modifying its curriculum in the light of its findings. There is no reason for a department or school to develop duplicate reports. What the North Central Accreditation team will be looking for is whether each academic unit has an appropriate plan in place to assess student learning.

Sensing no significant opposition to the idea of a permanent Assessment Committee of the Senate, Mr. Downing inquired how the timing of this motion would fit in with the cycle of

committee appointments. When would volunteers for next year's committee assignments be solicited? Ms. Eberwein replied that the memorandum inviting faculty volunteers was even then being edited for distribution early in March. Mr. Downing, consequently, moved to waive a second reading of this motion so that the committee could be staffed in the usual fashion at the Senate's April meeting. Hearing no objection, the chair called for a vote and found members willing to waive the second reading. He then called for a vote on the main motion, which carried without dissent.

Following this decision, Ms. Otto (seconded by Mr. Gerulaitis) introduced the second item of new business, a proposal from the University Committee on Instruction to establish a university-wide system of baccalaureate program reviews:

MOVED that the Senate approve a university-wide system of baccalaureate program reviews as detailed on the [attached statement](#) on UNIVERSITY-WIDE BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM REVIEWS.

Mr. Chipman welcomed this proposal, reminding senators that he had been urging such a system since the mid-1980s. He recognized that the reviews would be a bother but nonetheless well worth doing. Mr. Goslin then asked who would actually assess minors and concentrations included within the Bachelor of General Studies program: the B.G.S. Faculty Council or the sponsoring academic units? Mr. Cowlshaw reasoned that no B.C.S. minor stands alone; since all are offered by existing departments, he expected that any concentrations or minors would be reviewed by their originating departments or concentration committees. Mr. Olson strongly advocated assessment of a minor in its home department, such as Exercise Science, rather than by the B.G.S. Faculty Council. Mr. Downing reported that all College of Arts and Sciences departments regularly review their minor programs for academic quality; the only thing not now considered, in the case of B.G.S. students, is how programs get aggregated for the degree. Mr. Moore greatly appreciated the care taken by authors of this proposal to allow close coordination between the university's review system and existing outside review activities, and Mr. Horwitz credited Messieurs Dahlgren and Eliezer for that prudential judgment. Following this discussion, he declared the first reading of the motion concluded and reminded senators that a final vote would follow in March. He hoped that the university's implementation of this system would replicate the College's experience and justify any associated hardships.

With formal business thus completed, senators offered no private resolutions for the good of the order; so attention turned to a succession of information items. These began with Professor Brieger's report for the Campus Development and Environment Committee about changes in the university's smoking policy that should appear on March/April Senate agendas. Mr. Horwitz provided some background for this presentation, mentioning that the Committee had advanced a proposal to the Steering Committee, which then referred it back to the Campus Development and Environment Committee to be perfected in a few details. The Steering Committee has now received the perfected proposal and expects a motion to appear on the Senate agenda. By inviting Mr. Brieger to brief the Senate on forthcoming recommendations, the Steering Committee hoped to prompt reflection on them before formal action is taken. Mr. Brieger then explained that his Committee had responded to a request from President Packard, channeled through the Steering Committee, for reconsideration of current smoking policy. That policy restricts smoking to specified areas within each building, including faculty offices. However, complaints have arisen about foul hallways, with one faculty member claiming to find no fresh-air access to a classroom except through the window. His committee had also

studied recent research findings on the hazards of secondary smoke, a pollutant that cannot be successfully cleared by the university's ventilation system. Although his committee colleagues are not demanding that smokers change their habits, they are asking them to think about the communal aspect of their behavior. The proposal would prohibit smoking in all Campus buildings except private residences (with the residence halls specifically excluded for now, since they are in the process of developing their own policies). The only other exceptions would be for the Meadow Brook Theatre, when smoking is part of performance, and for research subjects in experiments related to smoking. For those interested in further information, he offered access to the committee's "fairly impressive" bibliography. Following this preview of coming Senate attractions, Mr. Horwitz moved ahead to other matters of general interest.

