



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 14 March 1985
Fifth Meeting
Gold Room A and B

MINUTES

Senators Present: Appleton, Berger, Bertocci, Burke, Bledsoe, Carbone, Chapman-Moore, Chipman, Downing, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Edgerton, Eliezer, Evans, Evarts, Garcia, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hart-Gonzalez, Heubel, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Hough, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lindell, Moore, Russell, Scherer, Schwartz, Splete, Strauss, Tomboulion, Tomilo, Tripp.

Senators Absent: Boganey, Brown, Butler, Cass, Champagne, Christina, Copenhaver, Coppola, Federlein, Frankie, Hammerle, Hartman, Howes, McCabe, Moorhouse, Pine, Pino, Schimmelman, Shichi, Snider-Feldmesser, Tracy, Wagner, Windeknecht.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 10 January 1985 (R. Eberwein; Garcia). Approved.
2. Motion to accept a report from the Academic Computing Committee (Splete; Hildebrand). Revised and superseded by # 4.
3. Amendments to incorporate references to the MIS program into the report (Horwitz; Lindell). Withdrawn by sponsors.
4. Revision of main motion, with advice to the committee to consider incorporation of amendments, above (Heubel; Scherer). Approved.
5. Resolution to provide for implementation of this report (Hough; Hart- Gonzalez). Approved.
6. Motion to recommend establishment of a fund to support computing Innovations for instruction (Downing; Splete). First reading.
7. Motion to approve a new undergraduate admissions policy (Hildebrand; Chipman). First reading.
8. Amendment to Incorporate more specific language into Transfer section of proposed admission policy (Downing; Tomboulion). First reading.
9. Amendment to strike the word "normally" from section III, B, 2 (Russell; Tomboulion). First reading.
10. Motion to fill vacancies on the Admissions and Financial Aid and Teaching and Learning Committees (Edgerton; Hough). Approved.
11. Good and Welfare statement directing Senate attention to the proposed closing of the Kresge Health Center (R. Eberwein). Referred to the Steering Committee.

With thoughts of rearranging the agenda while waiting for a quorum, Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:23 p.m. The timely arrival of Senator Evarts, however, allowed business

to proceed as usual with consideration of the minutes of 10 January 1985 (Moved, Mr. Eberwein; Seconded, Ms. Garcia). These were approved without discussion, correction, or dissent.

No old business confronted the body, which turned at once to the first item of new business: a motion from the Steering Committee regarding an Academic Conduct Committee report (Moved, Mr. Splete; Seconded, Ms. Hildebrand):

MOVED that the Senate accept the report, "*ACADEMIC COMPUTING: Goals and Restructuring for Academic Action*," with thanks to the Academic Computing Committee.

Professor Helen Schwartz, chair of the Academic Computing Committee, directed attention to certain parts of the report, chiefly the statements of context and purpose on page 1 and the listing of priorities on page 6. She stressed that her committee has no desire to add another bureaucratic level to work within schools but simply wants to provide for coordination of interschool computing issues and to be involved in decisions within any one school that are of such magnitude as to affect the university in general. The principal goals of this report are to encourage a formal academic liaison with administrative computing offices, to establish a fund to support faculty creativity in computer use, and to ensure an Academic Computing Committee role in long-range planning related to computers. The concluding list of priorities is offered as a first word, not the last one, on its topic. She stressed that this is "a very permeable list" involving categories that often overlap. The list was prepared by the committee in the light of information about state funding of a major new library computer project but before knowledge circulated about Oakland Foundation support for faculty microcomputers. The interior section of the report explains the meaning of the eleven categories included in the final list.

Mr. Heubel launched discussion by inquiring about these priorities, wondering whether the committee's highest priority is not in fact the getting of equipment for the offering of courses. He inquired what message might be implied in the groupings of categories. Ms. Schwartz then explained groupings within the list that seemed to her to represent the committee's thinking and offered definitions of "threshold competency," "general support for instruction," "programming instruction," and "non-programming instruction." She acknowledged that priorities numbered 3, 4, and 5 are hard to disentangle. Ms. Hart-Gonzalez pursued the quest for definitions, inquiring which of these categories involve hardware and which involve software. She questioned also the relation of "threshold competence" to programming (not intended as the same thing by the committee, though a higher level of "computer literacy" might entail programming experience) and inquired why "threshold faculty competency" was rated so much below that of students (committee recognition, it seems, of substantial faculty competency already achieved). Ms. Schwartz indicated that she would welcome simultaneous progress on all of these priorities but could not project actual costs. Her committee offers this document in a sufficiently simplified form that the university community can discuss and vote on it. It is not a specific shopping list.

