



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 17 March 1994  
Sixth Meeting  
*MINUTES*

Senators Present: Andrews, Benson, Bertocci, Bhatt, Braunstein, Briggs-Bunting, Buffard-O'Shea, Chipman, Christina, Dahlgren, Downing, Dunphy, Eberwein, Fish, Frankie, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hansen, Hildebrand, Hormozi, Hough, Hovanesian, Khattree, Liboff, Mittelstaedt, Moran, Olson, Polis, Rickstad, Rozek, Rush, Russi, Schmitz, Schott-Baer, Selahowski, Wedekind, Zenas.

Senators Absent: Abiko, Ari, Bricker, Brown, Capps, Cole, Garcia, Kheir, Mabee, Marks, Moore, Muir, Otto, Packard, Pine, Pipan, Reddy, Reynolds, Rooney, Schwartz, Sevilla, Shepherd, Stano, Stevens, Taam, Thomas, Urice

### Summary of Actions

1. Reports on proposed recreation center (Mr. Herman), strategic planning (Ms. Frankie), technological improvements (Mr. Connellan), fund-raising (Mr. Disend), faculty hiring (Mr. Russi), admissions and enrollments (Mr. Russi), and the Dodge Hall fire (Mr. Russi).
2. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to replace the chair of the Academic Conduct Committee (Grossman; Gerulaitis). Approved
3. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to fill a vacancy on the Academic Conduct Committee (Zenas; Hansen). Approved.

Mr. Russi called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m., turning at once to presentations on several matters of general interest. He first introduced David Herman, Acting Vice President for Student Affairs, who provided information about recreational needs on campus, including those for aerobic equipment and for a pool meeting new competitive specifications. Confronted with a number of expensive decisions about upgrading the Lepley Center, people have begun looking into possibilities of building a new sports and recreation building. Visits to other campuses with new facilities increased awareness of just how much Oakland's center has fallen behind those of other institutions, some of which compete with us for students. Recreation facilities recently constructed on these campuses have proven attractive to older students and women as well as to traditional undergraduate students and athletes. His office is now working with a consultant on preliminary plans for a recreational center that might be functional as early as the fall semester of 1997. In the process of raising awareness on campus and assessing interest in building a new recreation center, he and his graduate intern (herself a veteran athlete) have been making an audio-visual presentation to student groups and other interested parties. He then entertained the Senate with that show, which combined contrasting images of dismal Lepley Center facilities and glamorous new sports palaces, occasional written statements underscoring the severity of our need and the possibilities of change, and energetic

music with a driving rhythm. The projected center, it appeared, could be used for public events as well as athletics.

Following this lively display, Mr. Christina inquired whether the projected center would be used exclusively for student recreation or also for competitive sports. Mr. Herman replied that the swim teams would necessarily use the new facilities; others might still use Lepley. That answer led Mr. Christina to note that we might still have to renovate that building in any case. Ms. Briggs-Bunting delightedly praised the audio-visual presentation as the best proposal she had yet seen at Oakland University. When she said it deserved a round of applause, her fellow senators responded graciously. Mr. Herman then credited Geoff Upward and his staff with development of the video. Appealing as he found the proposal, however, Mr. Bertocci wondered what we would not be building if we choose to do this. Since construction costs would not come out of state funding but money borrowed through bonds and repaid through student and user fees, Mr. Herman saw no conflict with construction of academic facilities, which (like the Science Building) would result from legislative appropriations. Mr. Liboff then asked where the center might be located. The consultant is exploring several options to evaluate comparative costs and traffic implications (both vehicular traffic and the pedestrian sort) in order to predict maximum utilization. Just recently, the corner of Walton and Squirrel has emerged as a strong candidate. References to a consultant prompted Mr. Christina to ask what the university was paying for those services. Mr. Herman informed him that \$50,000 had been budgeted last year for this study, with money coming from the Foundation and Student Affairs. Ms. Sandoval, Acting Director of Admissions, pointed out that prospective students and their parents often ask about recreational opportunities when visiting our campus. It can be difficult to show them the variety of activities currently going on here either in sports or the arts. Mr. Liboff then wondered what impact a new center would have on future uses of the Oakland Center and Lepley. Mr. Herman recognized that there would be some overlap with the OC, as most sports buildings these days have some food services (health bars predominantly) and meeting space. There would not be competition for sit-down meals, however, and he anticipated that a recreation building might take some pressures off the OC to allow for scheduling more meetings. Ms. Benson's inquiry about overlaps with Health Enhancement Institute facilities brought the response that there would, indeed, be some duplication of aerobic machinery and running tracks but that the two facilities serve different users. The new building would be mainly for students. When Mr. Olson asked whether plans are already set for what kinds of sports would be provided in the new building, specifically mentioning indoor tennis, Mr. Herman indicated that the consultant is investigating interests within our campus community, estimating times when one or another facility would get most use, and costing out options to help in assigning priorities. Indoor tennis courts, which require extensive space in proportion to number of users, seem relatively unlikely choices unless a private donor steps forward. To get further senatorial response, Mr. Herman urged everyone to fill out a yellow questionnaire card such as those already collected from other campus groups.

