

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E

Oakland University Senate

Fifth meeting
February 14, 2002

Minutes

Members present: Abiko, Aubry, Bazaz, D. Berven, K. Berven, Binkert, Coppin, Didier, J.Eberwein, Frick, Gardner, Grossman, Haddad, Hansen-Smith, Henke, Hildebrand, Jarski, Khapoya, Kheir, LeMarbe, Lipman, Long, Machmut-Jhasi, Mann, McNair, Moudgil, Olson, Osthaus, Rozek, Russell, Sangeorzan, Schmidt, Schott-Baer, Schweitzer, Sethi, Shablin, Sieloff, Surrey

Members absent: Alber, Blanks, D. Clark, Downing, Eberly, Emrich, Goldberg, Graves, S.Klemanski, Latcha, Mosby, Mukherji, Otto, Sevilla, J.Smith, Stamps, Willoughby.

[Note: the list above is based on those individuals who were present at the time of the roll call]

Summary of actions:

1. Information items.

--The state of general purpose classrooms--Mr. Shablin and Mr. Preisinger

2. Approval of the minutes of the January 17, 2002 meeting. (Mr. Henke, Mr. Schwartz)
Approved.

3. Senate Steering Committee election (Senate Elections Committee) Ms. Schott-Baer elected.

4. Motion to recommend approval of a Bachelor of Science program in Financial Information Systems (Mr. Gardner, Ms. Eberwein) First reading

5. Motion to recommend approval of a Bachelor of Science Program Wellness, Health Promotion and Injury Prevention (Mr. Olson, Mr. Mann) First reading

6. Procedural motion to staff Senate standing committees (Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Binkert)
Approved.

7. Procedural motion to appoint Senate representatives to the Board of Trustees. (Mr. Coppin, Mr. Schwartz) Amended to: Procedural motion to appoint Senate representatives to express faculty opinions to the Board and to enhance communication between the Senate and the Board. (Mr.Russell, Ms. Mabee) Amended version approved unanimously.

General Purpose Classrooms

The Provost called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and introduced George Preisinger and Steve Shablin who presented an overview of the current state of instructional technology in general classrooms. Mr. Shablin began by defining a general purpose classroom as space that is managed and scheduled by the Registrar for instruction, supports multiple users, and is funded by central service operations. Central service operations include the Registrar's Office, Capital Planning and Design, Campus Facilities and Operations, and Information and Instructional Technology Services. Currently there are 89 general purpose classrooms with

South Foundation having the most at 37, the Science/Engineering Building with 13 and the new Education Building will have 11. Mr. Preisinger then used a [Powerpoint presentation](#) to outline the various levels of classroom technology. In summary:

Level 1 (47% of existing classrooms)	Projection screen, overhead projector, chalkboard, OUNet connection. Cost: \$4000-12,000
Level 2 (38% of existing classrooms)	Video/Data Projector, televisions, VHS VCR,DVD Player,Fixed AV equipment lock box, campus telephone,video switcher, powered speaker. Cost \$16,000-24,000
Level 3 (11 % of existing classrooms)	Video/Data Projector, Fixed AV equipment lock box, instructor multimedia desk (inc. PC, VCR-DVD, digital document camera, fiber transceivers. Cost: \$28,000-36,000.
Level 4 (3.4% of existing classrooms)	2-way interactive video classroom. \$48,000-56,000.
Level 5	Not part of general classroom group. Basically a Level 3 classroom with student computer workstations. All owned by individual units, not controlled by the Registrar. Cost \$70,000.

A new mobile multi-media cart will enable a level 1 classroom to be converted to a level 3. After Mr. Preisinger went over a brief history of how quickly classroom technology has changed, Mr. Shablin continued by noting that the Senate Computing Committee and the Classroom Improvement Committee both provide advice and assist in developing standards. Mr. Moudgil announced that he has allocated \$50,000 per year for classroom improvement and has asked for recommendations about how best to use the funding. Ms. Hansen-Smith asked what happens at the end of technology lifetime. Mr. Preisinger responded that they are really challenged by this and this is why there is a charge back system, that this charge back system generates funds to add and to update technology on campus. He added that as we add more technology, the need for designated funds for support and improvement will increase; he noted too that we need to maintain what we have.

Mr. Long asked if any consideration had been given to requiring students to have their own laptops. Mr. Moudgil responded that a number of high schools in affluent areas have done this but that it would be a hardship for many of our students. Mr. Ludorf reported that OU had considered the idea of laptops but a survey of the students indicated that 85-90% of them had access to computers at home or work. Given that the cost of this initiative would be an additional \$400-500 per year for students, Oakland decided not to ask students to shoulder this additional burden. Mr. Gardner added that requiring laptops may have made sense 10 years ago but not now since students generally have access to computers. The Provost reminded the group that plans are underway for a university-wide computer upgrade and that it is hoped that all computers could be upgraded on a three year basis. He also stated that academic units have other needs and that this is a tight budget year. Mr. Jarksi stated that he has generally had good experience with high technology but runs into problems with low technology, for example, problems with lights that can't be dimmed, needs for extension cords, projection screens badly positioned so that they cover the main part of the blackboard. Mr. Preisinger replied that problems should be reported using the category 'Report a Problem' on the [ITI page](#).

