



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 23 September 1993  
First Meeting

### *MINUTES*

Senators Present: Ari, Awbrey, Benson, Bertocci, Bhatt, Braunstein, Bricker, Briggs-Bunting, Chipman, Christina, Dunphy, J. Eberwein, Frankie, R. Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hansen, Hildebrand, Hough, Hovanesian, Khattree, Kheir, Liboff, Mabee, Marks, Mittelstaedt, Moore, Moran, Muir, Olson, Packard, Pipan, Polis, Reddy, Reynolds, Rickstad, Rooney, Rozek, Rush, Russi, Schmitz, H. Schwartz, Schott-Baer, Selahowski, Sevilla, Shepherd, Stano, Thomas, Urice, Wedekind, Zenas.

Senators Absent: . Abiko, Brown, Cole, Dahlgren, Downing, Hormozi, Pine, Stevens, Taam

#### Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 15 April 1993 (Bricker; Kheir). Approved
2. Motion from the Senate Planning Review Committee recommending consolidation of the School of Health Sciences with the School of Nursing (Chipman; Callewaert). First reading.
3. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to fill vacancies on Senate standing committees (Rush; Briggs-Bunting). Approved.
4. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to stagger initial terms on the Senate Assessment Committee (Grossman; Rush). Approved.
5. Special resolution from the Steering Committee thanking Ronald Horwitz (Hough; Christina). Approved by acclamation.
6. Reports from the Senate Budget Review Committee (Callewaert), Senate Planning Review Committee (Chipman), and Strategic Planning Steering Committee (Frankie).

Mr. Russi called his first Oakland University Senate meeting to order at 3:14 p.m., welcoming a new Senate at the start of the academic year. He began by introducing two officers: Mr. Grossman, who begins his duties as parliamentarian, and Ms. Eberwein, who continues as secretary. He then directed attention to the minutes of 15 April 1993, which won approval without correction or comment (moved, Mr. Bricker; seconded, Mr. Kheir).

The first order of business was election of a new Steering Committee. Mr. Brown, ably supported by his Elections Committee, accepted nominations for all six positions. Those elected were Mesdames Dunphy, Eberwein, Reynolds, and Zenas and Messieurs Grossman and Hough.

While the Elections Committee counted ballots, Mr. Chipman (seconded by Mr. Callewaert) placed the first item of new business on the floor in the name of the Senate Planning Review Committee:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees the consolidation of the School of Nursing and the School of Health Sciences into a single school which also shall have administrative responsibility for the Meadow Brook Health Enhancement Institute, to be implemented as soon as possible.

Noting that the motion comes from the Senate Planning Review Committee (SPRC) in response to its charge to "make recommendations to the Senate on any changes affecting the academic organization of the university," Mr. Chipman stated that he viewed his committee's further responsibility to be informing and advising the Senate as it has done with respect to issues that arose in its inaugural 1992-93 year. To put themselves in a position to do that, the SPRC and the Senate Budget Review Committee (SBRC) jointly held an open hearing on Thursday, 16 September. They have transmitted to the Steering Committee position statements from that hearing along with other materials relevant to the proposed consolidation, and they expect the Steering Committee to make copies available to senators. When the time comes for an informed recommendation, his committee intends to take a leadership role in the Senate. As yet, however, its members are not ready. He reported that views on the SPRC vary as widely as those elsewhere in the university, with some thinking consolidation a good idea, others a terrible idea, and others finding themselves unable to arrive at a decision on the basis of available evidence. He called attention to the four guiding questions outlined in the SPRC's "Preliminary Report" to the Senate (9/20/93):

- 1) would the academic organization resulting from the consolidation make sense for Oakland University at this time?
- 2) could Oakland University get from where it is now to the proposed configuration, in a programmatic sense;
- 3) could Oakland University get from where it is now to the proposed configuration, in a human sense? and
- 4) could Oakland University get from where it is now to the proposed configuration, in a practical sense?

When next the Senate hears from the SPRC on this matter, Mr. Chipman pledged that his colleagues would have sought informed answers to those questions. Meanwhile, they continue their work.

