



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 13 April 1989  
Eighth Meeting

### *MINUTES*

Senators Present: Abiko, Appleton, Beehler, Bhatt, Braun, Burke, Cass, Chipman, Christina, Coffey, Downing, J. Eberwein, Eliezer, Fish, Frankie, Fullmer, Garcia, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hartman, Hildebrand, Hough, Karasch, Ketchum, Kleckner, Millwood, Muir, Olson, Pettengill, Pillow, Sherman, L. Stamps, R. Stamps, Stern, Theisen, Tracy, Williamson, Wilson, Witt.  
Senators Absent: Barthel, Brown, Cardimen, Champagne, Dahlgren, R. Eberwein, Haskell, Herman, Horwitz, Jackson, Larabell, Lauer, Lindell, Maschke, Miller, Murphy, Pine, Reddy, Riley, Schimmelman, Sevilla, Tripp, Wedekind.

#### Summary of Actions

1. Special resolution on transfer admission policy (Pettengill; Hough). Deferred for first official reading at a subsequent meeting.
2. Motion to call the question (Braun; L. Stamps). No vote taken
3. Motion to waive a second reading (Braun; Stern). Declared out of order.
4. Motion to direct the Steering Committee to call a meeting (Gerulaitis; Stern). Approved.
5. Minutes of 16 March 1989 (Stern; Garcia). Approved.
6. Motion to approve revised version of a new constitution for the School of Business Administration (Hough; Tracy: introducing a modification of the Horwitz; Theisen motion from 9 February 1989). Approved.
7. Motion to modify policy on reporting academic status in 100 and 200-level courses (Dahlgren; L. Stamps). Approved.
8. Amendment to require indication of performance within the first four weeks of a course (Chipman; Coffey). Defeated.
9. Amendment to require indication of status within four weeks in 100-level courses and 6 weeks in 200-level courses (Coffey; Chipman). Defeated.
10. Procedural motion to staff Senate standing committees (Wilson; Pettengill). Approved.
11. Good and Welfare motion to approve amendments to SBA constitution (Hough; Tracy). Ruled redundant.

Mr. Kleckner began the year's last scheduled Senate meeting promptly at 3:10 p.m., indicating that he would have to leave early and had therefore arranged to yield the chair to Mr. Appleton. Because of late-breaking new business, he proposed approaching the agenda "by inversion." Copies of a special resolution were distributed for consideration. Mr. Kleckner explained that the issue of standards for transfer admission had arisen in part because of APPC planning activity that reveals confused ideas on enrollment and its links to the budget. He reminded his colleagues that we were on a program to reduce enrollment slowly but that we have put that

program on hold in response to last summer's tuition rollback, which threw our budget/enrollment projections out the window. We have now stopped any notion of enrollment reduction for the time (estimated as at least 2-3 years) until the deficit is completely eliminated. The question we now face is how to keep enrollment steady. This proves hard to do, given all the variables in our system. Transfer admission seems to be a key factor.

The Senate's role in this matter is tied to its responsibility to set admissions policies. Back in 1985, the Senate responded to recommendations in the Commission on University Excellence (CUE) report by approving a new admissions policy. This measure introduced two major changes in standards for transfer admission: (1) increasing GPA requirements, and (2) increasing credit requirements from 28 to 40 except for those applicants whose high school performance had qualified them for admission. Those involved in formulating the revised policy had expected item (2) to have only short-term effects in diminishing transfer applications while anticipating that (1) would have long-term implications; the opposite has proven to be true. Although community college administrators approve (2) because of its tendency to retain students at those institutions, counselors there keep on assisting students who want to transfer early in their college careers and simply steer those candidates away from Oakland because they haven't yet achieved 40 credits. They disregard the other part of our policy that declares many students eligible for earlier transfer on the basis of their high school records.

