

Oakland University Senate

Second Meeting
October 17, 1996

Minutes

Members present: Alber, Andrews, Awbrey, Benson, Blume, Bricker, Brieger, Briggs-Bunting, Buffard-O'Shea, Christina, Cole, Connellan, Dillon, Downing, Frankie, Garfinkle, Gilroy, Gordon, Hahn, Haskell, Herold, Hildebrand, Hovanesian, Keane, Landsberg, Liboff,, Mahamwal, Meuser, Miller, Moore, Moran, Nesbary, Olson, Otto, Pettengill, Polis, Purcell, Reynolds, Rice, Rozek, Russi, Sahu, Schochetman, Schwartz, Speer, Tower, Witt

Absent: Abiko, Dahlgren, Fliedner, Gardner, Jarski, Kazarian, Kheir, Lilliston, Long, Meehan, Raiss, Reddy, Riley, Sevilla, Talbert, Wharton

Summary of actions:

1. Committee reports:

University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction-Mr. Ozinga
Teaching and Learning Committee-Ms. Wood

2. Approval of September Senate minutes (Polis, Downing) Approved.
3. Motion to revise the charge to UCUI (Reynolds, Gilroy) Second reading. Tabled.
4. Motion to lay on the table the motion to revise UCUI's charge (Schwartz, Moran) Approved.
5. Motion to fill vacancy on Research Committee (Andrews, Christina) Approved.
6. Motion to establish an Honorary Degree Screening Committee (Andrews, Bricker) First reading.
7. Motion to add a graduate student to the Honorary Degree Screening Committee (Landsberg, Briggs-Bunting)
8. Motion to establish a Library Committee as a Senate standing committee (Andrews, Gilroy) First reading.
9. Motion to amend the charge to the Library Committee (Frankie, Tower)
10. Motion to recommend approval of an amended Library Constitution (Frankie, Gilroy) First reading.
11. Report from the Ad Hoc Athletic Committee.

Mr. Connellan called the meeting of the University Senate to order and asked the Senate's indulgence in a slight rearrangement of the agenda to accommodate faculty presenting committee reports. Mr. Ozinga led off with an account of the activities of the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction during the past year, activities which included standardizing petitions of exception and creating guidelines for Committees on Instruction regarding such petitions, establishing a schedule for undergraduate program reviews, revising the charge to the committee, establishing guidelines for ethnic

diversity and approving ethnic diversity courses, considering Math. 011/012 credits which count in the grade point average but don't count towards graduation; internal baccalaureate degrees, reporting on CLAP credits, deciding on nomenclature definitions for major, minor, concentration and specialization, defining UCUI's role in catalog changes and dealing with several problems relating to course duplication.

The second committee report on the work of the Teaching and Learning Committee was presented by Ms. Wood. Their activities consisted of reviewing and funding Educational Development Grants, sponsoring several teaching and learning luncheons with speakers, issuing two newsletters, providing some funding for Martin Luther King Day activities, and selecting the winner of the Teacher Excellence Award. The Committee was unable to support the Faculty Forums last year but is hoping to reinstate this activity in future years.

As the first item of business, Mr. Connellan called for a motion to approve the Sept. 19 Senate minutes. Mr. Polis so moved, Mr. Downing provided the second and the minutes were approved as distributed. Mr. Connellan then notified the Senate that volunteers were still needed for Senate committees and ask that they consider volunteering and that they encourage their colleagues also to volunteer.

Moving to old business, the motion to revise the charge to the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction was then opened for discussion. Mr. Schwartz led off by expressing his concern over the idea of UCUI monitoring a course and reported that the AAUP Committee on Academic Freedom has requested that Mr. Follo, chair of UCUI, meet with them to discuss this issue. In the interim he suggested that item 9 of the charge be separated from the main motion and tabled until the issue of academic freedom can be addressed. This led to a discussion regarding tabling item 9 versus tabling the entire motion. Mr. Andrews donned his parliamentarian hat and decreed that the entire motion would need to be tabled. Hearing that, Mr. Moran seconded the proposal to lay the motion on the table. That led Mr. Keane to wonder what would happen if it were tabled and Mr. Andrews replied that an action would be required to take it off the table. Mr. Sahu, former UCUI chair, attempted to clarify UCUI's role. He declared himself a champion of academic freedom and assured the Senate that item 9 is being misunderstood. If a course is being monitored for a certain ideology that would be wrong. But he argued, that is not the case here. When a department proposes a course that is to fill the requirement, the Senate gave UCUI the responsibility of determining whether or not the course meets the criteria. And, he added, courses which have met the criteria need to be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that the course content continues to meet the Senate's requirements.

