

## Oakland University Senate

Seventh Meeting  
March 18, 1999

### Minutes

Members present: K. Andrews, Benson, Bertocci, Blume, Connellan, Dillon, Doane, Downing, Eberwein, Grossman, Herman, Hildebrand, Johnson, Keane, Liboff, Macauley, McNair, Moran, Osthaus, Ott, Papazian, Pettengill, Rozek, Schochetman, Sen; also Russi, Eberly, Roberts, Rottenberg, Cooke, Mehl

Members absent: Abraham, Alber, S. Andrews, Blanks, Boddy, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, David, Haskell, Herold, Hovanesian, Jarski, Lilliston, Lombard, Long, Mabee, Mitchell, Moore, Moudgil, Mukherji, Olson, Otto, Polis, Reynolds, Riley, H. Schwartz, R. Schwartz, Sieloff, Simon, Speer, Sudol, Weng, Wood

#### Summary of actions:

##### 1. Information items:

- a. Committee to deal with faculty hiring procedures being finalized.
- b. Open Hearing scheduled for Thursday, March 25, 1999 from 3-6 p.m. in Dodge 200 to discuss proposed amendments to the Senate Constitution.
- c. Electronic discussion of proposed amendments to Senate Constitution available at: <http://www.oakland.edu/~cww>, then Other 999 Senate Discussion; login=senate;

pw=discussion

- d. Change of Winter 2000 calendar-delayed start of classes.

2. Motion to endorse the SPRC-SBRC report concerning the Creating the Future Initiative. (Mr. Dillon, Mr. Moran) Second reading. Approved.

3. Motion to endorse the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Multi-Purpose Complex. (Mr. Dillon, Mr. Andrews) First reading. Approved following the approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Mr. Connellan, Mr. Andrews)

Mr. Downing called the meeting to order at 3:15 and proceeded to detail several information items, including:

- a. The committee to consider faculty hiring procedures is in the process of being finalized;
- b. There will be an open hearing on March 25, 1999 from 3:00-6:00 p.m. in Dodge Hall 200 to consider the proposed amendments to the Senate Constitution;
- c. Copies of the Constitution with the proposed changes are available on the [Senate web site](#), in departmental offices and the Provost's Office;
- d. An electronic forum has been established on the web using the course web wizard. This will provide the option for discussion using the web and can be found at: <http://www.oakland.edu~cww>. Once there click on "classes", then "other"; login=senate; password=discussion.
- e. One item on the Board agenda is a revision of the winter 2000 academic calendar. While the university is in the midst of Y2K preparations it seemed a good idea to delay the start of the winter term for a few days in case problems arise. So registration will be Jan. 6th instead of the 4th, and classes will begin on Jan. 10th rather than the 5th. This will allow several days to fix any problems and avoids beginning classes on a Friday. The term will have 13 Mondays and 14 Tuesdays-Saturdays.

In response to a question concerning the Spring and Summer terms, Mr. Downing stated that spring registration will occur before exams end. This means students will register before they know what their final grades are, but, he noted, many students already preregister for their classes anyway. There may be some difficulty in the turnover of dorm rooms but Ms. Reynolds has indicated that this can be accommodated as a one time only project.

### Creating the Future

Turning to the only item of old business, the second reading of the SBRC/SPRC [report](#) on the Creating the Future document, Mr. Downing opened the floor for discussion. Ms. Eberwein commented that she was struck by the non-parallelism of the unit strategies as represented under the principal headings. If these are the particular strategies that should warrant university financial support, she is concerned about the variations in the strategies. If however, these are just indicators of types of strategies, she felt that many good ideas were omitted and others may have been overvalued. For example, she noted that international study is not the only way to prepare students for a diverse workplace. She expressed her willingness to support the broad goals; however she wondered if a vote in support of the report would also be a vote for the specific array of strategies and that she is not comfortable doing.