Mr. Horwitz applauded the Academic Computing Committee for its intention to fund creative instructional use of computers by faculty, noting with regret that the Teaching and Learning Committee has chosen not to commit Educational Development Fund money to this purpose. He went on, however, to lament the absence of attention to the Management Information

Systems (MIS) program in the report. To achieve institutional recognition of this program and to avoid selling our university short institutionally should opportunities arise, he offered a series of amendments (Seconded, Ms. Lindell):

Amendment #1: Add to the heading of II.C. on page 3 the phrase: "and in Management Information Systems." The revised heading would be:

"C. Instruction in Programming, in Computer and Information Science, in Computer Engineering, and in Management Information Systems."

Amendment #2: Add item #3 under II.C., page 3:

"3. The School of Economics and Management offers an undergraduate major in management information systems and an MBA program with special emphasis on the management of information resources. A range of advanced MIS courses is taught for these programs on a regular basis."

Amendment #3: Add item #10 under II. D., page 4:

#10. A microcomputer lab that provides students with the full range of capabilities found on an executive workstation."

These amendments raised a number of procedural questions, parliamentary and otherwise. Mr. Kleckner wondered how to proceed, noting that the Senate was asked to accept a report, not amend or rewrite it. He suggested that a companion document be submitted concurrently, but Mr. Horwitz objected to any method that would result in an approved and circulatable committee report that omitted MIS. Mr. Bertocci wondered whether the Academic Computing Committee had already considered and rejected these matters and, if not, whether further committee study might not be in order; he advised remanding the report to committee. Mr. Grossman, a member of the sponsoring committee, thought the omissions a simple oversight and doubted that there would be any committee resistance to inclusion of MIS in the ways suggested by Mr. Horwitz. Ms. Schwartz agreed that an argument could be made for such inclusion and knew of no committee opposition, though she was reluctant to speak for the whole group with only four of them present. Being very much interested in moving promptly to a Senate vote on agenda items #2 and 3, she hoped a way might be found to expedite action on the report. Considerable discussion ensued, with Ms. Hart-Gonzalez inquiring about the relationship of MIS additions to the priorities list and Mr. Russell joining Mr. Bertocci in questioning the necessity for immediate action.

Parliamentarian Heubel came to the rescue with the observation that it would be bad form to try to rewrite somebody's report on the floor (unlike motions, which can be amended). He proposed amending the motion in a way that referred Mr. Horwitz's concerns back to the committee for incorporation in a revised report. When Mr. Grossman inquired whether the Academic Computing Committee could then publish the perfected report, Mr. Kleckner assured him that Senators could take all existing copies of the original report and burn them, confident of being provided with the corrected report as an information item at a subsequent meeting. Thus reassured, Mr. Horwitz and his seconder withdrew their amendments in favor of a revised main motion offered by Mr. Heubel and seconded by Ms. Scherer:

MOVED that the Senate accept, with thanks, the Academic Computing Committee report, "*ACADEMIC COMPUTING: Goals and Restructuring for Academic Action*," suggesting that the committee incorporate the amendments here circulated to conform to the spirit of the original report.

This revision elicited various questions about what the Senate would be doing in approving it. When Ms. Garcia discovered from Mr. Kleckner that this motion would be binding on the Academic Computing Committee, which would presumably feel obligated to include the Horwitz recommendations in its final document, she concluded that she would have to oppose the revised motion in order to maintain the committee's freedom. Mr. Burke inquired what the committee intended in bringing this report to the Senate. Would we be committing Oakland University to this list of priorities? Ms. Schwartz interpreted "accepts" as meaning that the Senate would note the report as received without indicating detailed approval of any language, including the priorities list on the final page. Uncertain whether she was being asked to accept, receive, or endorse the report, Ms. Tripp asked whether the Senate would be accepting every word, and Mr. Tomilo suggested substituting the verb "receive." Mr. Hough responded to these concerns on behalf of the Steering Committee by distinguishing between motion number one, by which the Senate would simply accept a document as received, and resolution number two, which he identified as "the turkey." Mr. Appleton reassured his colleagues that no policy implications adhere to acceptance of a report; that is why it comes before the body as a procedural issue. He, therefore, suggested holding all amendments until the subsequent resolution. Mr. Horwitz, suspecting that such restraint would result in publication of a report lacking his amendments objected. According to Mr. Kleckner, a yes vote on the first motion would mean that the Senate receives the report without judgment; it would anticipate later receipt of a revised version, perfected in the light of this discussion, which would have been accepted in advance.