Mr. Schwartz commented that ethnic diversity does not seem to have been defined in a clear way and that a faculty member would have to guess whether or not the content was acceptable. Mr. Sahu replied that this requirement is very like general education, someone decides whether or not a course meets the general education guidelines. He added that the problem may be with the institution of the requirement rather than the role of UCUI in carrying out their Senate mandate. Mr. Moran disagreed with the comparison to general education, arguing that the measure of writing, for example, is fairly clear but that ethnic diversity is laden with political and ideological overtones and he would like to see it more clearly defined. Mr. Liboff also argued that general education is different in that it involves the concept of a series of disciplines. In the present case, ethnic diversity doesn't have a disciplinary basis and he isn't sure how it fits.

Ms. Gilroy pointed out that UCUI distributed to the deans and department chairs a definition of ethnic diversity. When the Senate charged UCUI to oversee the requirement and review courses for it, the Senate only specified that a course could satisfy the ethnic diversity requirement by including 3 out of 16 weeks (or 20%) of course content related to an American ethnic identity. UCUI further defined the American ethnic identity and determined that study of a single culture was acceptable as long as it

covered how that culture interrelated with the society as a whole. She opined that the UCUI very clearly defined what criteria they were looking for in regard to the requirement and added that the committee members simply don't have the time nor the inclination to see whether you are adequately covering American history from a perspective that we would support. The Committee is simply looking for evidence that a syllabus contains the elements needed to fulfill the ethnic diversity requirement. If more specificity is needed, then UCUI needs more guidance from the Senate as to what were the intentions when the requirement was approved.

Stating that we are dealing with several issues here, Mr. Andrews attempted to clarify them. One, what constitutes suitable elements in ethnic diversity? He suggested that UCUI could report back to the Senate on this issue. The other issue relates the use of the word monitor. In this instance monitor means that UCUI has established a procedure for approval of courses meeting the requirement and of updating the list of courses. If a course is on the list, how would it get removed if the content no longer contained the 3 week diversity component he asked. He stated that is what is meant by the phrase 'to monitor' and noted that, in that respect, it is very like the general education requirements. Mr. Bricker remarked that the character of this ethnic diversity requirement is highly simplistic but that if we tried to make it anything but simplistic, the result would be controversial. The assumption is that the goal of teaching ethnic diversity is to teach respect for ethnic differences and is an agenda coming out of a liberal tradition. However, what about an ethnic group that violates traditional human rights--how would we handle that? He concluded that it is better to leave it superficial or do away with it entirely. Mr. Schwartz and Ms. Buffard-O'Shea expressed interest in further discussion of the concept of ethnic diversity. The motion to lay on the table was put to the vote and passed.