Mr. Callewaert then reported for the SBRC, observing that it faced the somewhat simpler task of estimating cost savings that might result from administrative realignment of two schools into one. Referring to multiple past efforts to save money in difficult times by trimming small amounts from lots of budgets, he indicated that saving considerable expense from a single structural change presented quite a different option. His 20 September memorandum already distributed to senators estimated annual savings of just under \$200,000. from consolidation of schools. He directed particular attention to expenses that would be incurred in conducting another search for a Dean of Nursing in a highly competitive market. When SBRC members questioned whether Nursing revenues might decline as a result of enrollment shortfalls in the wake of administrative realignment, they concluded that there was little danger of finding too few applicants for a program that has always been popular. Perhaps new opportunities might open up for external grants in support of interdisciplinary health-focused research. Although physical relocation of faculties might conduce to more efficient, cost-effective operations, the committee's estimates do not necessarily assume professorial migrations. He reminded senators that projected staffing cuts refer only to positions--not to persons now holding those positions, most of whom would presumably find work elsewhere in the university.

Dean Zenas then made a presentation to acquaint the Senate with reactions to the proposal

from the School of Nursing. She reported that her colleagues first heard of the projected change in a 27 August meeting with Vice President Russi, when he told them that he intended to bring such a recommendation to a Board subcommittee the following week in the expectation of formal Board action in early October. He projected review of the proposal by the Senate and its committees, but all that seemed destined to happen uncommonly fast. She thought it important to communicate her School's situation, functioning as it does in a metropolitan area rich in health facilities that include nationally prominent schools of nursing at the University of Michigan and Wayne State University. Representatives of several important health-care institutions had testified at the previous week's open hearing that they could no longer support institutional linkages with Oakland University if this university displays reduced respect for the nursing program by denying it separate administrative identity. Expressing concern about the proposal's impact on her School's collaborative programs with the Henry Ford Hospital system, Ms. Zenas worried about public perception of Nursing's diminished stature within its home institution. With regard to accreditation, she emphatically denied that consolidation would lead to denial; if we are found to be in transition at the time of the fall 1994 accreditation review, however, she foresaw inevitable citations that would necessitate a focused follow-up review; this eventuality would undermine the record of success that the School of Nursing has proudly maintained. She also questioned assumptions made in the SBRC report about cost savings to be gained from a consolidated operation whose structure remains to be articulated. Also questionable from the point of view of her Nursing colleagues is that committee's assurance of stable enrollment, especially if Oakland forfeits its corporate arrangements with the hospitals that provide many of its off-campus students. She concluded her statement by questioning the likelihood of Oakland's being able to attract a division head to do a dean's work for much less pay. If, as seems likely, we face an external search for such a director, she wondered why it wouldn't make more sense to look again for a School of Nursing dean.

Following these presentations, Ms. Gerulaitis introduced discussion by asking Ms. Zenas whether the Nursing faculty would be more favorably disposed toward consolidation if Nursing were featured in the title of the new school. Ms. Zenas thought that would make little difference; her colleagues want their own school and their own dean.

Mr. Christina then directed questioning toward Mr. Callewaert, asking why the SBRC memorandum assumed such high costs for recruiting a Nursing dean. Mr. Callewaert responded that the competitive market makes it likely that any candidate would negotiate for new positions as a condition of hire; thus, his committee has projected into its calculations three new faculty positions with salaries and fringe benefits. He admitted that one could question that assumption, and Mr. Christina immediately proceeded to do so, wondering whether it might not be possible to find "some poor person" willing to come into our existing situation. Although reluctant to argue for keeping deans, he found it easy to argue for preserving secretarial positions--for which he regarded a projected salary of \$16,500 as an insult. While on the subject of budgets, Ms. Mittelstaedt inquired the reasoning behind inclusion of the Meadow Brook Health Enhancement Institute into the consolidated school, since it has the reputation of running at a deficit. Mr. Callewaert thought some savings might be effected by folding it in with the other two units but indicated that the SBRC had not factored that into their calculations. President Packard explained that the university treats the Health Enhancement Institute as an auxiliary operation for budget purposes so that its accounts are not commingled with those of the school in which it is administratively located. Although it is now associated with the School of Health Sciences, no money drifts to it from any Health Science program, nor would any profit accrue necessarily to that school. Were the

Institute to eliminate its deficit and begin to make money, the university would look at that money separately--as it does with income from the golf course, which now generates income that can be designated for academic uses.

