

**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE**

Sixth meeting  
March 19, 1998

Minutes

Members present: S. Andrews, Benson, Bertocci, Blume, Cronn, Dillon, Doane, Downing, Eberwein, Gardner, Goslin, Grossman, Halsted, Hanson-Smith, Hildebrand, Keane, Landau, Lilliston, Lombard, Long, McNair, Miller, Moore, Mukherji, Olson, Otto, Papazian, Patterson, Polis, Reynolds, Riley, Rozek, Rush, R. Schwartz, Sen, Sieloff, Simon, Speer, Sudol, Wood

Members absent: Alber, Barnett, Blanks, Brieger, Connellan, Frankie, Gilroy, Haskell, Herold, Jarski, Johnson, Longan, Mabee, Mahamwal, Moudgil, Schochetman, H. Schwartz, Weng

## Summary of actions:

1. Motion to approve the January 8, 1998 Senate meeting minutes. (Mr. Keane, Ms. Reynolds)  
Approved.
2. Motion to appoint Ms. McNair to the Senate Planning Review Committee (Mr. Dillon, Ms. Reynolds)  
Approved.
3. Motion to recommend approval of the School of Business Constitution as revised. (Mr. Gardner, Mr. Olson) Motion approved following the approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Mr. Grossman, Mr. Olson)
4. Motion to recommend to the President and Board approval of the High Scope and Weston Technical academies (Mr. Dillon, Mr. Downing) Motion approved following the approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Mr. Dillon, Mr. Olson)
5. Motion to revise administrative memberships on Senate Standing committees. (Mr. Grossman, Ms. Reynolds) First reading

After calling the meeting to order the Provost recognized Ms. Halsted who invited everyone to a guest lecture by Angela Davis on March 28th at 3:00 p.m. The Provost called the Senate's attention to the information item regarding the name change of the Department of Mathematical Sciences to that of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. The January 8th Senate minutes were approved as distributed (moved by Mr. Keane, seconded by Ms. Reynolds)

The first item of new business, a motion to retroactively approve the appointment of Ms. McNair to the Senate Planning Review Committee was moved by Mr. Dillon. He noted that Ms. McNair has been serving on this committee this semester in place of Ms. Jackson who is on sabbatical. Following Ms. Reynolds's second, the motion was approved.

The next item of new business was presented by Mr. Gardner who moved that the Senate recommend approval of the revised Constitution of the School of Business Administration. He explained that changes in the accreditation process to reflect a mission based approach and new requirements such as continuous quality improvement had stimulated a review and revision of the existing constitution. The revised constitution reflects the requirements and concerns of the accrediting body. Following Mr. Olson's second, Ms. Papazian asked if Section v in Article III represents the main change. Mr. Gardner replied yes, adding that other changes were minor clarifications or changes in responsibility. With no further discussion forthcoming, Mr. Grossman moved to waive the second reading, Mr. Olson provided the second and the Senate concurred with more than the 3/4 majority needed. The main motion was then put to the vote and was approved.

Mr. Dillon then moved that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board the approval of two additional public school academies, specifically the High Scope Academy and the Weston Technical Academy. Following Mr. Downing's second, Mr. Dillon remarked that, in addition to the material distributed with the agenda, a memo from the Senate Planning Review Committee recommending approval of these academies had been distributed earlier in today's meeting. Mr. Blume wondered about the name of the High Scope Academy, noting that there is a school with the same name operating in Ypsilanti. Ms. Otto indicated that there is no relationship as far as we know. Mr. Blume then opined that using the same name as an established school might be considered deceptive. Ms. Otto replied that she will bring this up with the President of the High Scope institution in Ypsilanti and will ask if they see it as a problem. Mr. Blume commented that we don't want to be perceived as participating in anything that looks deceiving.

Ms. Eberwein asked, since it is housed in an Islamic Center, whether a clear distinction would be made between the Arabic culture and the Islamic religion, noting that schools with religious affiliations are not eligible for state charters. Ms. Melhado replied that there will be no religious focus or bias, that the curriculum will be culturally based and added that the legal office of the University has already considered this and is satisfied that there are no legal concerns. In response to Mr. Polis's question about just how this Arabic focus would work, Ms. Melhado stated that the core curriculum would be the basis but that it would be used with a Middle Eastern perspective. Mr. Gardner wondered how this focus on a specific culture fits in with the current movement toward cultural diversity. We have already charted two others with a cultural focus, Ms. Melhado stated and the schools should complement each other. And, she added, it is hoped, the schools will eventually collaborate with each other. The Provost noted that the memo from Ms. Otto that was distributed with the agenda is not part of the motion, but only an information item since concern had been expressed about the adequacy of oversight personnel. What if my child wanted to attend this Arabic-centered academy asked Mr. Keane. Ms. Melhado replied that anyone can attend, that enrollment is open and that there is no discrimination regarding admissions. Noting that there is a need to expedite this motion so that it can go to the Board in April, Mr. Dillon moved to waive the second reading. Following Mr. Olson's second, the Senate approved that motion and then voted in favor of the main motion.

Turning to the last agenda item, Mr. Grossman moved and Ms. Reynolds seconded a motion to revise the administrative memberships on Senate standing committees. Rather than reading the entire the motion, Mr. Grossman referred the Senators' attention to the exact text of the motion as printed in the agenda. Mr. Grossman commented that the motion's intent is to establish consistency across committees with regard to administrative appointments. As it stands now, some committees have designated titles specified while others are vice presidential appointments, some are voting, some non-voting. The accompanying chart is not part of the motion but shows the how the proposed motion would change the committees' administrative memberships.