Mr. Russi then called upon Ms. Frankie to provide what would probably be her last update on the strategic planning process. She reminded the Senate that its official deliberation on the proposed plan would begin on 14 April. Recent developments began with February distribution of the draft plan to the university community (with each senator provided four copies to share with colleagues) and open hearings on 15 and 16 March that were conducted by the Senate's Planning Review and Budget Review Committees. Copies of statements presented by the fourteen persons making official presentations at those hearings could be provided to anyone interested. She estimated attendance at each hearing as about forty persons. Because concerns about undergraduate education had emerged as a disturbing theme at those hearings,

she and Mr. Chipman had met that morning with the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to enlist that body's help in reviewing provisions in the plan relating to undergraduate education. Meanwhile, the Strategic Plan Steering Committee continues its intensive labors, with Friday and Saturday meetings projected for the coming weekend. At that time they would have cost estimates available for the first time, provided by the Task Force on Resources and also will be assigning responsibility for implementing specific recommendations. Even as the Steering Committee reviews comments already received, it invites additional responses and promises to take them into account. The Authorship Committee meets next week to review the document, and the Steering Committee plans another marathon set of meetings the weekend of 25-26 March. A final version of the plan, including costs and responsibilities, is scheduled for release on 7 April in time for Senate deliberation and action on 14 and 20 April. It is hoped that President Packard will bring the plan to the Board for its approval this May and June.

Next came a report from Mr. Connellan, officially entitled "Technology--A Strategic Step" but actually calling attention to a number of steps being taken to improve computing capabilities for academic and administrative use. Mr. Connellan began by indicating that Library staff and the Senate's Academic Computing Committee had worked very closely on these developments at every step of the way. He appreciated helpful advice from these representatives of the university community. The centerpiece of his report was the new fiber optic system. Cable installed earlier will soon be hooked up to all buildings, thereby bringing new levels of technological power into offices and classrooms. In a related development, he announced that a proposal would soon reach the Board for installation of a new digital telephone switch from ROLM. The university's Distance Learning Committee is now exploring possibilities of expanding our range of instruction through such technology. He stressed that its members are committed to maintaining quality of academic offerings comparable to courses conducted on campus. Meanwhile, efforts continue to replace outdated computer equipment on a gradual basis. There are great disparities of age and adequacy in equipment currently used, and the goal is to ensure that everybody can carry out tasks successfully. Steady incremental improvements should stave off need for waves of major equipment replacement every few years. New technology raises expectations that Oakland will soon be able to carry out administrative computing tasks now being performed on a University Senate Minutes 17 March 1994 page 4 rental basis off campus and that we can accomplish this work at lower cost.