The easiest solution, according to Mr. Bertocci, would be to remand the issue to committee. Ms. Schwartz, however, continued to hope; for prompt action on a document her committee had originally expected to bring before the Senate in December. She feared that decisions would continue to be made in an uncoordinated way while the Senate awaited committee consultation. Her colleague Mr. Grossman concurred, noting that delay condemns students to keep working with inadequate equipment, though Mr. Kleckner doubted that major new purchases would happen rapidly, in any event, and allayed fears that the Senate year would expire with only one more meeting. Mr. Downing pointed out that motion number three was an ordinary motion, eligible only for a first reading at this meeting. He suggested launching that process immediately, even if acceptance of the report should be postponed. When Ms. Hart-Gonzalez wondered whether Mr. Horwitz's objections were the only ones aroused by the report, no other concerns were raised?leaving the Senate relatively at peace with the idea of accepting a report in the expectation that a perfected substitute document would soon be produced. On that understanding, the revised motion carried without dissent.

This action led to presentation of the next order of business, a resolution presented by Mr. Hough and seconded by Ms. Hart-Gonzalez:

RESOLVED that the university develop a structure to implement this report and guarantee significant academic input, including involvement of the Academic Computing Committee, into all major decisions about computing and communications.

The seconder then launched discussion by inquiring what "structure" was intended to mean: whether channels of communication or a group of people. Mr. Hough acknowledged that the Steering Committee had deliberately chosen a fuzzy word, recognizing that the Senate is not empowered to establish or rearrange administrative arrangements. The intention is to have the Academic Computing Committee function as a sort of watchdog on administrative actions. Mr. Kleckner Indicated that, if the resolution should pass, an arrangement would be developed by which the Academic Computing Committee would have input into all decisions in the specified categories; this objective could be implemented in a variety of ways. This led Ms. Berger to wonder whether the Senate would be informed that this had been done and Ms. Schwartz to promise inclusion of this information in her committee's annual reports to the Senate. Noting that the report called for appointment of a faculty member to help in computer administration, Mr. Grossman hoped that such an appointment was intended within the language of this resolution. Ms. Schwartz responded that her discussion with the Steering Committee had resulted in a decision not to confront the Senate with excessively specific recommendations that might needlessly restrict the proposal. Upon Ms. Scherer's calling the question, the resolution carried with unanimous support.

Next on the agenda came an associated motion from the Steering Committee, proposed by Mr. Downing and seconded by Mr. Splete:

MOVED that the Senate ratify in principal the establishment of a fund (comparable to the Educational Development Fund) to be administered by the Academic Computing Committee to support innovative academic computing uses.

When Mr. Strauss asked how much money was Intended, Ms. Schwartz replied that her committee would take anything offered. She interpreted the phrase "comparable to the Educational Development Fund," however, to limit aspirations to a relatively modest figure, such as the \$6000.00 the Teaching and Learning Committee disburses annually. Mr. Kleckner replied to a question from Ms. Hart-Gonzalez with assurance that this motion does not tie one fund directly to another in terms of dollars, noting that each of them, like the research fund, could profitably spend \$100,000.00 a year, if available. Ms. Hart-Gonzalez then asked whether this fund would pay for hardware, software, or both, learning from Ms. Schwartz that her committee preferred not to specify purchases. A major function of this award is to give the Academic Computing Committee a pipeline into future directions in computer instruction so that the Committee can only benefit from freeing up applicants to propose whatever they have in mind. Mr. Downing reminded his colleagues that the Educational Development Fund has not recently awarded money toward software acquisition, and Mr. Kleckner thought it improbable that much hardware could be purchased with something on the order of \$6000.00 available on a university-wide base. This being the first reading of the motion, it was held for action at the next Senate conclave.

With Academic Computing Committee business behind it, at least for a time, the Senate then turned to a significant item of new business advanced by its Admissions and Financial Aid Committee (Moved, Ms. Hildebrand; Seconded, Mr. Chipman):

MOVED that the Senate approve the revised Undergraduate Admissions Policy (distributed with the agenda) for implementation in fall 1986.

