



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Ninth Meeting
May 2, 2002

Minutes

Members present: Abiko, Aubry, D. Berven, Coppin, Eberwein, Graves, Grossman, Henke, Hildebrand, Jarski, Klemanski, Latcha, Lipman, Mabee, Machmut-Jhasi, Moudgil, Mukherji, Osthaus, Otto, Russell, Schwartz, Schweitzer, Shablin, Smith, Stamps

Members absent: Alber, Bazaz, K. Berven, Binkert, Blanks, Clark, Didier, Downing, Eberly, Emrich, Frick, Gardner, Goldberg, Haddad, Hansen-Smith, Khapoya, Kheir, Long, McNair, Mann, Mosby, Olson, Rozek, Sangeorzan, Schmidt, Schott-Baer, Sethi, Sevilla, Sieloff, Surrey, Willoughby

Summary of actions:

1. Motion to endorse the *Oakland University Profile 2010*. Second reading.
2. Consensus vote to substitute revised SPRC version of *Oakland University Profile 2010*. Approved.
3. Motion to endorse the revised *Oakland University Profile 2010*. Approved.
4. Motion to staff Senate standing committees. Procedural motion. Approved.

The Provost called the meeting to order at 3:15. Ms. Klemanski was recognized and announced that the Oakland University Telephone Directory would soon be available online as a WORD document and that individuals could access it and print out copies. The directory includes both full and part-time faculty, full time faculty have offices and phone numbers listed; part-time faculty may just have unit phone numbers listed since they may not have offices on campus. Following her announcement, the roll was called with 25 Senators indicating their presence.

Turning to old business, Mr. Moudgil reminded the group that the motion to endorse the *Oakland University Profile 2010* had been amended during its first reading and a substitute motion had been presented to endorse it as amended with the proviso that any future revisions be reviewed by the Senate. Now a revised version of the *Oakland University Profile 2010* has been prepared by the Senate Planning Review Committee. On behalf of the SPRC, Mr. Russell

MOVED that the revised SPRC version be accepted as a substitute and further that the Senate appoint a committee to develop a vision statement and that the Senate should request the senate liaisons to the Board to inform them of this act.

Mr. Stamps provided the second. Mr. Moudgil pointed out that he had distributed to everyone a copy of the OU mission statement. Mr. Russi wondered if item 2 at the bottom of the revised

version meant the committee was to revise the mission statement. Mr. Moudgil indicated that the intent was not to modify the mission statement, the intent was to develop a vision statement. Mr. Stamps stated that he likes the new profile, noting that it takes the best ideas of everyone and puts them together. Ms. Jackson, chair of the SPRC, spoke in favor of the mission statement. Responding to Mr. Grossman's query concerning the differences between the two versions, Ms. Jackson indicated that ambiguities and inconsistencies were eliminated and certain other areas were clarified, adding that the new version would work better at providing a direction for fund raising activities. She thanked Mr. Henke for his comments at the last Senate meeting that proved very helpful as they worked on the document and recognized Mr. Russell who worked on reorganizing the document. She pointed out that most of what is in the new version came from the original but has been rearranged into four clearer categories. Ms. Jackson also felt that developing a vision statement was important, that it should be done by a small group and that the Senate should be the driving force developing the vision. Mr. Russell commented that some of the important characteristics we want are more clearly stated, e.g. the contact between students and faculty. And Ms. Jackson added that the committee focused on what is important to Oakland, that is, we want to teach, to create new knowledge, and most importantly, to work with and to inspire our students.

Mr. Henke recognized the urgency in getting this written and approved, yet noted that another key aspect was the lack of vision and an institutional mission statement that does not distinguish us from everyone else. He thought it important that we find ways to set OU apart, to define unique ways that make Oakland stand out among all the other institutions of higher education in the region. Mr. Osthaus asked "what next?" If this is approved and we proceed with it, what happens if we don't achieve the goals, will this then be revised? In response, Mr. Moudgil stated that yes, as the goals are achieved, or not, or as new goals arise, the document may need revision. He added that this is a document the OU community has agreed upon, it can be shown to donors to help the university raise money and support for the University's programs. Ms Schweitzer pointed out that it is also useful for new faculty, that it gives a clear message that undergraduate and graduate programs are important. Mr. Jarski, however, thought that the document was almost apologetic about graduate programs and felt that it should emphasize graduate programs as much as it does undergraduate ones. References to graduate programs in special areas are included, Mr. Moudgil responded, but graduate programs are not widespread and the undergraduate program is the common denominator. Mr. Russell stated that the committee felt we should emphasize quality programs period, never mind whether they are undergraduate or graduate. We need to keep in mind, remarked Mr. Henke, that this is a high level document, a hook to catch the attention of donors, and opined that focused graduate programs are a plus. He stressed the need for an *ad hoc* committee to develop a vision statement that could be used to identify the uniqueness of OU, something that could be used to identify the University. Ms. Berven raised a question concerning item # 5 under academic programs, namely the statement that "every OU undergraduate will have the opportunity to work with a faculty mentor in research or other creative endeavors"; she asked whether or not this might be a bit strong since it is hard to imagine how this might work in certain majors. Mr. Russell indicated that the key word is "opportunity", that it that this is a vision, a goal, but doesn't guarantee that every student will do this. Ms. Berven countered that the key word is "every." Ms. Eberwein commented that many units in the College are involving students in research.