When questions were invited following this presentation, Mr. Hovanesian led off by inquiring how Mr. Connellan's group defines its task. He had expected a broader interpretation of its charge. Mr. Liboff agreed, recognizing that technology could be envisaged in further ways, including improved inter-university communication. When Mr. Christina asked whether the new system would provide all offices with Internet capability, Mr. Connellan replied that it could; the telephone switch will have great capacity once the whole network is in place. Mr. Liboff maintained that the university should have at least one dish pointing to the heavens for downlinking (as with Hubbell telescope information that could then be displayed visually). Mr. Connellan noted that it is one thing to downlink to one building, but moving the display to classrooms and other locations presents challenges. Ms. Hildebrand's inquiry about how much of this new equipment would be for students drew a range of replies. Mr. Connellan responded that "some of it" would meet their needs. Mr. Russi added that the projected network can provide a more active learning environment in residence hall rooms and elsewhere, while Mr. Herman added that the new telephone switch would improve faculty chances to communicate with students elsewhere on campus.

Mr. Disend then stepped forward to report on the university's fund-raising situation, using slides to illustrate his presentation. Acknowledging that Oakland has been thought to be insufficiently effective in raising donor contributions, he tried to correct that impression by pointing out that the university actually ranks in the top 16% of public comprehensive universities in terms of fundraising. Using slides to demonstrate points of interest, he began by providing graphic evidence of decline both in number of donors and actual revenues over the past three years. One of his charts also showed the actual disposition of gifts, demonstrating that only a relatively modest percentage has been going to auxiliary enterprises. By and large, he noted, the university's fund-raising efforts are geared toward regular giving in support of ongoing programs; much less money gets raised for endowments and new facilities. There has recently been a major slump (over \$100,000) in gifts from major donors, and we have been getting surprisingly few of our large gifts from individuals as distinct from corporations and foundations. By contrast, national averages for such philanthropy show institutions generally raising a much higher percentage of contributions from individuals than from businesses. Oakland has spent as much as 40 cents on every dollar we succeed in raising. With paying membership in the President's Club declining now that long-term members have paid up their obligations and new prospects are discouraged by long waits for golf course greens time, we need to redirect our fund-raising focus. The encouraging news is that we have reversed the downward trend this year and are gradually heading upward--with a decreasing percentage of gifts earmarked for auxiliary enterprises, some of which have engaged in costly fund-raising activities. As the productivity of our development staff rises, dollars spent on fundraising decline in proportion to moneys raised.

Looking toward a probable capital campaign in support of the expected Strategic Plan, Mr. Disend pointed out that universities traditionally double gift-giving at the end of a campaign as compared to its beginning. Local conditions could alter that pattern somewhat, however. He outlined a possible timetable for such a campaign, projecting a period of planning that would begin this summer with a period of gathering data on possible contributors. The private phase of the campaign would begin next year in order to yield a nucleus fund. Then the university would go public with the campaign from 1996-97 to 2000-2001. During this seven or eight-year process, of course, some institutional needs would be likely to change. He demonstrated on a chart that a broad range of dollar goals is possible although none would result in actual collection of more than about one-third of the money pledged; the rest predictably comes later in the form of bequests and ongoing gifts. He ended by cautioning that there are many variables involved, with no guarantees of full happiness in matching contributions to specific Strategic Plan goals.

Mr. Chipman launched the question period following this report by asking for more information about variables affecting the university's prospects. Mr. Disend referred to two comprehensive studies of fund-raising in higher education that provide useful benchmarks. When Mr. Liboff asked what advantages or disadvantages we face in contrast with the University of Michigan and other educational institutions with longer histories, Mr. Disend responded that we benefit from trends away from dependence on corporate philanthropy, which tends to benefit institutions on whose boards a corporation's chief officers sit. Individual giving is different, and it is to our advantage that there are many persons with great wealth in our area. If we work really hard, we have hopes of becoming their preferred charity. National foundations, on the other hand, respond to prestige and are inevitably harder for us to persuade than Michigan foundations. Mr. Russi pointed out that the timing of Oakland's campaign would be important. We should try to avoid overlap with similar endeavors by the University of Michigan and Michigan State. Mr. Liboff indicated that he, as a scientist, felt

particular concern about filling the gap between our equipment needs and state funding. Mr. Disend recognized that concern but doubted the gap could ever be completely filled. The target always moves: as money comes in and people do good things with it, the tendency is for them to dream harder and want more.

