



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## **Oakland University Senate**

Third Meeting  
Tuesday, November 13, 1973  
3:15 p.m.  
128-130 Oakland Center

### ***AGENDA***

Submitted by Frederick W. Obear, for the Steering Committee

#### A. Old Business

None

#### B. New Business

##### 1. Motion from the Steering Committee (Mr. Obear)

THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE APPROVE THE NEW UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM AS DESCRIBED BY THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL CONSTITUTION AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF OAKLAND UNIVERSITY AND OF THE OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE.

First reading.

Comment: A copy of the proposed University Council Constitution is enclosed with this agenda.

Governance Commission II, a special committee\* consisting of the president, three faculty members, three students, two members of the administrative-professional staff, and a member of the clerical-technical staff has proposed a new system of internal governance for Oakland University. Central to the proposed system would be a University Council, which would in most respects replace the University Senate, University Congress, and Administrative-Professional Assembly.

[\*Beverly A. Beasley, Marianne M. Berry, Elizabeth L. Conner, Ronald L. Cramer, Richard A. Light, Roger H. Marz, Donald D. O'Dowd (Chairman), Rodney Ross, Jerry W. Rose, and Anne H. Tripp.]

##### 2. Motion from the Steering Committee (Mr. Obear).

a. THAT MOTION b. BELOW BE MADE ELIGIBLE FOR FINAL VOTE AT THIS MEETING.

Procedural motion.

b. THAT THE UNIVERSITY PLANNING COMMITTEE BE RECONSTITUTED AS THE ACADEMIC BUDGET AND PLANNING COMMITTEE WITH THE FOLLOWING CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP SPECIFICATIONS:

Charge: To prepare and disseminate general budgetary reports on all existing academic programs; to advise the Senate on budgetary implications of any academic program brought to the Senate for its approval; to oversee the development and updating of medium (3-5 year) and long-term (10 year) goals, objectives, and plans for programs and budgets; and In conjunction with the Academic Policy Committee to evaluate and monitor ongoing and proposed academic programs for their consistency with these goals and objectives.

Membership: Five faculty; three students; three administrative-professionals; and the Provost, who shall be *ex officio* and non-voting.

c. THAT THE FOLLOWING FACULTY APPOINTMENTS TO THE ACADEMIC BUDGET AND PLANNING COMMITTEE BE APPROVED:

- A. Liboff (Ch.) (2-year term)
- E. Bantel (1)
- W. Hammerle (1)
- R. DeVore (2)
- R. Eberwein (2)

Procedural motion, eligible for final vote.

3. Motion from the Steering Committee (Mr. Obear).

THAT MR. RALPH SCHILLACE BE NAMED CHAIRMAN OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE FOR A TWO YEAR TERM.

Procedural motion.

4. Motions from the Academic Policy Committee (Mr. Feeman)

THAT THE GRADE CONVERSION SCHEME FOR OAKLAND UNIVERSITY NUMERICAL GRADES TO THE COMMONLY USED A, B, C, D SYSTEM SHALL BE

- 3.5 - 4.0 A
- 3.0 - 3.4 B
- 2.0 - 2.9 C
- 1.0 - 1.9 D

First reading.

Comments: The University Senate approved the following grade conversion scheme on April 5, 1973:

3.6 - 4.0 A  
3.0 - 3.5 B  
2.0 - 2.9 C  
1.0 - 1.9 D

Shortly thereafter, the University Congress approved a different scheme, as follows:

3.5 - 4.0 A  
2.8- 3.4 B  
2.0 - 2.7 C  
1.0 - 1.9 D

and submitted it to President O'Dowd. Faced two contradictory proposals. President O'Dowd suspended the Senate action until an accommodation could be reached between the Senate and the Congress on the most desirable form of the conversion.

The Academic Policy Committee was charged with the task of determining a mutually acceptable formulation of a grade conversion system. The committee met on August 7, 1973, but was not able to arrive at a resolution of the matter. The newly formed Academic Policy Committee, with the full participation of its five student members as well as several University Congress members, discussed the issue at its meeting on October 29, 1973, and was able to reach a compromise.

Please note that this proposed scheme differs from the previous Senate approved scheme only in the A-B borderline. The A-range is widened by one-tenth of a point from 3.6 - 4.0 to 3.5 - 4.0, while the B-range is decreased from 3.0 - 3.5 to 3.0 - 3.4. The C-range and D-range are not changed. Undergraduate Grade Distribution data from Fall 1972 and Winter 1973 show the following differences in the two schemes in terms of percent of total grades earned in the respective ranges.

		Fall 1972	Winter 1973
(1)	3.6 - 4.0	19.5%	22.4%
	3.5 - 4.0	24.4%	27.5%
(2)	3.0 - 3.5	24.5%	25.7%
	3.0 - 3.4	19.6%	20.6%
(3)	2.0 - 2.9	24.5%	23.5%
(4)	1.0 - 1.9	5.6 %	5.6%

At the A-B border, there is an exchange of approximately 5% of the total grades.

It is also interesting to note the number of graduates with G.P.A. in the respective ranges 3.6 - 4.0 and 3.5 - 4.0. For the three most recent graduation lists the figures are as follows:

	3.6 - 4.0	3.5 - 4.0	Total
April 1973	86 (15.1%)	118 (20.7%)	570
June 1973	24 (9.8%)	43 (17.5%)	246
August 1973	9 (6.9%)	14 (10.7%)	131
Totals	119 (12.6%)	174 (18.5%)	947

This shows an exchange at the A-B border of about 6%. We wish to remind the Senate that the original *ad hoc* conversion scheme which was used in the days of the super grades 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, was as follows:

3.5 - 4.3 A  
 2.6 - 3.4 B  
 1.6 - 2.5 C  
 0.5 - 1.5 D

The proposed scheme is quite a bit tougher than that in the lower ranges, representing a change which nicely compensates for grade inflation in recent years.

Finally it should be noted that, even though the creation of a grade conversion scheme is intended to provide an official scheme for external purposes (graduate schools, professional schools, etc.) it will appear on the key which accompanies transcripts and thus will have rather widespread distribution.

For the information of the University Senate, the Academic Policy Committee feels that there is a need to study our entire grading system. In addition to the grade conversion problem, there is widespread confusion over the meaning of the grades we assign. Many people in the University community yearn for a simpler system. Furthermore, there are inconsistencies in the use of N grades and difficulties with procedures on the use of I grades. At its meeting on October 29, 1973, the Committee agreed unanimously that it would accept the charge to study the grading system and make recommendations to the Senate at some future date. It feels quite strongly that such a wholesale study would be far more useful in the long run than to spend great amounts of time and energy resolving problems with the present system in a piecemeal fashion. However, since the new conversion scheme is a matter of some urgency, the Committee urges reconsideration of the previous Senate action and adoption, with the University Congress, of the compromise action.

Office of the Provost/or  
 11/9/73

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

Home Page