When Ms. Muir asked Mr. Callewaert to elaborate on his response to Mr. Christina's question about projected needs for support staff in a consolidated school, Mr. Callewaert mentioned that many campus units are now administered in a more streamlined fashion. The SBRC projections assume some savings from administrative merger even if the Nursing and Health Sciences faculties continue to be housed separately. Ms. Zenas responded that staffing should be based on work load rather than administrative alignments; that work load would not decrease. The School of Nursing now arranges over 450 student placements each semester in addition to maintaining more than 50 collaborative institutional relationships. Assuring colleagues from other units that there is now no excess staffing in the School of Nursing, she doubted that any single dean could operate within SBRC projections. Reminding administrators of how much they had saved in three years of acting deanships, she maintained that any diminishment of the School of Nursing would diminish Oakland University as well. Mr. Christina then asked whether it was indeed true that the School of Nursing now serves 1100 students and the School of Health Sciences about 400. When told that those figures were correct, he responded that "It blows my mind."

Mr. Bertocci asked about opportunities that some anticipated for better external funding as a result of interdisciplinary Nursing/Health Sciences research projects. Mr. Callewaert knew of one such combined study, which suggested possibilities for others. Mr. Bertocci then inquired why that sort of collaboration could not happen now, especially if faculty with related interests were relocated within one building. Nancy O'Connor, one of several non-senators from the School of Nursing faculty who participated in the discussion, then referred to the statement she had made at the previous week's hearing with respect to research opportunities. The newly established federal Institute for Nursing Research opens improved opportunities for research focused specifically on Nursing practice. Only her colleagues in the School of Nursing would qualify for such grants. In other respects, she saw no reason why they could not collaborate with other Oakland University faculty (including those in academic units beyond Health Sciences) under existing administrative structures. She resented being told by persons outside her discipline what research she and her School colleagues should be doing.

Frances Jackson asked senators to consider the National League for Nursing requirement that whoever is in charge of a Nursing unit must hold master's and doctoral degrees specifically in Nursing. She wondered both how Oakland University expected to recruit a director for less than such a person could easily earn elsewhere in the profession and how it expected to find a well qualified director when it had failed to recognize any of its dean candidates as qualified. Having chaired the 1992-93 dean search for her school, she emphatically denied statements that the search failed to attract appropriate candidates. Her colleagues identified several candidates acceptable to the school's faculty who have since accepted deanships elsewhere. It was not at the school level that the searches stopped but somewhere at the vice presidential level or above. She also faulted the SPRC report that highlighted its four key questions for ignoring the one central question raised by Mr. Russi: What is the best means of providing effective leadership for Nursing? When she asked senators to hold Mr. Chipman, the SPRC, and others responsible for answering that question, Mr. Chipman respectfully declined to address it. He encouraged people to read his committee's statement, observing that "What we said is what we meant."

Mr. Liboff then asserted that the primary question in all such deliberations should be academic quality. Looking back to his participation in planning for Oakland's entrance into Nursing education, he recalled that there had seemed to be good reasons at that time for establishing a separate school. Without knowing for sure whether those reasons still held true, he advised assessing every academic program on the basis of quality. Ms. Benson thought that the focal question should be that of benefit to students. She hoped someone would inform her how Oakland University students in the affected programs would gain from consolidation. When the Nursing faculty retorted that they could find no such advantages, Mr. Chipman pointed out that the SPRC had already committed itself to exploring that question. Robert Eberwein, chair of the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, announced that UCUI is exploring the proposal's curricular implications to find out what might be gained or lost by combining teaching efforts on specific courses. Ms. Benson hoped their findings would be made available well before the Senate faced a vote on this matter. She asserted that such research should have happened earlier to avoid precipitating the anxieties and divisions now evident. She took it seriously that the university is confronted by an entire Nursing faculty opposing the proposed merger; if her own department were confronted with such a prospect, she would want to know how the new structure would assist students. Mr. Bricker then asked that senators be provided with background materials detailing the historical circumstances in which both affected schools had been established. While he appreciated the complex matters confronting the SPRC, he worried that it would be premature to consider this day's discussion of proposed consolidation as a formal first reading of a proposal not yet circulated by the committee. Ms. Schott-Baer expressed disappointment that materials had not been made available before this session. Urging close study of the documentation to be provided by the SPRC, she raised questions about the relevance of the 10-year-old CAMP report in terms of major changes that have since taken place in American health care and the status of the Nursing profession. She hoped senators would focus attention on statements from the October 16 hearing, which speak to the immediate situation.