After the roll call, the Provost called for approval of the [minutes](#) of the January meeting. Mr. Henke so moved, Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion and the minutes were approved. Mr.

Moudgil explained that the Constitution of the School of Nursing was still undergoing revision and that it would probably appear at a later date as a new motion.

Steering Committee Election

The first item of new business involved another Steering Committee election. Mr. Russell, chair of the Senate Elections Committee opened the floor for nominations after reviewing the eligibility requirements. The single nominee, Darlene Schott-Baer of the School of Nursing, was elected by acclamation.

Financial Information Systems

The Senate then turned its attention to a [proposal](#) for a new bachelor's program in Financial Information Systems. Mr. Gardner

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of a program leading to a Bachelor of Science in Financial Information Systems

Following Ms. Eberwein's second, Mr. Gardner explained that this program was designed to meet the needs of the financial community and was based on a market analysis and input from advisors and the SBA board of visitors. In response to Mr. Sethi's query regarding the amount of overlap with MIS, Mr. Gardner indicated there is hardly any overlap although students in FIS may take MIS courses to complement their degree. Mr. Grossman asked about the expected number of new students and Mr. Gardner responded that, with proper advertising, they expected 15-30 new students. Mr. Gardner added that he thinks the traditional accounting degree may be phased out and replaced by degrees like this one. Mr. Grossman noted that the College would need additional support for the added math section that would be needed to accommodate these new FIS students. Following his line of thought, Ms. Didier pointed out that additional library resources will be needed in spite of the fact the SPRC report concludes that no new resources are required. She stated that almost all new programs require additional library/research resources and that there have been problems in the past in getting these allocated. In response, Ms. Jackson, chair of SPRC, noted that her committee doesn't consider budget implications, but looks at the overall impact of a program, the need for faculty, classroom space, how it fits in with the mission of the university. Mr. Gardner stated that SBA handles its own shop when it comes to technology and marketing and that the only incremental costs would be the library resources needed. Ms. Eberwein, chair of UCUI, commented that UCUI thought it a valuable addition to the curriculum and was careful not to get involved in the budgetary implications. Mr. Lipman wondered if this would have any impact on graduate programs and Mr. Gardner thought not.

Wellness, Health Promotion and Injury Prevention

The Senate then turned its attention to the next agenda item a [proposal](#) for a B.S. in Wellness, Health Promotion and Injury Prevention. Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Mann

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of a program leading to bachelor of Science in Wellness, Health Promotion and Injury Prevention

Mr. Olson explained that this will be an interdisciplinary program with an expected initial enrollment of 50 growing to 200 by year 4. He also stated that if enrollments do not meet these projections, the budget, especially with regard to additional faculty will be scaled back.

In reply to Mr. Henke's question about career paths for students completing this degree, Mr. Olson called attention to section 1.1.2 and Table 1 where the career possibilities are delineated. Mr. Olson stressed that this program emphasizes behavior and in this way differs from programs that emphasize science. Mr. Moudgil pointed out that elements of the WAG report included comments on wellness. Mr. Grossman noted that added resources would be needed in the College to support the extra work load from students taking the pre-core classes that are part of this new program. Ms. Jackson reported that the Senate Planning Review Committee thought it a good program and a good opportunity. Speaking as a Nursing faculty member, she indicated that Nursing is very interested in collaborating with Health Sciences in this endeavor, adding that many Nursing classes might be appropriate as electives. Mr. Moudgil commented that he would encourage closer collaboration between SON and SHS. With no further discussion on this proposal the Provost indicated that we will review them again next month for the second reading and perhaps by then the report from the Senate Budget Review Committee will be available

Senate Appointments

A procedural motion to appoint the members listed in the agenda to Senate committees was moved by Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Binkert, and approved.

A second motion to appoint Senate faculty representatives to attend Board of Trustees meetings was made by Mr. Coppin and seconded by Mr. Schwartz. Mr. Moudgil provided a brief outline of the background of this motion which is the result of both a Jan. 17, 2002 Senate motion and a recommendation from the Academic Affairs Review Committee. He noted that Board meetings are not usually well attended by faculty and that this step will ensure that faculty are at Board meetings. He will make sure the materials for the meetings are provided ahead of time and he added that this is one step toward our goal of getting official faculty liaisons appointed to the Board. Mr. Henke pointed out that the wording of the motion was misleading, that it sounds as though these individuals are official representatives rather than senate faculty members who would attend the meetings. Mr. Russell came up with a proposed amendment which was seconded by Ms. Mabee:

MOVED that the individuals listed below be appointed for the duration of their Senate terms to express faculty opinions to the Board and to enhance communication between the Senate and the Board of Trustees.

