

Oakland University Senate

Sixth Meeting
February 17, 2000

Minutes

Members present: Andrews, Braunstein, Brieger, Chapman, Coppin, Dow, Early, Eberwein, Esposito, Garfinkle, Grossman, Hildebrand, Marks, Mitchell, D. Moore, K. Moore, Moran, Mosby, Pfeiffer, Rozek, Russell, Schochetman, Sieloff, Stamps, Sudol, Wood

Members absent: Alber, Benson, Blanks, Boddy, Buffard-O'Shea, Carter, Downing, Eberly, Emrich, Estes, Fink, Gardner, Herman, Kleckner, Liboff, Long, Mayer, McNair, Mili, Nakao, Olson, Otto, Polis, Riley, Rusek, Schwartz, Shablin, Sharma

Summary of actions:

1. Approval of the minutes of the January 20, 2000 meeting. (Moore, Sieloff) Approved
2. Report on Master Planning Process (Schaefer)
3. Motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee to amend the university readmission policy (Sieloff, Braunstein) Approved following approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Andrews, Sieloff)
4. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to staff a Senate standing committee (Sieloff, Andrews) Approved.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Esposito and the [minutes](#) of the January 20th meeting were approved, following a motion by Ms. Moore and a second by Ms. Sieloff. Mr. Russell questioned a statement by Mr. Moudgil concerning graduate student support and its impact on the budget but Mr. Esposito counseled him not to worry about it since the university administration was still working on the budgetary implications of the program. Mr. Esposito added that he will be discussing these issues with the Deans and that the final budget will be different from the one presented to the Senate.

Senate Constitution Amendments

Mr. Esposito reported that a lively discussion had taken place at the open hearing that was held last week on February 10th and that ballots were then sent out on the 11th. Some concern has been expressed about the voting list and whether or not the new Banner system had a correct roster. An e-mail has been sent telling faculty to notify Mr. Mayer, the chair of the Senate Elections Committee, if they have not received a ballot. Mr. Garfinkle stated that no one in the Physics Department has received a ballot. Mr. Esposito responded that the Feb. 25 due date may need to be extended to ensure that everyone has gotten a ballot and had time to vote.

[Master Plan Process](#)

Ms. Schaefer and Ms. Aldrich then updated the Senate on the progress that has been made in developing an updated master plan for the university. A Task Force co-chaired by Ms. Schaefer and Mr. Esposito is working on the project and meeting with both internal and external groups

to gather input for the process; their report is due in March 2001. The master plan being developed is to provide guidance until the year 2020 and will build on the ideas contained in the Strategic Plan and the Creating the Future document. Rather than turning the process over to an architect, the campus community will create the plan and the architect will be involved later in the implementation. Updating the master plan is important at this time because of the changes and growth at the University. We need to have a physical map in place that will help us achieve our goals and that will serve as a tool for making management decisions. Topics being discussed include what is a master plan, what is the appropriate process for developing such a plan, what information is needed, what is OU's vision of where it will be in the next 20 years, how will all this fit into the mission, vision and strategic goals of the institution. Ms. Schaefer noted that the Enrollment Planning Council is in the process of developing an enrollment plan that will play an important role in the planning process. Variables such as enrollments, academic programs, the mix of graduate/undergraduate students or residential/commuter students will be factors in developing the master plan.

There are two phases in the process. Phase 1 will include looking at the strategic vision, developing the planning principles, gathering information about future enrollments, looking at the Strategic Plan and doing an "as is" analysis of the campus, the latter with the assistance of outside evaluators. Ms. Schaefer noted that some of the campus infrastructure has reached the end of its useful life. Phase 2 will focus on planning solutions, matching programs and facilities and coming up with implementation strategies, e.g. financing, placement of facilities, infrastructure issues. She emphasized that there will be extensive consultation at all stages of the process. Ms. Schaefer noted that parking is an important issue and that an ad hoc parking committee was established to consider the options and make recommendations.

Then, using campus maps, Ms. Aldrich identified those areas that are developable, namely the corner of Adams and Walton, the area along Squirrel and the upper and lower playing fields. Those that aren't include a number of wetland areas, the south campus golf courses, the faculty subdivision, the east campus with a number of its buildings part of a National Register Historic District, and possibly the areas recommended by the Senate to be set aside as biological reserves. New development in the western core campus will include the new education building and maybe also additional student apartments. She reported too that the Board recently approved the redesign of the northwest parking lots and that some temporary lots will be constructed.