Ms. Hildebrand introduced the motion with background information on the ongoing process

by which her committee had worked toward a new admissions policy, beginning before the Commission on University Excellence was founded and then continuing its work under the influence of the CUE report. She reminded her fellow-Senators of the major changes identified on the agenda and indicated that several committee members, including Mr. Rose, were on hand to respond to questions. Citing the University's Role and Mission Statement as well as the CUE report to emphasize the importance of assuring a racially, religiously, and ethnically diverse community, Ms. Ray-Bledsoe called for a more aggressive statement on this theme although not to the point of establishing a quota. Mr. Chipman agreed with her position and announced his intention to submit for Senate approval a supplementary document that would address other issues studied by CUE but not covered in this policy; its purpose would be to try to clarify operating procedures on such points as internal admission standards, limitation of enrollments to reflect our support capacities, the responsibility of the university to select students with a view to a desirable program mix, and our continuing commitment to provide a representative student population. These operating principles are intended to supplement the proposed policy, which he approves. Mr. Edgerton called later for inclusion of some general principles relevant to internal admissions, with attention to the ways in which these would be monitored for the general good of the university.

Ms. Berger, inquiring if or how the proposed policy would appear in the catalog, pressed to discover whether the college-preparatory curriculum would appear as a requirement or simply a recommendation. She was afraid of scaring away exacting readers while failing to deter skimmers. Ms. Hildebrand hoped that the statement would encourage completion.

Considerable attention was devoted to the idea of requiring ACT scores for admission, with Ms. Garcia warning that nationally standardized testing in itself discriminates against certain groups. Ms. Hildebrand responded that her committee had considered the issue in detail but judged the test results valuable in terms of tracking, placement, and advising. The advantages seemed to her to outweigh potential disadvantages. Ms. Garcia maintained, however, that the use of such scores to limit admission would work for the institution's benefit rather than the student's. Ms. Hart-Gonzalez wondered how such a test could be used for placement. Mr. Rose, pointing out that 80,000 college-bound Michigan students already take the ACT, noted that many schools use these scores for that purpose. We have no plans to do so but believe the information provided by the testing service will prove useful. Despite contradictory studies about the effectiveness of such tests, Mr. Kleckner declared himself unpersuaded that the ACT does not correlate well with other placement instruments. Mr. Grossman read from the current catalog to note that Oakland University already requires ACT scores for advising but learned from Mr. Rose that the existing system prevents us from getting results in time for orientation; by requiring submission of scores for admission, he expects that the university would ultimately receive more than the current sixty-to-seventy-percent response.

Advising stalwarts among the Senators spoke strongly in favor of acquiring this information. Indicating that her Academic and Career Advising Committee has itself been studying uses of the ACT, Ms. Chapman-Moore shared with her colleagues the knowledge she had gleaned from discussion with our campus representative of that testing service. It seems that the test is intended, not as an admission criterion, but as a counseling tool. With scores considered valid for only three years, the test is unlikely to be helpful for admission of non-traditional students. Although anticipating problems storing and retrieving ACT results in their current hard-copy form (also available on tape), she reported that she loved the idea of using all this data for placement once a computerized student record system goes into action. Calling the ACT an enormously useful tool for advising, Mr. Appleton professed himself eager to require it of all

freshman students. He felt that the student gets more than his or her money's worth from the expense. He noted, however, that the admission policy on the floor requires the ACT only for regular freshman admission?not for transfers with over forty credits, mature students, and candidates for the Academic Support program. He calculated that the requirement would affect only about forty percent of our current students. Ms. Hildebrand confirmed that standardized tests are not specified except for freshmen.

Evaluating the proposal as offering the university the best of all possible worlds on the ACT, Mr. Horwitz argued that our current non-use of a generally accepted system mitigates against our chances of attracting the best qualified applicants. Mr. Chipman, in reference to CUE studies of literature on this subject, reported that a mixture of high school g.p.a. with test scores generally provides the best information. The proposed admission policy strengthens our ability to admit those students most likely to succeed here. Reminding Senators that the current (1970) policy only designates the g.p.a. as the basis for admission without even specifying a preferred curriculum, Mr. Rose requested that his admissions staff be allowed to use state-of-the-art material. When Mr. Bertocci inquired why the SAT would not be used instead, especially if the ACT is really designed for advising, he was reminded by Messrs. Rose and Appleton that the SAT is seldom taken by Michigan students, whereas the ACT generally is. There is no scientific evidence proving the SAT's superiority as a predictor of collegiate success. Mr. Bertocci then summarized this extensive discussion by observing that the reason for inclusion of this evidence is to provide the University with information, not to operate as an arbitrary admissions cutoff.

