



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Third Meeting
November 13, 1975

MINUTES

Present: Senators Barren, Barthel, Beardman, Bingham, D. Burdick, H. Burdick, Coffman, Covert, DeMent, Doane, Evarts, Feeman, Freeman, Gardiner, L. Gerulaitis, R. Gerulaitis, Graber, Gregory, Haskell, Hitchingham, Hovanesian, Johnson, Liboff, Light, Lind, McKay, McKinley, Obear, O'Dowd, O'Leary, Palmer, Reilly, Schmidt, Schwartz, Krompart, Sherry, Solomon, Strauss, Susskind, Tipler, Torch, Tower, Sturner, and Woodard
Absent: Senators Akers, Dykes, Brieger, Coon, Dovaras, Gray, Hetenyi, Kilburn, Matthews, Moorhouse, Paslay, Schillace, and Seeber

Mr. O'Dowd called the meeting to order at 3:25 p.m. and made some informal comments concerning the Energy crisis.

Mr. Susskind seconded by Mr. Feeman, moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 15.

Approved.

A. Old Business

None

B. New Business

1. University Council Constitution.

Mr. Obear, seconded by Mr. Woodard, moved:

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.

Mr. Obear indicated that the Steering Committee wanted an expression of sentiment on the issue of the University Council Constitution to advise Mr. O'Dowd. Mr. Obear indicated that

the Steering Committee was advancing this item to the agenda without commentary for or against the proposal. Mr. Swartz asked for a brief overview of the difference between the documents presented and the existing University Senate. Mr. Connellan indicated that (1) the University Council would be a 65-member body, including representatives of all employee groups, (2) that a 60% vote is required to pass a substantive issue, and (3) that specific powers were reserved to the groups comprising the Council.

Mr. Susskind raised a concern about the wieldiness of a 65 member body. Mr. Light stated that the Senate presently has 57 Senators. Mr. Burdick asked if the purposes of the Council could be achieved simply by expanding the membership in the existing Senate and dissolving the Student Congress and the AP Assembly. Mr. Connellan indicated that it could be so achieved but that the Council proposal provided some expansion of duties, responsibilities, committee structure and power, so that amendment of the existing constitution seemed more clumsy than writing a new constitution. Mrs. Burdick asked how students would react to the dissolution of the Student Congress. Mr. Lind indicated that the students were wary of giving up their concurrent advisory status and their present committee memberships but that on the other hand there were some strengths in the Council proposal. Mr. Sherry indicated that there was the opportunity to have a single forum rather than several or with issues being kicked back and forth. Mr. O'Dowd commented on the virtue of securing student input at the time that debates are undertaken by the faculty group. Mr. McKay asked if we wanted a vote of sentiment on the subject or a technical vote on the legal form which he felt was deficient and on its face would have to be voted down because of the deficiencies. Mr. Connellan indicated that an expression of sentiment was desired and that probably the document itself would need some additional work. Mr. Barthel asked what the advantages of the Council are. Mr. Connellan answered that it is unicameral.

Ms. Schwartz raised the question of whether deans are considered part of the central administration and is that why they are excluded from the Council. Mr. O'Dowd said yes. Mr. Light agreed that the Secretary of the Senate would distribute the present University Constitution to all Senators. Mr. DeMent then commented that he was on University Governance Commission I and that they had made no report because of the conflict of form versus function. Thus, apportionment based on numbers follows form, and that actually University Governance Commission I had come around to discarding the unicameral form and had tried to work out a multicameral point of view but had failed to do that as well. Mr. O'Dowd indicated that the University secretary called for in the Council proposal would strengthen the administrative functions of the Council by providing coordination, research ability, etc. Mr. Light observed that the unicameral system required compromise in terms of numbers and that there was no quantifiable measure by which to assign numbers of seats in the proposed Council, that the numbers proposed are a result of political compromise and an understanding of political realities. Mr. O'bear reported that the Steering Committee is considering assembling an *ad hoc* committee for constitutional improvement which would attempt to improve the existing University Constitution in terms of some anachronisms and some oversights but that is not a substitute for this Council proposal.

2. Academic Budget and Planning Committee

a. Mr. O'bear, seconded by Mr. Gerulaitis, moved:

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

MEETING.

Approved.

b. Mr. Obear, seconded by Mr. Coffman, moved:

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.

Mr. Krompart, seconded by Mr. Burdick, moved to refer the items back to the Steering Committee. Motion failed.

Main motion was then approved.

c. Mr. Obear, seconded by Mr. Tower, moved:

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)

Approved.

3. Chairperson of the Teaching and Learning Committee

Mr. Obear, seconded by Mrs. Gerulaitis, moved:

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

Approved.

4. Grade conversion Policy.

Mr. Feeman, chairman of the Academic Policy Committee, moved:

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

Seconded by Mr. Tower. Mr. Feeman distributed three handouts in connection with the grading issue. (A copy of these materials is attached to the file copy of these minutes.)

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Richard Light, Acting Secretary
University Senate
Office of the Provost/ss
12/5/73

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page