When Mr. Bertocci asked whether August 27 was actually the first date when Nursing faculty learned that so drastic a change was proposed for them, Ms. Zenas said that was the case. Although Mr. Russi had met with them earlier about the failed dean search and had gathered their advice in writing about the School's leadership needs and future direction, they had had no glimmer of such a proposal. Declaring that there was no consensus among her faculty for a merger, she urged that attention be directed instead to hiring a permanent Dean of Nursing. With respect to the upset caused by presenting an idea to the Board before consulting the affected units and governance bodies, President Packard mentioned the impact of the Open Meetings Act, which now provides access to information about Board committee discussions in their very early stages. Thus it becomes necessary to alert people that they might be affected by Board deliberations that may or may not result in action. She asked members of the community not to react excessively to suggestions tossed out at meetings, noting that many would never come forward as serious proposals. This explanation prompted Mr. Christina to ask what mechanism exists for the community to learn about items to be considered by the Board. Ms. Packard replied that agendas for subcommittee meetings as well as formal Board meetings get posted in advance, although there are no restrictions placed on the freedom of Board members to introduce new issues once a meeting is in progress. When Mr. Christina asked whether community members could get minutes, the President indicated that those were available on request although not widely circulated. Mr. Christina hoped the Steering Committee would consider ways of ensuring Senate access. Ms. Briggs-Bunting noted that minutes of Board committee meetings are not always maintained, certainly not always released.

Speaking of proposals, Mr. Bertocci wondered why the Senate faced a motion on its agenda before the committee with primary responsibility for reviewing the proposal was ready to make its recommendation. He thought it useful to inform everyone that school consolidation was being considered but thought too little lead-time had been provided for Senate action. Mr. Russi responded, "I think the Steering Committee has heard you."

Referring back to an earlier stage of this discussion, Mr. Moran represented himself, a historian, as uncomfortable with anyone's denying relevancy to events ten years before. He considered the gradual historical evolution of the Nursing profession over that interlude a real factor in the decision facing this university, and he urged attention to future trends predictable on the basis of experiences in other nations that have introduced national health care systems such as that now projected for the United States- -all of which have elevated the status of nursing within those nations. He also called attention to the gender implications of diminishing the perceived status of a predominantly female academic unit.

Disturbed by awareness of so many still open questions, Mr. Bricker (seconded by Mr. Shepherd) moved to table the motion until the SPRC had opportunity to make its report available and was ready to present its recommendation. That move led to discussion of parliamentary options for preserving the Senate from overly hasty action. Parliamentarian Grossman elucidated the possibilities available, pointing out that a tabled motion dies if not taken from the table at the next meeting. When Ms. Eberwein asked whether a motion could be tabled to a particular date, he found that it could not; the proper action in that case, if the intent is to keep the issue alive, would be a move for postponement. Since the intent was to allow full deliberation at some later date, the Chair declared the tabling motion out of order. Mr. Chipman then asked Mr. Bricker to reformulate his motion to ask the Steering Committee to schedule the second reading of this motion for an appropriate date. Although chairing a committee that obviously needed more time to carry out the studies essential for its eventual recommendation, he preferred not to set a precedent of having the Senate wait around until a group gets ready to report. He preferred keeping the Steering Committee in charge of the agenda so that the Senate could proceed with its work. When Mr. Christina asked about plans for the next week's Senate meeting, Mr. Russi indicated that the 30 September conclave would feature reports of various kinds with no second reading of this proposal. Reassured about the possibilities of more time, Mr. Bertocci asked Mr. Chipman how soon he thought the SPRC could bring forward its recommendation. Mr. Chipman noted that three committees (SPRC, SBRC, and UCUI) were all gathering information about key issues including the thorny question of accreditation. They needed at least a month for this work, but he did not want to string out their inquiries indefinitely. His suggestion was that the Senate hold its Steering Committee responsible for arriving at a reasonable calendar and seeing that committees adhered to it. Admitting that he would be very uncomfortable with any delay beyond November, he left it to the Steering Committee to schedule the second reading for the October or November meeting. He also reminded his Senate colleagues that the question, "Can we get there in a human sense," is something the community as a whole rather than his committee alone needs to answer. Encouraged to learn that the SPRC could respond so soon, Mr. Bertocci proposed that this motion be continued as debatable but that a final vote be delayed until that committee made its recommendation. Mr. Russi declared that motion out of order also.