Moving on to new business, the chair recognized Mr. Andrews who, asking the indulgence of the Senate, interposed a procedural motion to appoint Robert Stewart (Dept. of Psychology) to the Research Committee for the remainder of the fall term as a replacement for Mr. Hansen. Mr. Christina seconded the motion which was approved. Then, Mr. Andrews moved and Mr. Bricker seconded the first item of new business, a motion to establish the Honorary Degree Screening Committee as a senate standing committee with the charge and membership as listed in the agenda. In introducing the motion Mr. Andrews noted that there was a time when honorary degrees were a regular feature of Oakland commencements and that this motion is intended to revive that tradition. The proposal has been with the Steering Committee for some time and he commended Jane Eberwein and Linda Benson for their thoughtful contributions in recent years. Mr. Liboff wondered about the committee's name and proposed an alternative, simply the Honorary Degree Committee, a change that was accepted as a friendly amendment. Calling it a very meritorious proposal, Mr. Bricker expressed his approval of the process, adding that honorary degrees tell the community a lot about what we value. Also speaking in favor of the motion was Mr. Downing who nevertheless wondered about the membership. Noting the need for broad-based representation he asked whether a restriction of no more than two individuals from any organized faculty had been considered. Mr. Andrews replied that it was left open-ended in part because of the difficulty the Steering Committee already has in filling committee vacancies. He assured the Senate that the Steering Committee makes every effort to achieve balance in committee assignments and would do so in this instance. Mr. Russi remarked on how important this is for the university, emphasizing that it is one of the ways to bring outstanding individuals to campus and to enhance our reputation in the community at large. Mr. Christina lamented the fact that the process does not involve the Senate, only the Senate Steering Committee. Mr. Landsberg moved to include a graduate student in the membership; Ms. Briggs-Bunting seconded the motion.

Hearing no further discussion relating to honorary degrees, Mr. Connellan then called for consideration of item 2 of new business. The proposal to establish a Library Committee as a Senate standing committee with the charge and membership as printed in the agenda was moved by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Ms. Gilroy. Ms. Frankie, on behalf of the Library Faculty, moved to amend the charge by

substituting the following in place of item 2: To advise the library in the formulation of broad general policies on collections, buildings, facilities, and services. These policies shall be presented to the University administration by the Dean of the Library.

Mr. Tower seconded the motion.

Ms. Frankie then listed a number of reasons why she believes the provision to share equally is inappropriate. The most important reason is that the provision would prevent the library faculty from exercising their right to self governance as an organized faculty; that provision 2 would impugn the authority of the Library. She argued that the faculty's ability to carry out their professional responsibilities is directly affected by library policies relating to services, collections, buildings and facilities, since the policies determine library faculty assignments, workloads, working conditions and work schedules. As with other academic units, the library faculty is vested with the responsibility for the design and implementation of library programs and services and is held accountable for these; thus, she stated, our authority must be commensurate with our responsibilities. She also expressed her opinion, that from an operational point of view, the provision is unworkable. The Library has many broad general policies, policies that are continually developed and reviewed as circumstances require and which take into account a variety of factors as well as the overall needs of the university community. The development of these policies requires significant continuing involvement and the professional expertise which exists only among members of the library faculty and staff.

She stressed, however, that a library advisory committee, made up of representatives from the various constituencies, is absolutely essential. Comments and advice about library policies are always welcome and in many instances, steps have been taken to ensure that such advice is obtained. As examples she cited the work of the Library Council, the open hearings and the special presentations to the University Senate that have taken place in recent years when key library decisions and policies were made. These activities have worked well and will continue to be used. The role of the Library is to serve the university community and, if there are policies of concern, the Library needs to hear of them, to justify them or to change them. She concluded that in reviewing the charges of other Senate committees there do not appear to be any which are vested with policy making authority in conjunction with another academic unit. The committee which most closely parallels the proposed library committee, the Academic Computing Committee, serves in an advisory capacity only.

Mr. Andrews commented that the main motion needs to be viewed in conjunction with the following motion regarding the amended Library Faculty Constitution. Most provisions of constitutions deal with internal organization and governance. However, for reasons somehow lost in the mists of time, the Library Council was made part of the Library Constitution in 1970. The provisions 1,2,3,4 and 7 in the charge are all modeled on the charge in the current Library Constitution under which the Library Council has operated for the last 26 years. He opined that a significant diminution in the role of the users would occur if the amendment were approved and added that no academic unit functions autonomously. In matters concerning other academic units, there are processes for resolving differences. He disagreed with the contention that Senate committees do not have policy making roles, citing Academic Conduct and Academic Standing and Honors and pointed out that all units are bound by policies promulgated by these committees. In terms of interactions between the Library and the rest of the university community, this proposal creates the sole point of contact between the Library and other academic units and creates a situation where the Library Committee is not superior to but rather equal to the library. And it guarantees four librarians as well as the library dean representation on the committee, a situation not guaranteed to any other academic unit when matters of academic conduct or academic standing arise. Mr. Christina explained that reason the Steering Committee recommended removing the Library Council from the Constitution was because its presence there demeans the library faculty in that it implies that the library faculty needs and requires a committee to monitor it. He pointed it didn't seem

appropriate that they should self monitor themselves with an outside committee. And that the Library Faculty approved their revised Constitution with a Library Council, that the decision to follow the Steering Committee's recommendation and remove the Library Council from the Library Constitution was done with the advice and consent of the Library.