Applications for admission are down this year for several reasons. FTIAC candidacies have diminished in response to demographic trends that we have long anticipated. Transfer candidacies seem to be diminishing also -- in part because of the way the new admissions policy is being reported to potential applicants. Because most transfer candidates file their applications later in the year than high school seniors, the majority of those who may apply for next fall have yet to declare themselves. Mr. Kleckner stressed that transfer admission is important to the university, which needs flexibility to respond to changing patterns. His proposal was that the Senate consider modifying current requirements in a way that will maintain academic quality while opening eligibility to students who have a good chance of success. He stressed that he was not interested in any long-term policy change that bypassed normal governance structures. All he was asking at this point was a few months of flexibility until the Committee on Admission and Financial Aid had a proposal to bring before its parent body, the Senate. He requested temporary authority to modify provisions of the new transfer admission policy in order to maintain enrollment. Unless we maintain current enrollment, he warned, we inevitably face further budget cuts. It was the 40-credit provision that he saw as causing problems and that he would like the opportunity to modify during the spring and summer. This matter had arisen suddenly so that he had not had the opportunity to review a proposal with the Steering Committee as a whole. He had consulted individually that morning with four of its six members and had spoken just before the meeting with the other two.

Mr. Pettengill, seconded by Mr. Hough, then introduced a resolution on behalf of the Steering Committee:

### **RESOLVED**

1. ) That the Senate authorize the Provost to suspend the 1985 increase in the minimum number of credits required for the admission of transfer students to Oakland University through the fall of 1989 if necessary to maintain the level of

enrollments projected in the 1989-90 budget, and

2 . That the Committee on Admission and Financial Aid study the matter of transfer admission standards and make a recommendation to the Senate in fall 1989.

Introduction of the resolution unloosed a flood of questions. Ms. Braun began by inquiring whether Oakland maintains different GPA standards for students transferring from two-year and four-year institutions. When informed that it does not, she queried whether anyone ever gets less than a B in a community college. Mr. Chipman expressed concern about the resolution's contradiction of recommendations in the CUE report. He had no problem with modifying current policy with respect to the 40-credit requirement if he could be assured that the Admission office would be instructed to admit only students with a real chance of academic success rather than simply opening the university's doors to all comers in hopes of balancing the budget. Mr. Kleckner denied any intention of simply sliding back to the old 28-credit requirement and indicated that admissions office would be expected to look carefully at a student's whole record.

Mr. Stern professed alarm at the university's failure to communicate clearly with community college administrators and counselors. He asked if we had a better plan for getting our message across this time. Mr. Kleckner traced the problem to the message's having been too complex in 1985: a demand for either credits or a satisfactory high school record had proven hard to deal with, and half of the message had been forgotten. This discussion led Mr. Stern to conjecture that the key variable might not be credits but terms of study. He would have liked to see the proposal modified to introduce terms spent at an institution as the point of issue, but Mr. Chipman preferred to leave the matter simply as a problem we know we'll have to fix systematically eventually rather than trying to formulate a complete proposal on the spot. Mr. Kleckner argued that the problem with terms is that some students take only one or two courses each time while other pursue full programs.

When Mr. Christina asked whether the proposal had gone through the Admission and Financial Aid Committee, Mr. Kleckner reported that it had not. The urgency of the problem had just come to his attention, and he had thought it best to go directly to the Senate with a short-term idea for carrying on until that committee could examine alternatives in the fall. Otherwise, it would be necessary to call both that committee and the Senate into extra sessions over the spring. Mr. Christina then persisted in his inquiries to find out how Oakland could keep from becoming the laughingstock of the community colleges by its reversal of policy. Mr. Kleckner suggested that our representatives could meet with community college counselors to explain how we are clarifying our policy to help them do their job. Mr. Christina refused to buy that idea, given that the community college counselors already have computerized record systems that enable them to examine high school records.

Ms. Muir supported the resolution because she had faith in the people who would be implementing it. Still, she reported two reservations. In the first place, she feared that we might be complicating matters in the interest of simplifying them. Also, she suspected that most prospective fall transfer students would already have made their plans by this point. Mr. Rose, however, still expected about 60% of the transfer applications his office is likely to receive for the fall. He responded to prior discussion by reminding senators that few candidates for transfer admission actually consult community college counselors, that many of them interrupted their educations many years ago, that some amassed weak high school

records so far back as to be of no predictive value now, and that 40% of our transfer students come to us from four-year institutions.