Several senators attempted to return attention to central concerns,,with Ms. Mittelstaedt urging academicians to look beyond data collection to the guiding question posed earlier by Frances Jackson with respect to long-term effective leadership for the Nursing programs. Mr. Grossman, discarding his parliamentarian hat to speak as a senator, commented that the

discussion seemed to be winding down without any presentations by those in favor of the motion. Having heard from the opposition, he wanted to learn what arguments could be mustered on the other side before being asked to vote.

Mr. Urice, mentioning that he had attempted to go through the materials that had been gathered at the previous week's hearings, wondered about the signatories of seemingly official statements from external agencies: Were those persons speaking for themselves or reporting official positions of their Boards? Ms. Mittelstaedt responded that they "absolutely" represented their institutions; while Mr. Chipman indicated that he would look into this matter, since he had seen no formal documentation on Board actions. Ms. Schott-Baer declared the question an insult to the integrity of high-level officers of hospitals and health agencies.

Mr. Bricker recurred to the question of how the Senate should proceed with handling this contentious issue. Having newly resumed the senatorial toga, he wondered what alternatives presented themselves to this body. What did the parliamentarian suggest about ways of postponing action? Mr. Grossman replied that a motion could be postponed indefinitely (in effect, killed) or postponed to a specific date (such as the October or November meeting). When Ms. Briggs-Bunting asked whether Roberts allowed a move to postpone at the first reading, Mr. Grossman saw no reason why that could not occur. Mr. Hough suggested moving on to the next issue on that day's agenda, leaving the Steering Committee to schedule the second reading whenever it thought best. Frances Jackson then concluded discussion by urging prompt action. As chair of her School's committee preparing its accreditation self-study, she pointed out that her group must provide specific details of program structure and governance when it drafts its report by January 1994. What they say in that report must correspond to what National League for Nursing site visitors will see in operation here when they visit next fall. Calling attention to Oakland University's distinction in numbering among its School of Nursing faculty no fewer than three NLN site visitors, she reminded persons outside that unit that she and her committee cannot write chapters on a governance structure that does not yet exist.

Much easier to deal with was the second item of business on the agenda, a procedural motion from the Steering Committee to fill vacancies on several Senate committees (Moved, Ms. Rush; seconded, Ms. Briggs-Bunting). Although Ms. Rush offered her colleagues full latitude to table the motion, amend it, or vote on it immediately, the Senate simply approved the slate of candidates without discussion. Hence, Professor Jack Nachman now chairs the Academic Computing Committee and Professor Kevin Andrews the Teaching and Learning Committee. Dawn Pickard represents the School of Education and Human Services on the Assessment Committee. Howard Schwartz succeeds Sherman Folland on the Committee on Human Relations, and Linda Hildebrand replaces Charlotte Stokes on the Senate Budget Review Committee.

Equally expeditious was action on a second procedural motion from the Steering Committee, this one moved by Mr. Grossman and seconded by Ms. Rush. The Senate voted to approve a system of staggered terms for members of its new Senate Assessment Committee, awarding one-year terms to Professors Peter Bertocci, Joseph Callaghan, Alice Horning, and Gary Moore. Serving two-year terms will be Brian Goslin (Chair), Dawn Pickard, Darrell Schmidt, and the yet-unnamed representative from the School of Engineering and Computer Science.

On a roll, the Steering Committee then presented a special resolution eloquently declaimed by Mr. Hough:

WHEREAS Ronald M. Horwitz served Oakland University generously and wisely as its Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs during the 1992-93 academic year; and  
WHEREAS he returned to the Senate for that period as its capable presiding officer while providing collegial leadership to its Steering Committee and cooperative assistance to its standing committees; and  
WHEREAS this community appreciates the sacrifices of time, effort, and teaching opportunities he made for the good of this institution; Now, therefore, be it  
RESOLVED that the Senate extends its thanks to Mr. Horwitz and its warm wishes for his renewed happiness as Professor of Finance.