In response to Mr. Grossman's need for clarification about the length of the term, the Provost indicated that the terms would expire at the end of this Senate term in 2003. The Provost noted that the Steering Committee discussed and decided against staggering the terms. Mr. Kheir asked if the Board would allow the faculty representatives to speak. Not unless they specifically had requested the opportunity to speak ahead of time, answered the Provost. Mr. Russell explained that the Board has become more flexible in its operations and will now permit individuals the chance to speak at the time an item is being discussed if they have previously indicated that they wish to speak. If items come up that are not on the published agenda, there's nothing that can be done. In the past the Board only allowed comments at the end of the meeting after all the votes had been completed. The Provost hopes that this will allow the Board to see the advantages of the communication and to allay any fears the Board may have. The proposed amendment was then approved unanimously. Mr. Russell addressed Mr. Lipman's concern about the difference between senate representatives vs. faculty representatives by noting that this was taken care of in the Jan 17th motion which specified

faculty senate representatives. Mr. Binkert asked if the faculty representatives would be expected to report back to the Senate and the response was that yes, they would. The amended motion was then approved.

Good and Welfare

Mr. Russell asked about the status of the Senate Planning Review Committee's [report](#) on the General Education Learning Outcomes. Mr. Sudol responded that there was not enough time to develop wording for a Senate motion and that the Steering Committee would be reviewing the report. Mr. Moudgil took the opportunity to recognize and thank the General Education Task Force I for their hard work and accomplishments. Mr. Binkert asked if the report was available and was told that it is No. 7 on the Senate general education page.

Mr. Henke brought up further concerns about the Board of Trustees refusal to add faculty liaisons, noting that at the University of Michigan the faculty would raise hell if the Regents rejected such a proposal. He argued that if the cause is just, we need to pursue it and if we don't, we will give the Board the impression the faculty really don't care. The Board membership changes, students change but faculty spend their careers at Oakland and should be allowed input into university decisions. Mr. Moudgil thought it time to move on since the motion had already been approved. Mr. Russell pointed out that anyone can attend and speak at Board meetings so the senate representatives will not be the only ones with input. Ms. McNair shared Mr. Henke's concern but counseled patience, that this is just a first step. Mr. Berven opined that the best shot is through the President and Provost, that they have the best chance of convincing the Board of the value of faculty liaisons. The Provost assured the Senate that he will work toward this objective. Mr. Binkert asked if other institutions have faculty liaisons on their Boards and Mr. Moudgil replied that there are some but not very many. Mr. Henke reported that the Regents at U of M are in frequent communication with faculty on the Executive Committee; Mr. Moudgil pointed out that the Regents are elected while Oakland's Board is appointed.

Changing topics, Ms. Mabee expressed her concern over the possibility that general education requirements might eliminate the foreign language requirement or include it with other modules and thus dramatically affect their enrollments. The general education report doesn't seem to address foreign languages she noted. Other members of the Modern Languages Dept. expressed similar concerns. Mr. Russell reported that the Senate Planning Review Committee consensus was in favor of including a foreign language. Mr. Binkert added that there is a subcommittee looking into issues of implementation and reminded the group that much remains to be decided. The Provost indicated that he would like to see the Senate move forward on the Learning Outcomes in general and if we agree on the principles, we can decide the specifics later after consultation with the academic community. Mr. Grossman asked about the difference between specifics and principles and Mr. Moudgil indicated he'd consider foreign language as a specific within the learning outcomes. The Provost indicated that he's put the memo he sent to SPRC up on the web.

Mr. Dickow, president of the Student Congress, presented to the Senate the following resolution that was approved by Congress on February 11, 2002:

Whereas, a goal of the Oakland University Student Congress is to ensure that students' interests and concerns are addressed,

Whereas, current Oakland University undergraduate diplomas do not reflect the degree program completed by the graduate,

Whereas, the students of Oakland University request that majors be designated on all undergraduate diplomas,

Whereas, other institutions of higher education throughout the nation have already endorsed this policy,

Let it Be Resolved that the Academic Standing and Honors Committee (ASH), the University Senate Steering Committee and the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction (UCUI) formally address this need of the students at Oakland University,

Let it Further Resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Students, all aforementioned committees, the Oakland Post and Oakland's radio station WXOU.

Mr. Moudgil stated that he would forward the resolution to the Academic Standing and Honors Committee. And with no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E
Home Page

3/11/02