Ms. Stamps worried that the university might be tempted to overload its classrooms for the sake of generating revenue. She hoped there would be a cap on the number of new students. Mr. Kleckner assured her that it is easy to stop admissions when we reach our enrollment goals. His motivation in offering this proposal was not to raise money but to arrive at an enrollment of 9200 students with good chances of success in our curriculum. He reminded his colleagues that there was no intention of going back to pre-1985 standards. All he asked was a one-semester trial of a more flexible approach. Nonetheless, Ms. Stamps called attention to existing problems of students being turned away from overcrowded classes. Even with a slightly shrinking enrollment, the university has difficulty serving current needs. Mr. Kleckner commented that regulating enrollment is a difficult business. Anyone who wants the job may have it. Shortly after that, he apologized for running out (the result of a meeting conflict that developed when the April 6 session was cancelled in favor of this date) and yielded the floor to Mr. Appleton. In parting, he mentioned that the Senate might want to devote a second meeting to this issue but needed to act quickly.

Ms. Garcia declared herself in favor of the resolution. A community college graduate herself, she had faith in the counselors who serve such institutions and thought that Oakland should be able to improve its communications with them. Her support launched a succession of similar statements -- many of them couched in acknowledgment of doubts. Mr. Hough thought he supported the motion but hoped he understood why. He wondered who the swing group might be: were they older persons whose high school records had been weak but who have proven themselves in two-year colleges for a short while? Mr. Rose said that was correct. The university wants some latitude in dealing with cases of that sort. Mr. Appleton pointed out that he had seen no evidence that transfers with fewer than 40 credits actually perform less well here than FTIACs or other transfer students. He would really hate to see us exacerbate our fiscal problems and trigger unhappy eventualities out of a misplaced sense that we are upholding academic quality. Mr. Christina, on the other hand, voiced his support for the resolution as another entry he is compiling in his list of simplistic solutions that won't work but that Oakland characteristically adopts. Ms. Muir, while basically in favor, hoped the admissions office would pay attention to the intended majors of candidates. She would be reluctant to add to already overloaded pools of applicants for admission to major standing. Mr. Rose assured her that there was no plan to open the floodgates. His staff would be careful in evaluating a person's full record. All he wanted was freedom to get rid of a problem that has been caused both by publication of an arbitrary number and by failure to communicate existing policy. Ms. Beehler declared herself tentatively supportive on the basis of assurances she had heard, but she wondered how many students would be likely to be affected by the resolution. Mr. Rose thought there might be 100-200, if we move quickly and if we manage to communicate that we are interested in increasing flexibility without sacrificing academic standards.

Taking the negative side, Mr. Burke thought this approach a mistake. He feared Oakland would only compound confusion by changing policy on a short-term basis. He preferred that we intensify our efforts to communicate the neglected aspects of our existing policy. Mr. Rose, responding to concerns he had heard, hoped that whatever policy the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee might bring before the Senate next year would take many factors into consideration beside credits. He favored Ms. Braun's suggestion that we pay attention to the quality of previous schools attended.

Mr. Tracy supported the resolution. He urged that policy drafters pay attention to how people predictably respond to rules. They always respond better to a simple message than a complicated one. He judged this step a good one, having found no strong feeling at the university in favor of shrinking enrollments or of cutting the number of transfers. The prospect of a fuller study in the fall encouraged him. He shared concerns that had been voiced earlier about the problem of communicating this step in a positive light.

Looking for an alternative that would be less likely to imperil academic standards, Ms. Stamps asked whether we have stand-by admission practices like those adopted by Ivy League schools. If we did, she suggested that we could reconsider the qualifications of some earlier applicants whose candidacies had been put on hold. Mr. Rose agreed with her but reported that Oakland has never maintained waiting lists. He indicated that the proposal he had in mind to bring before the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee next fall would work better than the current system. Even now, he thought we could honestly say to counselors that we are looking for specific types of students for certain programs. This comment led Mr. Stern to hope that we could avoid signaling the improvisational nature of Oakland's response to problems.