Mr. Lipman spoke in favor of the substitution, particularly since it came through the governance process (SPRC) and felt it would point us in the right direction. Ms. Smith asked for additional information regarding how this document would be used, how will we know it is

doing what it is intended to do? Mr. Moudgil responded that this is a document produced by the community, that as a consensus document it can be used for publicity and for developing external resources to support our programs. Mr. Lipman asked for clarification, that is, do we want the SPRC document to replace the original and if so, we should decide and then continue debate on the appropriate document. A vote was taken and the Senate agreed unanimously to substitute the SPRC version for the original and discussion then continued on the SPRC version. Mr. Grossman asked if the substitution also included the three items listed at the bottom of the document. There was consensus to eliminate the word "mission" in item #2. Mr. Lipman, along with Mr. Smith, expressed concern over how this would be used. Mr. Lipman noted that the "Creating the Future" document was useful as a mechanism for developing friends & building connections with outside constituencies. Then the academic units discovered that the document had to be quoted in order to obtain funds for internal projects and so the purpose of the document changed from a friendship building exercise to a policy creation exercise. He argued that those outside individuals are not the bodies that should create the policies for this institution. Mr. Lipman then asked if the purpose is to drive financial and programmatic decisions or to be a vision that we work toward and the usual mechanisms are still in place. Mr. Moudgil replied that if we created this document through the governance process and approve it, then it should count as where we want to go. Mr. Henke appreciated that the intent is to raise money but to use it as a way to run the university is wrong because the process was wrong. The procedures for developing this kind of information is a set process and the approach that was used to develop this document was not consistent with good business practice; he felt that it was driven by the [Washington Advisory Group's report](#) rather than being developed internally. The process he stated should have involved coming up with a vision statement that is acceptable to the university community, then making sure the vision is consistent with the mission, and finally coming up with goals and objectives, which is what this profile is. He was also concerned over the fact that few faculty were involved although the Provost explained that he had expected the deans and chairs to share the Profile with their faculty.

Ms. Smith asked for clarification about the idea that the Senate adopt this as a "working" document. Mr. Moudgil replied that this is not written in stone, as new issues and opportunities arise, we may need to amend this profile. Ms. Jackson added that as the vision statement is developed, we may need to revisit these goals and objectives. Regarding item 3 at the bottom, Ms. Klemanski wondered if it shouldn't be the Provost reporting to the Board rather than the faculty Senate liaisons. Ms. Jackson responded that Mr. Sudol had suggested that it be the faculty representatives and the Committee thought it seemed like a good idea. However, since Mr. Russi has already reported to the Board at one of their working sessions, this may be a moot point. Mr. Grossman confessed he was still confused over item 2 and asked whether this vision statement would be shorter, longer, what? Mr. Henke responded that the vision statement should be short, about one sentence.

At this point, Mr. Moudgil called for a vote and the senate voted unanimously in favor of the motion as presented below:

MOVED that the Senate endorse the Oakland University Profile 2010 (the SPRC version) as presented to it this date as amended, and Be it further moved that any revisions to the document be reviewed by the Senate. (Mr. Lipman, Mr. Grossman)

Mr. Russi expressed his appreciation for the work of the Senate and its committees and their

efforts to create a document that clearly articulates a sense of direction for Oakland. This Profile will be used as a guidepost for the capital campaign. Mr. Henke then asked, what about item 2, e.g. establishing the *ad hoc* committee to develop a vision statement. Mr. Moudgil suggested that, with the Senate's approval, he would consult with the Senate Planning Review Committee and other bodies to come up with a representative committee. Mr. Grossman pointed out that constitutionally the Senate Steering Committee is charged with establishing *ad hoc* committees. Mr. Moudgil then indicated he would take the matter to the Steering Committee, adding that he wanted to expedite the process and that he would solicit input and approval via e-mail. Mr. Russell suggested that the e-mail be sent to all faculty asking for volunteers or nominations for this *ad hoc* committee and Mr. Moudgil agreed to this process.

The next item on the agenda, a motion to fill vacancies on Senate standing committees, was moved by Mr. Coppin and seconded by Mr. Latcha. Ms. Eberwein commented that she was grateful to her colleagues for volunteering to serve but indicated her concern that untenured faculty were being tapped to chair some of the committees. They are usually very valuable members of a committee, she noted, but chairing committees involves a tremendous amount of work for a faculty member at that stage of their career. She stated that we should not be burdening untenured faculty with these responsibilities and that tenured people should volunteer more and accept leadership responsibilities. Mr. Moudgil indicated that he would help find more tenured faculty to serve. The motion to approve the members and chairs as printed in the agenda was then approved.