Ms. Frankie countered with the fact that the charge to the Library Council was changed to an advisory function when the Library Constitution was revised in 1995. She emphasized that this change was done with the advice and the approval of the Library Council. When that version of the amended Constitution was reviewed by the Senate Steering Committee, the Steering Committee recommended removing the Library Council from the Constitution and replacing it with a senate standing committee. However, in the process of forming the senate library committee, the old charge to the Library Council was retained in place of the one recently approved by the Library Council. She argued that the College does not have a special university committee with the authority to participate equally in its policy making activities, nor do any of the Schools, and that neither should the Library.

Mr. Christina felt that other senate committees set policies which affect academic units, that sometimes the units affected may not have been represented; he argued that the provision for equal participation was a benefit to the Library. Mr. Andrews agreed, noting that in a number of areas committees have jurisdiction over policies and enforce those policies on units, and argued that the units are subordinate to the committees in regard to the policies. In reply to Mr. Pettengill's request for clarification of the four areas in the College to be represented on the committee, Mr. Andrews listed them, social sciences, math and sciences, humanities and language and literature. Mr. Downing added that these categories are normally used for election purposes. In comparing the existing membership specifications with that the proposed Library Committee, Ms. Frankie emphasized the importance of having an broadly based and representative committee.

The next item of business, a motion to recommend to the President and Board the approval of the amended Library Constitution, was moved by Ms. Frankie, seconded by Ms. Gilroy. Mr. Pettengill wondered if anyone else had a defective copy of the Constitution but it appeared that he was the only one so afflicted. Mr. Downing asked if it would be possible to have the Constitution showing the original wording, the deletions, changes and additions. Ms. Frankie indicated that such a document would be prepared for the next Senate meeting.

Mr. Russi wondered about the status of the amendments on the floor; Mr. Andrews, the parliamentarian, responded that they would be carried forward and voted on at the next Senate meeting.

Having thus concluded the business of the meeting, the Senate then turned its attention to good and welfare items and as such, welcomed the Ad Hoc Athletic Committee. Mr. Bissonnette led off the discussion by summarizing the work that has been done so far in examining the role of athletics at OU. The past two years have seen a number of changes, the retirement of Paul Hartman, the development of the Strategic Plan, a number of surveys concerning the role of athletics on campus and during that period he has been working on evaluating the athletic programs on campus. He noted the importance of athletics in the Strategic Plan and the interest of students in improving athletic programs. Over the past couple of years a number of consultants have provided information and advice. In May 1996 a retreat was held during which alumni, faculty and athletic department personnel discussed the athletic programs and developed ideas for the future. A different approach emerged from this retreat and some different ideas about Oakland's fit with the schools represented by GLIAC. One of the Board's criteria has been that institutions in the conference that we play should look like us and share the same concerns for excellence that we do and, based on that, we began to look at different options.

He explained that Division I has three layers and that the AAA designation refers to schools that have

Div.I athletic programs without football, adding that many existing AAA schools have very respectable academic reputations. In looking at our peer groups and our aspirant groups, a number have AAA programs and there is a lot in favor of moving to Div.I-AAA status. And, considering intercollegiate athletic resources, it appears we will be better off in a Div.I program. The NCAA is very wealthy as a result of the TV programs which relates to enhanced revenues. Also, there is a restructuring going on now which will make it more difficult for schools like OU to move to Division I status in the future.