Following this interchange, Ms. Braun (seconded by Ms. Stamps) moved to call the question. Mr. Grossman, however, wondered where in its constitution the Senate might be deriving the power to act on this matter. Mr. Appleton said that it would be necessary to get a 3/4 vote of those present to waive a second reading; failing that, he proposed, it would be necessary to vote to hold an additional meeting. Thus advised, Ms. Braun (seconded this time by Mr. Stern) moved waiver of the usual second reading. Mr. Grossman again interposed a question of protocol, pointing out that the motion had not been circulated in advance to all members of the faculty and staff, as the constitution stipulates, and thus had not officially had so much as a first reading. Mr. Fullmer opposed a waiver since the issue was one of such substance. When Mr. Stern raised a question about whether senators could do all the necessary work to give the matter adequate consideration after only ten or fourteen days, Mr. Appleton remarked that it could really be no more than a week. Still, he favored an extra meeting if people felt uncomfortable. He agreed with Mr. Grossman about the matter of a first reading and therefore ruled the Braun motion out of order. The alternative he suggested of a motion to direct the Steering Committee to call another meeting and to place this issue on the agenda was promptly offered in motion form by Ms. Gerulaitis (seconded by Mr. Stern).

All this parliamentary delay prompted Ms. Stamps to inquire whether there is any Oakland precedent for dealing promptly with crises. Mr. Appleton replied that there were various stratagems that could be applied, though he would prefer not. When Ms. Braun asked how many senators would constitute a quorum for an extra session, Mr. Appleton said that the constitution stipulates no number. Thus informed, the Senate voted to direct its Steering Committee to call a special meeting for deliberation on this issue. So ended the "agenda by inversion."

Mr. Appleton signaled the return to normal procedure by calling for attention to the minutes of the Senate's 16 March conclave (Moved, Mr. Stern; seconded, Ms. Garcia). These were approved without discussion.

Mr. Hough, seconded by Mr. Tracy, then embarked upon old business by moving approval of a revised form of the new School of Business Administration (SBA) constitution, as detailed in the agenda. With Mr. Horwitz absent, Mr. Hough called attention to the explanatory material

that had been made available to the Senate. Mr. Ketchum, apologizing for his absence at the first reading, then inquired about the responsibilities of Committees on Appointment and Promotion (CAPs). He wondered if it were really the school's intent to call upon its CAP for more work than the contract requires. Specifically, he asked whether the faculty expected the CAP to handle CI reviews. It turned out that the SBA CAP has already been accomplishing that task and is expected to continue its practice. He then asked why CAP is represented as advising the FRPC rather than making recommendations to it. Mr. Ketchum considered the latter option a stronger one that more adequately characterizes what these committees do. Messrs. Hough and Tower huddled briefly to consider their response; while Mr. Tracy ventured a guess that the language might have been chosen for stylistic reasons to achieve parallelism with the phrase "shall advise the dean." Mr. Hough suspected that either word could have been there without stimulating an argument. Mr. Ketchum, concerned about possible degradation of the CAP, urged modification of the language related to its connection with the FRPC although he admitted unconcern about its dealings with the dean. Mr. Hough recalled that CAP letters traditionally use the verb "recommend." To amend the constitution on this or any other point would necessitate sending the document back to the sponsoring school, amendments being beyond the purview of the Senate.

Mr. Ketchum then pursued his inquiries, asking about the school's Research Committee: the source of its funding and the beneficiaries of its largesse. It turned out that the funds disbursed by the committee were all internal to SBA and that all SBA faculty members not serving on it were eligible to apply.