A question and answer period followed. Responding to Mr. Stamps' query about activity around the playing fields, Ms. Aldrich stated that they are trying to improve them by raising the grade to eliminate some of the water problems. She added that it is likely that they would remain as athletic fields. Mr. Dow asked if there was any thought given to constructing pedestrian tunnels between buildings, particularly since so much activity takes place during the winter months. Ms. Schaefer said no, there are no plans for tunnels but that the planners are interested in creating a pedestrian campus and will consider the placement of buildings to make it easier for people to cut through during inclement weather. As for the faculty subdivision, Ms. Schaefer indicated that Rochester Hills has just changed mayors and planning directors and that there's not much going on right now regarding Adams. The university returned the most recent proposal from Rochester Hills with the statement that it was unacceptable. Mr. Stamps thought that Adams Road and the faculty subdivision should be included in the master planning process. With regard to Adams Road, Ms. Wood indicated that she was very much in favor of the status quo. Mr. Moran countered as a Birmingham resident that he'd like to see the road widened as soon as possible.

Returning to the parking issue, Mr. Grossman stated that he hoped Oakland would maintain its tradition of open free parking. Ms. Schaefer commented that they decided early in the process that parking could consume them and so established the ad hoc committee, adding that the main concern is to make sure we have enough. Mr. Russell indicated his delight that athletics was a low priority in the planning principles. Mr. Garfinkle said that, while it is a good thing to be able to look at the principles, it is another thing to have an actual plan and indicated his belief that the campus community should be consulted as early as possible as a plan is created. Ms. Schaefer reiterated that the process is designed to incorporate consultation and that the next step in the process is to match the academic plan with the master plan. She indicated that the Task Force will consult when appropriate. Which led Mr. Garfinkle to wonder when it would not be appropriate. Ms. Schaefer used as an example the redesign of the northwest parking lots which was shared with the Campus Development and Environment Committee but which did not come to the Senate.

Ms. Wood expressed concern over the need to fix up existing buildings and in particular 124 Wilson Hall which was scheduled for renovation, a renovation that has been postponed. Ms. Schaefer responded that they will have the time frame for renovation done within the next two months but that the renovation of 124 may not take place until the summer of 2001. Ms. Eberwein was pleased by the focus on quality academic facilities and the idea that like disciplines should be grouped together. She wondered about the site of the new education building and the opportunity to locate it in a way that would facilitate alliances with other units. She added, that in addition to the architect's advice, it would be good to get input from the university community. Ms. Schaefer responded that there is already a planning committee looking at these concerns. Mr. Dow added that frequently the problems are in the details, the sidewalks, the berms and planters that restrict sight lines, etc. Ms. Schaefer opined that the Master Plan will guide future facilities decisions but won't be prescriptive and won't include all the details. We will be looking for an architect who will be responsible for taking our vision and working with it. Mr. Moran asked if the new education building might be an aesthetically satisfying building and Ms. Schaefer only commented that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. With the new buildings on campus, Mr. Stamps wondered who would decide on the allocation of space as areas of existing buildings are vacated. Mr. Esposito answered that, with regard to academic units, he would, after appropriate consultation. Mr. Moran suggested that the 18 year old carpet in O'Dowd be replaced. Ms. Aldrich mentioned the Master Plan web site, noting that it includes the option of sending the Task Force comments and suggestions.

The master plan will have input from the Enrollment Planning Council, Mr. Esposito reminded the group. A draft of their plan should be ready by mid March this year.

Readmission Policy

The first item of new business, a motion to amend the university's readmission [policy](#), was moved by Ms. Sieloff, seconded by Mr. Braunstein. Mr. Moran requested that the split infinitive be corrected. Mr. Esposito noted that the current policy does not limit the number of times a student can be readmitted and this amendment will change that. Mr. Keane reported that he has served on the Academic and Standing Honors Committee for a number of years and that the committee would sometimes see the same names over and over again, that there was no policy to prevent this. He noted that this policy is comparable to other schools and that it doesn't preclude the student from going to another institution. Ms. Eberwein wondered about the two committees involved. Mr. Keane stated that the University Readmission Committee is made of of staff who have been doing it for many years and that the guidelines for the first readmit are not particularly rigorous. The Academic Standing and Honors Committee handles

any additional readmission requests. There was no further discussion and Mr. Andrews ventured a motion to waive the second reading. Ms. Sieloff seconded and the motion to waive was approved. The Senate then voted to approve the additions to the Readmission's Policy.

The second items of new business, a motion to replace Mr. Bello-Ogunu on the Academic and Career Advising Committee with Jane Goodman, was moved by Ms. Sieloff, seconded by Mr. Andrews and approved by the Senate.

Good and Welfare

Under the Good and Welfare rubric, Mr. Grossman expressed concern over the Banner system and continued university support for Macintosh computer users. Mr. Cigna responded that the problem was not with Banner or the Macintosh, but rather the result of an expired certificate. The particular problem Mr. Grossman experienced has been fixed but Mr. Cigna noted that, while the university does support Macs, many of the software vendors do not since around 95% of the computers now are PC's.

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate
3/14/00

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