



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Third Meeting
Thursday, 7 December 1989
Oakland Room, Oakland Center

MINUTES

SENATORS PRESENT: V. Allen, S. Appleton, M. Arshagouni, K. Berven, D. Bricker, J. Briggs-Bunting, P. Cass, J. C. Chipman, M. Coffey, J. Cowlshaw, G. Dahlgren, G. Dillon, R. Eberwein, W. Fish, S. Frankie, J. Grossman, P. Hartman, A. Hormozi, R. Horwitz, J. Hovanesian, K. Kazarian, K. Kleckner, V. Larabell, A. Lindell, F. Mili, B. Murphy, R. Olson, R. Pettengill, K. Salomon, F. Schieber, J. Schimmelman, M. Sherman, L. Stamps, A. Tripp, G. Wedekind, T. Weng, H. Witt, C. Zenas

SENATORS ABSENT: B. Abiko, K. Beehler, D. Braunstein, P. Bertocci, P. Cardimen, J. Champagne, J. Eckart, I. Eliezer, W. Garcia, L. Gerulaitis, B. Hamilton, D. Herman, K. Kulig, A. Liboff, A. Meehan, D. Miller, G. Pine, V. Reddy, J. Rosen, R. Schwartz, B. Theisen, R. Tracy, J. Urice, R. Williamson, B. Winkler

Call to order at 3:15 p.m. by Provost Kleckner. Notes change of venue. Provost Kleckner asks to reorder the agenda due to a need to leave for another meeting at 3:30 p.m.

I Informational items:

1. Regarding the question raised by L. Gerulaitis about the return policy for library books borrowed by faculty, many attempts have been made over the years to reach a reasonable compromise on this issue. Present policy is the result of such compromise and will stand.
2. Regarding scheduling of rooms in the Oakland Center, this question became moot just a few days after it was raised. Preferential student scheduling policy is not new--it is an attempt to strike a balance among multiple constituencies. Policy is currently being reconsidered especially for departmental events/activities involving students. Another option is to schedule meetings in the new library space.
3. Meetings continue concerning Macomb County enrollments. The task force chaired by S. Appleton has completed their report. A Beardslee report also suggests fewer and fewer FTIAC'S. Evidence is accumulating that other universities are stepping up recruiting activities in this region, meaning enhanced competition for freshmen. Oakland University will need to become more aggressive in a highly competitive market. Western Michigan University now gets 20% of its enrollment from the tri-county area. OU will need to step up recruiting, scholarships, including full academic scholarships, etc. This will help market the university to

potential students.

Regarding transfers, Macomb County is a major supplier of OU students and we are seeing a decrease in transfers to Oakland University. We need to be more aggressive in recruiting. OU was not an early participant in the Macomb Community College venture. However, meetings continue to identify what we can do with the college. Oakland University is perceived as "snooty." We accept fewer credits from MCC than do other 4-year colleges in this region. Counselors do not "go out of their way" to recommend students to Oakland University. (Walsh College has an 82 credit acceptance rule.) Provost Kleckner points out however, that the real issue is how many credits transfer toward the degree. Students sometimes may not even ask. There is a need to talk to counselors to have Oakland University better understood. We need to look at our standards compared to others, and talk with students regarding why they should consider OU. Increased affluence in this area means more students will enter competitive schools. It is clear that OU will need to cooperate in some way in the Macomb Center. We may offer a part of our programs there, or conferences, etc. All options will cost additional monies. However, we need to be concerned about what will happen if we don't participate; e.g., decreasing enrollments. Negotiations are becoming more specific. FTIAC situation in Macomb County is not so different from other counties. The major difference is in transfer students.

II. Approval of minutes October 19, 1989. Moved (A. Tripp, G. Wedekind). Approved unanimously.

III. Old Business:

None

IV. New Business

A. Motion (1): From the Steering Committee to fill a vacancy on the Academic Conduct Committee (Pettengill/Briggs-Bunting).

MOVED that David Lau be appointed an alternate member of the Academic Conduct Committee to fill the unexpired term (1989-90) of Barbara Mabee.

Procedural Motion: Debatable, amendable, and eligible for final vote at this meeting. Unanimously approved.

B. Motion (2): From the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to modify minimally acceptable scores for the award of credit by CLEP examinations (Appleton/Pettengill).

MOVED that: Oakland accept credit for CLEP general examinations passed with scores of 550 or higher and subject examinations passed with scores of 55 or higher, except that no credit will be granted for examinations which cover material comparable to Oakland University courses which do not carry credit toward graduation, and

Five years after this is implemented the UCUI will review the composition of CLEP credit recipients to see what effect this policy change has had and will recommend to the Senate whether further action seems advisable.

First Reading: Eligible for discussion but not final vote at this meeting.

Discussion by S. Appleton: Figures on agenda give a notion of the 157 most recent students awarded CLEP credits; comparative survey suggests OU standards are among the highest for CLEP requirements. Most difficult case is to decline credit to transfer students who have been granted credit by other academic institutions.

Questions:

How many students took test? B. Millwood states no concrete numbers available but trends are that more students are trying CLEP.

F. Mili asks for new score percentile data. J. Cowlishaw explains the process of initially establishing the test items and percentile standards. On subsequent use, questions change without testing on a reference group. Percentiles continue to determine that about 50% of students pass, using CLEP reference cut off scores. Tests are renormed only when new content is added. Majority of schools use scores rather than percentiles to make decisions to grant credit.

S. Appleton clarifies that accepted CLEP scores usually place students above the 50th percentile. A. Tripp states that with the need to recruit transfer students, we should support this motion.

A. Tripp moves to forego second reading (R. Horwitz seconds). S. Appleton speaks in support of the main motion but not in support of waiving the first reading. A. Tripp asks about effects on enrollment for winter. S. Appleton sees no effects. S. Appleton asks about effects on current students and asks would students have an opportunity to resubmit scores for reconsideration. F. Mili notes that using scores would mean percents would be different.

Motion to waive first reading passed unanimously. No further discussion on main motion. Passed without dissent.

D. Good and Welfare:

A. Science building is moving along well. Later in 1990 we should see money voted for building.

B. Dean Frankie speaks to availability of space in the library for classes and seminars. Further information is forthcoming. Computer labs to open in winter. Government documents on-line in February. Materials being removed from remote storage and journals will be classified in subject areas by next fall. Hoping for new furniture pending fund-raising success.

C. R. Horwitz: calls for update on A/P exams. Encourages us to be competitive regarding A/P exams as well as CLEPS.

D. J. Grossman: Asks about timetable for secondary education proposal. Dahlgren states perhaps after the first year of the year (1990).

VI. Adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Penny Cass

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page