Mr. Stamps, having examined the amendments to the previously introduced constitution, still failed to find the verb "consent" following "advise" with respect to the Assembly's role in responding to decanal proposals for departmental restructuring. When Mr. Tracy said that the omission was intentional, Mr. Stamps declared his opposition. Ms. Stamps explored the issue to find out whether proposals on school structure that emerged from the dean would fare better under this governance model than those emanating from the Assembly. Mr. Hough maintained that they would be treated the same: in either case, the dean would be obliged to forward the Assembly's action along with its reasoning. Ms. Theisen pointed out that language had been developed specifically to ensure that the Assembly's judgments would be known. According to Mr. Tracy, his colleagues thought it most important for the reasons behind the Assembly's negative response to a dean's proposed reorganization to go forward and be considered; they did not wish to include "consent" in their language. Yet Mr. Christina found no language that would guarantee that their reasons would be carried forward -- only their actual recommendation. He preferred "consent" as stronger diction that would mean that a negative vote could be resisted only in defiance of the constitution.

Mr. Fullmer, reminding the Senate of issues that confronted the AAUP in contract negotiations many years before, advised caution in dismissing such words from governance documents- Mr. Stamps sensed erosion of some basic principles; he worried that authors of other school constitutions might have yielded too much and was prepared to go to the mat on this issue despite the many merits of the proposed constitution. Mr. Christina discerned another trap: that a dean could send forward whatever proposal he wanted, with or without Assembly approval beyond simple consultation. He conjectured a scenario by which a Dean of Business Administration might propose his school's merger with the College of Arts and Sciences, leaving his faculty helpless to defend themselves. Mr. Hough reminded him that the dean would still have to seek the Assembly's advice in order to advance his or her proposal. If the diction were so crucial to faculty rights, Mr. Tracy wondered why it appeared in no other

school's constitution. He concluded the debate by reminding senators that his colleagues actually preferred this language and by pointing out that they had been told that "consent" would probably never get through counsel. Mr. Christina, however, argued that all constitutions included this language at one time. Following this spirited interchange, Mr. Appleton called for a vote on the matter, and the revised SBA constitution was approved by a vote of 18 in favor, 10 opposed.

The remaining item of old business was a motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee (Moved, Mr. Dahlgren; seconded, Ms. Stamps):

**MOVED** that instructors of 100 and 200-level courses provide to each registered student some indication of his or her academic progress prior to one week before the withdrawal period ends.

Ms. Gerulaitis, recalling that professors were once required to notify students of their academic status four or six weeks into the semester, criticized this proposal for setting too late a reporting time for students to get help. Mr. Appleton pointed out that the motion modified existing policy only by extending it to 200-level classes, not by changing dates; but Ms. Eberwein noted that the original policy had been expressed (like this one) in terms of withdrawal dates so that the Senate's subsequent revision of the grading system had effectively extended the period covered by the policy. Mr. Chipman (seconded by Ms. Coffey) then introduced an amendment to require indication of status within the first four weeks of a course. This amendment sparked considerable debate.

Mr. Stern worried that some professors would have a hard time reporting progress so early, especially in courses that depended heavily on papers rather than tests. Ms. Gerulaitis, however, reasoned that it should be possible to get some feedback early in the marking period. Mr. Tracy opposed the amendment, which would violate the rhythm of many courses that use two examinations and a final. Mr. Downing, sympathetic to the rationale behind the Chipman amendment, asked for specific information on how it would increase a student's flexibility. Mr. Stern detected an issue of academic freedom in any legislation that would effectively prohibit an instructor from giving a course with just a midterm and a final. Mr. Chipman, on the other hand, saw no reason why the Senate needed to consider only faculty convenience rather than student advantage. He thought it best to provide guidance that would actually help students. Ms. Stamps declared herself in favor of the amendment; while Ms. Gerulaitis assumed that only those indifferent to whether a student fails or passes would oppose it. Mr. Grossman, however, withheld his endorsement because 200-level courses vary tremendously in their structure. When the chair called for a show of hands, the amendment failed.

It failed, however, by a narrow enough plurality to encourage its supporters to make a second attempt. Ms. Coffey (now seconded by Mr. Chipman) proposed an amendment to set the reporting time at four weeks in 100-level courses and six weeks in 200-level courses. Mr. Tracy pointed out that this system would do no good in spring and summer terms. He thought it much more sensible simply to tie the reporting date to the withdrawal period. In that case, Mr. Chipman wondered who would actually benefit from a student's simply being warned to withdraw in time. Mr. Tracy admitted there would probably be no pedagogical benefit; he didn't want to be seen as advocating this method of teaching a class. Ms. Coffey thought comparable dates could be established for spring/summer terms. By a show of hands, however, this amendment also failed.