Vice presidential and deanal searches proceed apace. Mr. Pine reported that four candidates for the Academic Affairs vice presidency had recently made campus visits. Their credentials were under review by CAPs and the FRPC, and his Search Committee planned an all-day Saturday meeting to prepare its recommendations to President Packard. He praised the committee for conscientious, hard work. When Mr. McKay asked whether they were still accepting evaluation statements from members of the community, Mr. Pine indicated that those would be welcome anytime through the next afternoon. Mr. Horwitz reported that our president is making campus visits to learn more about candidates for this position. Mr. Goslin, who has inherited from Mr. Stevens the chairmanship of the Search Committee for the University Relations Vice President, reported that none of the candidates who visited campus in December will be joining us. The search has been reopened with the expectation that it will be more carefully directed toward a particular array of talents and experience. He urged people to nominate suitable persons. Mr. Olson then indicated that the Search Committee seeking a new Vice President for Finance and Administration had received a huge onslaught of applications, many from highly qualified candidates. They are now winnowing dossiers to select a group of finalists who will be invited to campus. Mr. Horwitz relayed reports from the two Professors Jackson regarding the progress of the two Dean Search Committees. Twelve persons have applied for the deanship of the School of Nursing, and Frances Jackson indicates that follow-up letters and reference inquiries are being sent out. Although the applicant pool is predictably small, she believes it includes some highly promising candidates. Glenn Jackson reports that the Dean Search Committee in the School of Engineering and Computer Science plans an all-day meeting on 6 March to select 10-12 candidates whose records they will scrutinize in order to choose a small group of finalists. It is Mr. Horwitz's hope that a new Vice President for Academic Affairs will be appointed in time to interview finalists for the two deanships.

Mr. Edgerton then called the Senate's attention to two *ad hoc* committees appointed by the Steering Committee to make recommendations to the Senate concerning governance arrangements for the Honors College and International Center, if these are moved from their original home in the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee looking at the International Center will consider an expanded university-wide role. Since the Honors College already enrolls most of its students from professional schools, it seems reasonable for a committee to consider inclusion of extra-College faculty in its governance. He expected recommendations from both committees to reach the Senate in March.

Mr. Horwitz then offered as an information item some news from UCUI that did not necessitate Senate action but might be of general interest to all those who read transcripts. The Registrar's Office has found a new way to designate repeated courses without resorting to the familiar slash marks. This system has been blessed by UCUI and will appear in each semester's

Schedule of Classes.

Following through on December's Good and Welfare initiative, Mr. Horwitz reported that he had presented to the Board of Trustees the Senate's special resolution advocating open conduct of the Board's committee meetings. The upshot of January consideration of this issue is a resolution to open all committee meetings on campus, not just those of the Board. As a consequence Mr. Horwitz himself has been designated chair of a new Committee on Open Meetings that must discuss what meetings should be open or closed and how much participation is to be encouraged from non-members attending open meetings. Announcing that his committee would be holding a suitably open meeting the next morning at 8 a.m., he invited all interested persons to attend. When the Board meets in March, it will be faced with a decision as to whether to bifurcate the parts of its resolution to consider its own meetings separately from others. The Oakland Sail Board has agreed to postpone its threatened lawsuit until after that meeting in hopes action will be taken on the original issue. Unfortunately, and to its members' regret, the next Board meeting could not be rescheduled and must take place Thursday afternoon, 4 March, during the University's winter-break week.

The next information item concerned a degree program that has been in limbo for many years after receiving Senate approval. Mr. Dahlgren announced that the Master of Science in Engineering Management program is about to be launched. It will start small, probably drawing some candidates from the M.B.A. program, but is expected to grow. He expected it to attract new students to Oakland University, particularly from the Research Park.

The Strategic Planning Process is underway, with task forces just appointed. Participants will gather at the Michigan State University Management Education Center on 26 February for a full day's retreat.

Mr. Horwitz reported encouraging news about the long-hoped-for new Science Building. There has been a flurry of activity lately in response to signals of renewed interest in Lansing, and it looks as though ours may really be one of the few construction projects with a good chance at funding this year. President Packard has been spending a great deal of her time lobbying for this project, assisted by Mr. DeCarlo and several Board members. Mr. McKay, declaring himself "thrilled" with such encouragement, urged the Senate to thank Ms. Packard and other Oakland ambassadors for their dedicated service; his sentiment appeared to be universally shared. When Mr. Stamps asked if this is the same building that was first proposed in 1976 and has been on hold for over a decade, Mr. Dahlgren assured him that plans have been reworked regularly to ensure that the building will be up-to-date when constructed. Even now the redesigning process continues. Mr. McKay, who chairs one of the departments expected to move into the new facility, praised the spirit of "shared sacrifice" that has expressed itself in generous cooperation among department leaders. Mr. Horwitz, while cautioning that no guarantees can be raised at this point, looked forward optimistically to the prospect of Governor Engler's wielding a shovel to break ground. With good wishes to all "faculty types" for an enjoyable break welcomed Mr. Gerulaitis's call for adjournment at 3:59 p.m.

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

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page