Mr. Dillon responded that their Committees felt it inappropriate to rank strategies and decided instead to cluster them by certain megastrategies. They then tried to identify [selected unit strategies](#) that related directly to the megastrategies. It is not an exhaustive listing he noted, but those that fit best under the megastrategies. He emphasized that the megastrategies are the most important part of their report. Mr. Downing added that this overview is consistent with the charge the Committees were given, which was to look at cross-campus, interdisciplinary aspects of the document. Mr. Moran agreed, stating that they could have looked at all 70 plus strategies but that their charge was to identify the most important. Mr. Dillon also noted that these are specific strategies that can be linked directly to the megastrategies; he recognizes that each unit has its own set of strategies and should be encouraged to go forward with them. This document will not stand alone, Mr. Downing pointed out, but will go hand in hand with the Creating the Future document and the Strategic Plan and will be influential in fund raising and development projects. With no further discussion forthcoming, Mr. Downing called for a vote on the motion and the Senate approved it with a few dissenting votes.

The next item on the agenda was a motion presented by Mr. Dillon to endorse the [report](#) of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Multi-Purpose Complex. Following Mr. Andrews' second, Ms. Schaefer summarized the activities that led up to the recommendations presented in the report. The Ad Hoc Committee was established in January to look at the concept of a multi-purpose complex and to consult broadly with campus constituencies. The Committee met with 22 groups and, based on input received, developed the guiding principles and a framework for evaluation the components of the complex. The report includes the benefits and the concerns that were raised for each of the components along with the Committee's recommendation that we move forward with the consideration of such a complex. In reply to Mr. Andrews' query about where do we go from here, Ms. Schaefer indicated that a recommendation from the university administration will be presented at the April Board meeting. The Board will be given the guiding principles and the next step is to move forward with consulting services, market analysis, financial projections, etc.

Mr. Liboff asked about the status of a performing arts center in Troy. Ms. Schaefer responded that she isn't sure what Troy is doing, that they are looking for a master developer and have

announced that they would like a performing arts center. Would we withdraw that component if they go ahead, asked Mr. Liboff. Ms. Schaefer opined that there will be only one performing arts center of this magnitude built in this area. Mr. Pettengill asked how this fits in with the plans to update the master plan and Ms. Schaefer responded that, since the master plan will take around two years to complete, the decision was made to move forward now with the multi-purpose complex idea. Mr. Grossman suggested a rewording of one of the guiding principles for clarification: The University should not expect to use its own resources or personnel, other than land, to construct or operate a multi-purpose complex on campus. He wondered if the recommendation regarding intercollegiate hockey was based primarily on cost or the nature of the sport. Ms. Schaefer responded that the concern was cost, and noted that there were mixed responses on this. Ms. Benson asked about the \$400,000 estimated cost of the consulting firm's study. Ms. Schaefer answered that the figure was supplied by the consulting firm and included all aspects, e.g. a market analysis, financial projections, site design, management and evaluation of requests for proposals. She noted that, if we go forward, the contract will have specific components with costs attached and so, if we decided not to pursue a particular component, that cost would not be incurred. Ms. Benson indicated that it seems a considerable amount of money for a proposal and was glad to hear we can withdraw, since she felt there were other areas on campus where the money could be better spent. Ms. Schaefer indicated that going through the process has the benefit of our learning how to structure private/public partnerships.

If it is approved, what then, asked Mr. Bertocci. Ms. Schaefer stated that it will go to the Board of Trustees for approval, then we will move to the analysis phase of the process and eventually to soliciting RFPs to identify private partners. Mr. Bertocci also asked if the guiding principles will play a role in future consideration of similar projects and Ms. Schaefer indicated that they would. Ms. Eberwein asked if there would be any further involvement or consultation with the Senate before construction begins and Ms. Schaefer responded that the Committee has recommended on-going consultation with the campus community. Mr. Downing then indicated that if a second reading of the motion was needed, it would take place at a specially scheduled meeting on the 25th just prior to the open hearing. Mr. Connellan then moved, seconded by Mr. Andrews, to waive the second reading, a motion the Senate approved with the requisite 3/4 majority. The main motion was then approved, again with a few dissenting votes and the meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Submitted by  
Linda L. Hildebrand  
Secretary to the University Senate  
4/13/99

[Return to Senate Home Page](#)