Although spontaneous applause prevented the Secretary from identifying any particular seconder to this resolution, Mr. Christina later came forward to claim that honor. The Senate warmly tendered its unanimous vote of thanks to Mr. Horwitz.

With all motions either approved or set aside for further deliberation, senators then turned their attention to reports from the chairs of the two committees formed last fall. Mr. Callewaert began by speaking on behalf of the Senate Budget Review Committee, which devoted much of its energy and time over the 1992-93 academic year participating in a lengthy series of budget hearings. He reported that the SBRC had worked hard to identify opportunities for savings to the university, and he thanked James McKay especially for compiling informational tables comparing the Oakland University budget with those of other Michigan institutions on the basis of HEIDI data. His committee was very favorably impressed by the way vice presidents developed their lists of budget priorities. The SBRC has reported its own recommendations to President Packard. Other business undertaken by the committee included advising the Senate about possible relocation of the Honors College.

Mr. Chipman began his report for the Senate Planning Review Committee by acknowledging that "Mr. Hough was right, and I was wrong. You do need two committees to do all this," and he pledged to make available to the Senate Steering Committee documentation of his committee's actions--both those independently carried out and those involving interaction with the SBRC; the Steering Committee can study this material and make it available. He reported that the SPRC and SBRC met jointly with the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs, thereby undertaking a new role for a Senate committee. As an example of their activity, he mentioned the critique they provided of a preliminary proposal for the new Office of Minority Equity; the SPRC supported the general idea but raised a number of serious concerns. its members regard creation of that office as one of those structural changes within the university on which they should report to the Senate, and they will do so after consulting with whoever is appointed to head that office and that person's immediate superior, Ms. Rush. Looking back at joint committee actions, he called attention to the first SBRC-SPRC advisory memorandum to the President on what was learned from the budget hearings and what actions should follow. Their second memorandum commented on the Cabinet's list of priorities. A third memorandum set the agenda for their 6 August meeting with the President; it offered six specific recommendations --mostly concerned with "process" in respect to continuation of budget hearings, acceptance of the HEIDI data-base (properly supplemented by other external data) as a basis for judgments, and identification of questions these two Senate committees find most of concern.



President Packard remarked that she thought this budget process worked quite well in its initial year. She found the committee recommendations helpful and congratulated the Senate on setting up this new system. With the 1993-94 budget almost completed, she anticipated making a detailed report to the Senate this November; although the Vice President for Finance and Administration will take over that duty in subsequent years. She expressed pleasure that it had been possible to accommodate a number of the committees' joint requests and felt happy about how the system functioned to inform the university community more broadly while gaining a wider field of advice.

When Mr. Christina asked whether these two committees report directly to the President rather than going first to the Senate, Mr. Chipman said that they did so when acting jointly. Individually, they report to the Senate, as happened with the first item on this day's agenda. The two chairs have tried to ensure that, when the SPRC and SBRC report to the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs, they do so consciously as representatives of the Senate and they make all their recommendations available to this body. Mr. Christina thought this arrangement gave unwarranted power to the two committees. He would prefer that the Senate respond to their recommendations before transmittal to administrative leaders. Ms. Packard noted the timing problems entailed in adding Senate review to the sequence of recommendations. State budget allocations generally get announced in the spring at the earliest; this year (as usual) news was deferred or left uncertain (with questions about K-12 educational funding leaving open grave threats of late- year fiscal cutbacks). She left open some hope that a Senate role could be factored into the process sometime in the future. Mr. Christina doubted, however, that efficiency justifies bringing forward what might not be a consensus opinion. "It may be efficient," he concluded, "but I don't think it's effective." When Ms. Muir asked what plans have developed for this year's budget process--and, specifically whether there would be another sequence of hearings, Ms. Packard admitted some uncertainty. That is a very time- consuming process and may not be necessary on an annual basis. Vice President Bissonette is proposing his own method for her consideration. If the state goes to a two-year budget cycle, as seems possible, she would prefer moving to a schedule of biennial budget hearings. At present, it seems useful to go through one more year according to last year's method. She could not say for sure what was possible, given downsizing in the Finance and Administration Budget Office.