Returning to the main motion, Mr. Stamps asked on whose shoulders responsibility would actually rest for notifying students of their academic standing. Would it be the instructor's job to alert the student or the student's to inquire? Must he go individually to each student with information about that person's prospects? Ms. Stamps thought it would be unreasonable for anyone to expect a student to guess her or his status without specific evidence such as a graded test or paper or a conference with the instructor. Mr. Burke assumed, correctly as it turned out, that he would have done his job if he simply gave tests and returned them to the class before the cutoff date without actually pursuing a student who failed to pick it up. When Mr. Tracy asked how the policy would be enforced, Mr. Appleton responded with much unhappiness that the duty of reminding his faculty colleagues of their obligations would presumably devolve upon him. He thought that routine reminders of Senate policy might have some legal effect as well as impact on Committees on Instruction in their handling of petitions. Ms. Garcia supported the motion as an attempt to redress some wrongs that have been done to students in the past. She knew of students who had been given quite inadequate feedback and therefore endorsed the legislation as an attempt to protect students. Mr. Appleton reminded his colleagues that, even if the motion should fail, the existing policy would still bind instructors of 100-level courses. When put to a vote, the motion carried overwhelmingly.

Ms. Wilson (seconded by Mr. Pettengill) then introduced a motion from the Steering Committee to staff Senate standing committees with the faculty members named on the agenda. No discussion ensued, and the nominees were unanimously confirmed as elected.

When Mr. Appleton invited proposals for the good of the order, Mr. Hough took the floor to present a problem. Mr. Tower's keen eye had detected a possible flaw in the Senate's action on the SBA constitution so that its supporters feared that it might have been endorsed without its new amendments. Messrs. Hough and Tracy, therefore, moved to approve the amendments. This situation prompted Mr. Christina to remark the the school obviously did not require Senate consent. Mr. Stamps, identifying this meeting as the occasion of historic abrogation of faculty power, wished to demand a roll-call vote on the crucial issue. Ms. Wilson, however, asked on behalf of the Steering Committee whether the School of Business Administration had not presented to the Senate an amended constitution. Ms. Eberwein, also speaking for the Steering Committee, reminded her colleagues that the Senate cannot amend any unit's constitution. It was her understanding that the faculty of SBA had submitted to the Senate a revised document (Hough/Tracy motion) that effectively superseded the new constitution introduced two meetings earlier (Horwitz/Theisen motion); thus the Senate's adoption of the motion on which it had just voted carried with it approval of the amendments. Mr. Tracy suggested that the chair simply rule on the matter, and Mr. Appleton ruled that the amended document had already carried.

In the absence of the regular chair, the budget report promised on the agenda as an information item was deferred until the special meeting that would soon be called. Ms. Eberwein reported on the Campus Voice issue that the Steering Committee had requested information on advertising policy from the Dean of Students' Office and would report its eventual findings to the Senate. Mr. Burke, who had not yet noticed one of these signs, asked what they looked like. Ms. Eberwein described the aluminum bordered signs that have recently appeared in areas of campus buildings where students are presumed to gather (none in Wilson Hall, as it happens) and summarized the kinds of information and advertising that appear on them, mentioning that she had noticed some career information as well as material on date rape. She encouraged senators to examine these signs and report their reactions but mentioned that she had never noticed students reading them. She saw no evidence that these signs helped



the university publicize its own events or policies. Ms. Stamps amplified this report by connecting the new signs to the electronic sign in the Oakland Center with which we have been living for several years. That one scrolls out information about happenings on campus. The others simply frame news items and advertising. One located near an especially poky elevator gets thoroughly studied by waiting students. With the agenda thus completed and the sad business of dissolving this Senate effectively postponed for at least another week, Mr. Stern called for adjournment at 4:50 p.m.

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

*Back to*  
**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY**  
**S E N A T E**  
*Home Page*