There were no items brought forth under the rubric of good and welfare and the Senate, having completed its business for the 2001-2002 year, then adjourned.

Submitted by:
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

Oakland University Profile 2010

as revised by the Senate Planning Review Committee
and approved by the Senate on May 2, 2002.

Quality academic programs

? Oakland University will provide high quality and challenging undergraduate education that offers students an enriching and diverse combination of liberal arts, professional education, and cultural and social experiences.

? Oakland University will create a visionary general education program that provides all Oakland baccalaureate graduates with the intellectual and cultural foundation for productive citizenship and a satisfying personal life in the twenty-first century world.

? Oakland University's commitment to the highest quality undergraduate education will be shown by the high percentage of classes taught by full-time faculty.

? A majority of classes taken by Oakland undergraduates will have sizes that maximize opportunities for student-faculty interactions.

? Every Oakland undergraduate will have the opportunity to work with a faculty mentor in

research or other creative endeavors.

? Oakland University will offer a wide range of masters and professional doctorate programs that both strengthen undergraduate programs and meet the market demands of our society.

? Oakland University will offer a limited number of Ph.D. programs focused on areas with a concentration of faculty expertise and of critical need to the state, region, and nation.

? Future growth in enrollment will continue toward a 20,000-student target matched with growth in faculty, staff, campus and student services and technological enhancements.

Inspired faculty

? Oakland University's academic experience will be driven by the dedication of its faculty to the teaching- learning process, research, scholarship and creative endeavors.

? Oakland University faculty will be known for their expertise in applied research that directly impacts society.

? Oakland University's faculty activities in basic research and scholarship will advance the frontiers of knowledge and inspire students to similar goals.

Scholarly community strengthened by its diversity

? Oakland University will provide a dynamic model of the synergism that is achieved by people with diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds working together for common goals.

? Oakland University will select students, faculty, and staff to build a scholarly community that reflects the diversities of available talent pools.

? The Oakland environment will provide students with cultural and social experiences, community outreach activities and team learning opportunities to prepare them to be effective contributors and leaders in tomorrow's workplace and society.

Community outreach and partnerships

? Oakland University will be recognized regionally for quality and responsive community outreach.

? Oakland University' will be recognized regionally for building collaborative relationships with business, industry, education and government to meet the demands of a highly educated workforce and high-performance workplace.

SPRC present this revised Profile for review by the Senate. We also request the following:

1. We ask that the Senate adopt this revised Profile as a working document.
2. That the University Senate will appoint a small ad hoc group (not Senate Steering) to develop a ~~mission and~~ vision statement for adoption by the Senate
3. That the faculty Senate liaisons will inform the Board of Trustees of Senate action on the revised Profile.

Oakland University Profile 2010 (original version)

A university of distinction with a visionary undergraduate experience.

Key Elements of the Profile

Strong undergraduate experience/strong academic programs

- Oakland University's central mission will be to provide a high-quality and challenging undergraduate education, including a visionary general education program, that offers undergraduates an enriching and diverse combination of liberal arts, professional education, and cultural and social experiences.
- Oakland University will create a learning experience that prepares students for a rapidly changing workplace and to be leaders for the future.
- Oakland's teaching, research and service activities will be enhanced by the integration of new information technologies.

Quality graduate programs

- Oakland University will be graduate-intensive, with expanding graduate programs to meet market demands.

Diversity

- Oakland will continue to embrace and encourage diversity through programs, faculty, staff, students, partnerships and community outreach.
- By participating in diverse programs, and cultural and social experiences, Oakland students will be better prepared to be effective leaders in tomorrow's workplace and society.

Inspired faculty

- Oakland University's academic experience will be strengthened by the dedication of its faculty to the teaching-learning process, research, scholarship and creative endeavors.

Quality students

- Oakland University will focus on attracting high-quality incoming first-year students to further enhance the educational and social environment of campus.

Research

- Oakland will be known for its expertise in applied research that impacts the people of Michigan and beyond.
- Oakland will enhance its research expertise through growing external support, and creation of a business incubator, and research and development park.

Community, corporate, government, educational and individual partnerships

- Oakland University will be recognized regionally for building collaborative relationships with business, industry, education and government to meet the demands of a highly educated workforce and a high-performance workplace.

- Oakland will build relationships with individuals and corporations that support the planned and unplanned needs of the university to ensure continued excellence.

Community outreach

- Oakland University will be recognized regionally for quality and responsive community outreach, including educational services, the cultural and performing arts, and sports. This outreach will further enhance the enriching and diverse combination of liberal arts, professional education, and cultural and social experiences for campus.

Growth

- Oakland University will be a growing university ? in terms of number of students, academic programs, campus and student services, and technological enhancements.
- Oakland will retain the best features of a small-campus setting while being large enough to offer a broad array of programs and services.

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page