Turning attention toward transfer admission, Mr. Downing urged adoption of a tiered system in support of CUE recommendations. He (seconded by Mr. Tombouljian) offered an amendment to clarify language and add a third category of applicants:

MOVED that section IV of the proposed undergraduate admissions policy be amended to read (new language underlined): Admission of transfer students from other accredited colleges or universities shall be based on the following criteria:

1. Applicants who have completed 40 or more semester hours of transferable credit and who have a 2.5 or higher cumulative grade point average (with respect to these credits) will normally be admitted.
2. Applicants who have completed 40 or more semester hours of transferable credit with a 2.0 to 2.49 cumulative college grade point average may be admitted to some programs of the University if there is indication of strong motivation and a likelihood of success in Oakland's academic programs.
3. Applicants who have not completed 40 semester hours of transferable credit at a college or university will be considered for admission based on the criteria for Admission of Freshmen (section II above), assuming that the applicant has a 2.0 or higher college grade point average.

When Ms. Gerulaitis requested a definition of transferable credit, Mr. Downing identified it as meaning those credits that would be transferable here on the Advanced Standing Report: i.e., not basket-weaving or welding. This led Ms. Garcia to express concern about the effect of such policy on Oakland's participation in the MACRAO agreement but learned from Mr. Kleckner

that that covenant involves only limited acceptance among institutions of one another's credits. Raising g.p.a. requirements would rupture no alliances. Mr. Chipman pointed out that many Michigan colleges require a 2.5 or higher average for all transfer admissions. Ms. Garcia then cautioned that there might be a significant number of non-traditional students among transfers with fewer than forty credits, and Mr. Russell worried about the administrative burdens of processing ASRs before admission.

One further amendment came forward in the course of discussion. Mr. Russell, seconded by Mr. Tombouljian, moved to strike the word "normally" from section III.B.2. to establish that all students in the low g.p.a. special admissions category would be referred to the Academic Support Program. Ms. Hildebrand acknowledged that her committee had deliberately incorporated occasional "mush words" into the proposal to allow flexibility for occasional exceptions. This being their first reading, the main motion and both amendments were then held for further action at the next Senate meeting.

After it had deliberated with such intensity and at such great length on the two previous items of business, the Senate moved decisively to approve a motion from Mr. Edgerton (Seconded, Mr. Hough) to fill vacancies on two of its standing committees. Asish Nag will, therefore, replace Gary Shepherd on the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee from this winter through winter 1986, and Will Hoffman will continue to replace William Bryant on the Teaching and Learning Committee for the duration of the academic year. Both men have already taken on these duties, given the unfortunate cancellation of February's Senate meeting, so Mr. Kleckner was pleased to elicit his colleagues' blessing on existing patterns of service.

With private resolutions invited for the good of the order, Mr. Eberwein presented a statement on behalf of Robert Fink with reference to the proposed closing of the Graham Health Center. He read a prepared statement calling for public deliberation on this change?perhaps on the Senate floor. Acknowledging that this is not an academic issue as such, Mr. Eberwein identified it, nonetheless, as a university-wide concern and asked that the Steering Committee consider what action might be appropriate. Mr. Kleckner assured the Senate that nothing will be happening before summer 1986, if then; he recognized this as an issue worth considering and promised that the Steering Committee would take it under advisement and report at the next Senate meeting. Mr. Eliezer reported that the University Congress is currently discussing potential changes in health care and distributing a questionnaire to determine student perception of the Graham Health Center. Mr. Carbone asked faculty cooperation with polling in some classes.

Several information items brought the meeting to a close. First, Mr. Kleckner reported that book center pricing will revert to publishers' list price (no higher) for the fall semester. Next, he warned that additional Senate meetings will probably have to be scheduled to accommodate committee business. Turning then to the matter of the governor's commission report, he announced that we have won the first round of a still undefined contest. The Senate Select Committee deliberating on this report has unanimously decided not to recommend to its parent body the recommendations on role and mission statements for each institution. What will come forth as a result of legislative deliberations remains uncertain, but certain things will not. No House action has occurred as yet, although that is the chamber that will consider disposition of the proposed research fund. He noted that President Champagne will shortly be speaking with each college and school assembly in respect to the commission report, the technology park, and the development campaign. The final information item called Senate

attention to another delay in Implementing the anticipated computer-based registration and student records system, now due for introduction in spring 1986. Upon invitation of its presiding officer, the Senate then adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

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

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page