Next came Dean Frankie's report on Strategic Planning Developments. Despite the late hour (already after 5 p.m.), she thought it important to inform the Senate about progress being made by Blue Ribbon Task Forces. Beginning by calling attention to the Vision Statement that resulted from last winter's planning retreat, she identified that brief document as the basis for subsequent thinking: "Oakland University will be recognized as an institution of excellence, responsive to the needs of its constituencies, and pre-eminent in selected areas of teaching, learning, research and service." All task forces plan to release their reports for community review by October 1, and they will hold public hearings next month to elicit response. She devoted much of her report to summarizing the charges of six task forces and identifying key recommendations now emerging from each. The Graduate Education group is considering several draft recommendations, which include guidelines for initiating innovative and collaborative new programs; encouragement to offer more graduate courses in the evenings and on Saturdays; and a recommendation for improved stipends for graduate students. The Undergraduate Education task force is focusing attention on ways of strengthening student retention, attracting and retaining quality faculty, enhancing diversity in instruction and in student and faculty representation, and ensuring quality in the classroom teaching-learning dynamic. The Excellence and Distinction task force is involved in reviewing academic

programs and practices to identify high quality areas and reviewing external funding sources and activities that have good potential for attracting support. The Student Development task force has established some fundamental insights into what students appreciate at Oakland University and what causes them to experience this institution as "not user-friendly." Among their findings are that there is support for a new student recreation/activities building financed through student fees; that it is desirable to broaden the composition of the student body; that there is a need for a feasibility study regarding the current affiliation with NCAA Division II and even of establishing a football program [GASPS!]; that faculty and staff orientation should be improved; and that the faculty reappointment and promotion process should recognize involvement in student advising and mentoring. The Campus Family task force has found the university's employees to be hardworking and resourceful even in times of pressure and despite the fact that they do not find Oakland an "employee-friendly" place to work. To enhance institutional morale and the spirit of fellowship, its members recommend emphasis on activities that promote teamwork rather than competition while they urge recognition of student advising and mentoring within the faculty reappointment process. The Community Outreach task force finds a similar need to reward those engaged in outreach activities; it also advises development of coordinating and evaluation mechanisms for such outreach programs. Its members recommend development of institutional partnerships and expansion of off-campus internship and learning opportunities for students. Ms. Frankie urged everyone to participate in the open hearings and to read materials that will be made available in deans' offices and the Library. These task force reports represent an important advance in the planning process but will necessarily undergo change as the Strategic Planning Steering Committee attempts to coordinate recommendations and planning decisions that are emerging through this process. In response to Mr. Christina's question about the Senate's opportunity to suggest changes to the Vision Statement and recommendations before the final report gets approved, she indicated that the Steering Committee would release its "Final Draft Report to the President and Senate" in early winter. That will be that committee's final statement, just as the task force reports now being submitted are the concluding efforts by those groups. The community will thereafter make decisions in response to recommendations it receives from these groups.

No private resolutions being offered for the good of the order, Ms. Dunphy took advantage of the opportunity to invite everyone's participation in Homecoming events, and Ms. Packard urged a good turnout at the ground-breaking ceremony for the new Science Building. When Mr. Braunstein asked just where the Senate stood with respect to the motion regarding school consolidation, Mr. Russi indicated that the Steering Committee would place it on the agenda for a second reading at the appropriate time. Mr. Bertocci then extended a welcome on behalf of his colleagues to the Senate's new presiding officer, wishing 'May this be the first of many bouts' [Applause]. Mr. Russi then provided two brief nuggets of information. He reported with respect to possible relocations of the Honors College and the Center for International Programs that he had asked Dean Urice to provide a rationale for those changes; he is still studying these recommendations and expects to bring forward a proposal soon to the Steering Committee. Although final figures on Fall enrollments are still being tallied, he estimated that we may have lost about 150 students in headcount. When Mr. Liboff suggested returning to the old Senate practice (long abandoned) of placing such information items at the front of the agenda rather than leaving them for the end, Mr. Russi expressed willingness to make that change. With that promise for the future, he interpreted a general lunge for the door as a move for adjournment and declared the meeting concluded at 5:29 except for the newly-elected Steering Committee members who were asked to remain.

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

*Back to*  
**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY**  
**SENATE**  
*Home Page*