Ms. Eberwein expressed some serious concerns about the proposed changes. She thanked to the Provost for bringing the proposal to the Senate committees' chairs and providing them an opportunity to respond. As the chair of the Senate Library Committee, as a long time veteran of the Senate Steering Committee as well as the former secretary to the University Senate, she recognizes the problems encountered by the new Provost in finding herself with committee spots to fill and committee spots not to fill although they are occupied by individuals reporting to the Provost. In addition she is sympathetic to the problems the Steering Committee must deal with regarding changing administrative titles and responsibilities. Even so, she stated, this proposal is a mistake and is likely to cause more problems that it will solve. She discussed the proposal with the Library Committee and that Committee was unhappy with its effect on their membership, since the Dean of the Library would no longer have a specific seat on the Committee. And, while the Provost indicates that one of her appointees would indeed be the Dean, there is no guarantee that the Library Dean would be appointed. The Library Committee would

also lose a VPAA representative and she explained that the Committee does not want to lose that position since it provides a valuable connection with Office of Academic Affairs.

Also, thinking back to her experience as the Senate's secretary, Ms. Eberwein noted that getting names of vice presidential appointees to committees in a timely fashion has been a problem and added that there are committees who can't function effectively or efficiently without their administrative representatives. Right now, with a few exceptions, it is clear who is to serve on various committees and doesn't depend on appointments. And while assurances have been made about how assignments will be made and records kept, she pointed out that records are often irregular and incomplete and that there are a number of years when only a few committee reports are on file, never mind the list of who was on the committees. There is also the matter of university history. There were reasons, she said, for the structures of the committees and changing the administrative representation will ignore the intent of those who formed the committees. She continued, noting that the problems this attempts to address are those seats designated for the Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee. There are only six of these seats and the reason they are included is that those committees' work is so important to the Academic Affairs Office that an administrative liaison is needed. Also, now the Provost will be faced each fall with an increased number of appointments rather than the six currently in place. The Steering Committee's concern about administrative changes is not a major problem since changing titles is something done fairly easily and routinely through a simple Senate motion. She sees no real advantages to this proposal and some severe disadvantages and she asked the Senate to think carefully about this proposal.

Ms. Eberwein then moved to amend the proposal to add the Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee to the Library Committee. Ms. Papazian seconded the motion. Mr. Grossman asked for clarification; you want two designees rather than one he asked and Ms. Eberwein agreed. Ms. Rush stated that she would prefer to have the Dean of the Library designated for the Library Committee rather than just two VPAA designees. The Provost responded that the Dean of the library would be on the Library Committee. That is not guaranteed by the language of the motion, Ms. Rush pointed out. The Provost referred to the accompanying chart which indicates her intended designees. If the desire is to have the Dean of the Library on the Library Committee then motion should state that, responded Mr. Grossman. Mr. Andrews suggested that another way to approach this would be to delete the words "and Library" and change Committees to Committee from part 1 a of the proposal, so that no change would occur with regard to the Library Committee and so moved.

Mr. Dillon cautioned that these proposed changes bring into question the whole structure of the motion. The intent of the motion, except for certain titles specified by the Senate Constitution, was to replace specific titles with designees of the appropriate Vice President. Ms. Rush indicated that the Senate Budget Review Committee hasn't had a chance to review this proposal and that she would like time to consider the overall implications of the proposal as well as the specific implications it will have on the Budget Committee. The Provost remarked that, since this is only the first reading, there should be time for committee discussion before the April Senate meeting.

Ms. Eberwein questioned whether it is a good idea to remove specific titles from the memberships and argued that there were valid and important reasons why they were included in committee memberships. She noted that one can't assume that appropriate people will be named and there is no reason to assume that future VP's would feel themselves bound by what is proposed today. She also worried that administrative officers might choose not to serve and so one could end up with the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee lacking someone from financial aid or admissions.

The Provost summarized that a motion to amend the amendment is on the floor, namely to strike the words "and Library" and change committees to committee in 1A. However, she noted, that motion was

not seconded. Mr. Grossman pointed out that the motion is really a clarification of the original motion to amend; Mr. Andrews concurred and the motion to amend the amendment was dropped. Mr. Dillon pointed out that the original amendment does not address the issue of assuring that the Dean of the Library would continue as a representative on the Library Committee. The only way of dealing with that would be to add the phrase "except for the Dean of the Library on the Library Committee" in part 1 of the proposal.

The motion now on the floor is to amend the proposal so that the Library Committee would have two VPAA designees rather than one, stated the Provost. She commented that the issue has also been raised as to the wisdom of removing specific administrative representatives from some of the committees. Mr. Keane asked if further amendments could be entertained at the next meeting and Mr. Grossman replied yes, adding that the Senate doesn't vote on amendments anyway at the first reading. Mr. Keane then suggested that concerns should be brought up now and placed on the table, that committee members should discuss it with their committees, and then further refinements could be proposed and discussed at the second reading in April.

Mr. Polis questioned the wisdom of making most of the administrative positions non-voting. The Provost replied that this was her suggestion, that the administrative representatives should serve as a liaison between the administration and committees to foster communication but should not interfere with or unduly influence committee decisions. She remarked that she's been told that, in general, most committees come to consensus and seldom actually vote. With regard to the idea of shared governance, Mr. Grossman noted that non-voting administrators has the effect of putting more power into the hands of the faculty and student members of committees.

Mr. Gardner wondered if the tradeoff is worthwhile, commenting that he doesn't quite understand what was broken. It appears that right now it is clear who should serve. However, with this proposal there seems to be uncertainty as to whether or not there will be proper representation of those individuals whose knowledge and input is integral to the work of the committees. The Provost called for further discussion and hearing none, opened the floor for any good and welfare items. With no good and welfare items, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 upon a motion of Mr. Olson and a general exodus toward the doors.

Submitted by  
Linda L. Hildebrand  
Secretary to the University Senate

[Return to Senate Home Page](#)