Following these reports, Mr. Russi provided information about other matters of general concern. He began with faculty hiring. Sixteen faculty searches have been authorized: six in the College of Arts and Sciences, six in the School of Education and Human Services, three in the School of Nursing, and one in the School of Business Administration. Fifteen of these fill vacancies, with the one newly created position awarded by President Packard to Arts and Sciences. Two searches have already resulted in successful recruitment of new colleagues, one in Business and the other in English. He hoped for similar success in filling the remaining positions and looked forward to welcoming sixteen new colleagues.

So far as welcoming new students is concerned, he noted disparate trends in applications for admission. In the College, both the application flow and enrollments are up overall, but both are down in the School of Business Administration. Applications have risen slightly in the School of Education and Human Services, though enrollments declined. In other words, patterns vary from school to school. The aggregate effect is that Oakland University's application flow is slightly down at this point, with enrollments dropping by 3.2%. The transfer pool is also down, but it is too early for alarm on that score. Ms. Sandoval pointed out that transfer students tend to make decisions in the spring. Theirs is now the hot market. Statewide, the pool of prospective FTIACs is down about 4.2% this year, with most state universities reporting fewer applications from aspiring freshmen. Mr. Russi promised to provide the Senate with information about graduate enrollment trends as information emerges. Mr. Bertocci's inquiry about the impact of the Macomb University Center on our enrollments elicited Ms. Sandoval's response that, as we offer only one program there at present, offerings by other schools hurt US. The effect is particularly pronounced in business because the Macomb program has the reputation of being a watered-down version of that offered on the home campus of its sponsoring university and is therefore considered an easy road to a degree.

Mr. Russi then concluded the informational part of the meeting with further word on the Dodge Hall fire and its effects. After recounting the several stages of Monday night's crisis, he lauded public safety officers and members of the Oakland community for their remarkable response. The building is now both open and safe. Fire damage, though heavy, was mainly confined to the immediate area of the laboratory where it began, with some additional injury to a wall leading to the fourth floor Eye Research Institute and the roof. Smoke and water damaged other facilities. He especially regretted that some of our graduate students and faculty colleagues have lost months and even years of research work. Damage costs are still being estimated. The university has a \$50,000 deductible on its insurance, with \$45,000 of that reserved in escrow. We await word from Lansing on our application for disaster relief. He praised the heroic, generous response to the week's challenges by fire fighters, police, faculty, students, deans, and staff as the university responded to the fire and made provisions for carrying on necessary functions. We can be relieved and grateful, he told the Senate, even though saddened by our collective loss.

On that note, he turned to the three items of actual business presented to the Senate. First came consideration of the minutes of 13 January 1994, which were approved. Next, in the absence of any old business, came two procedural motions from the Steering Committee in

response to Professor Lilliston's resignation from the Academic Conduct Committee. First, Mr. Grossman moved (seconded by Ms. Gerulaitis) that Frank Lepkowski be confirmed as elected to chair the Academic Conduct Committee for the remainder of this academic year. The Senate having approved that motion, Ms. Zenas (seconded by Ms. Hansen) moved that Michael Latcha be confirmed as elected to replace Lawrence Lilliston on that committee from now until 14 August 1995. That nomination too, won ready approval.

When opportunity arose for Good and Welfare announcements and proposals, Mr. Braunstein rose to announce the understandable relocation of that evening's Jeffrey Sachs lecture from Dodge Hall 201 to the Varner Recital 11. He urged his colleagues to attend this stimulating and important program offered in memory of the late Professor Alice Gorlin.

On that note, Mr. Russi looked for evidence of the body's willingness to adjourn and accepted Mr. Dahlgren's motion for that purpose at 4:32 p.m.

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

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

*Home Page*