Mr. Christina asked if the committee is ready to make its recommendations to the President; Mr. Bissonnette replied that they are still gathering information. Mr. Bricker expressed his appreciation for the committee's appearance at the Senate meeting. He pointed out that the reason we are discussing the wisdom of venturing into some form of Div. I athletics is because the Board has asked us to do so and the reason the Board is interested is that it wishes to find new ways of bringing our University to the attention of the public. He noted that neither students nor faculty have asked us to address the issue. Venturing into Div. I would be motivated by a desire for better public relations for Oakland. However, the culture of Div.I is winning; losing Div. I teams get reported and while some remain highly thought of despite losing, newcomers into Div. I only get noticed when they win. He fears that a move to Div. I would mean that winning would become everything with coaches being fired and students being replaced when they lose.

Mr. Bricker values the athletic programs we now have on this campus and enjoys the fact that we do not freak out when teams lose. But he expects that this would change with OU's entry into Division I. He spoke of the cultural forces that currently make classroom teaching difficult, students' interest in the cash value of everything, their focus on short term goals and he doesn't want anything to make his work in the classroom even harder. Any fame achieved through our Division I program would be an embarrassment, he feels, and he deplors the notion that winning is everything. He is also concerned about the financing of such a program. Although we would certainly secure assurances from the current administration that money would not be directed away from academic programs into athletics, no administration lasts for very long any more and he worries that the promises made by our current administration would not be binding on a new one.

Remembering promises made when the golf club was inaugurated, Mr. Liboff reflected that no money was ever generated for the general fund from this enterprise, that what monies are generated from an athletic program would remain in the athletic area and not be available to academic affairs. Mr. Bissonnette agreed, however he pointed out that successful programs don't necessarily generate dollars and that a secondary benefit comes from donors who get involved because of the sports' programs. He declared that because we have good students in Div.II doesn't mean that we won't also have them in Div.I; that good athletic programs and good academic programs can co-exist. Ms. Briggs-Bunting asked for clarification of the differences between Div.I, A,AA and AAA designations. Mr. Mehl replied that it relates in part to the presence of football and the level of support, e.g. attendance, scholarships, etc. Div.I-A includes teams like the University of Michigan; examples of AA teams are Georgia Southern; AAA schools (examples are Marquette, George Washington, American University) have no football, tend to be urban, more student centered and more balanced in their sports offerings.

Mr. Bissonnette pointed out that the original committee had made an operating decision to look at AAA status but that the new committee, augmented with faculty and student representation, has not. Mr. Mehl explained that the primary difference between A,AA and AAA are the size and presence and commitment to a football team; theoretically all schools in Div.I compete on the same basis with regard to other sports, specifically the same number of scholarships. Ms. Benson asked about funding for womens' athletics; Mr. Bissonnette responded that, with women's soccer and softball, we will have the right mix for Title 9 requirements. Mr. Mehl stated that if we were to move in the direction of Div. I, there would be the chance to make the intercollegiate grant offerings analogous to the population, a 60-

40 split, a luxury we don't have right now. Can an institution refuse to play us, Mr. Olson asked, if we don't have a competitive team. Mr. Mehl replied that planning process included compiling a list of schools that match our aspirant group from an academic standpoint and then looking at that list for conference opportunities.

In reply to Mr. Schochetman's query about faculty input, Ms. Piskulich, chair of the Senate Planning Review Committee, indicated that the Senate was currently having the opportunity to provide advice. She indicated that a lot of input has already been received and that she's willing to gather more. Mr. Bissonnette added that the committee has met with Student Affairs and the student leadership, residence halls and that an open hearing is planned.

Mr. Brieger reminisced that some years ago he had the idea of a faculty club and became aware of the value of market surveys to determine the feasibility and interest in an idea. Recently the proposal for an ice rink on campus showed there was not enough interest or support. In looking at the need for a bigger presence in the community, more donor dollars and competitive opportunities for our student athletes, and with the fine facility for sports and recreation under construction, he suggested the Committee should consider whether or not there are other routes available to reach these same goals. He proposed a market survey, an in depth analysis which would clearly present the costs and benefits of such a venture.

Mr. Christina wondered about characteristics of the aspirant group and Mr. Macauley replied that the group was selected based on variables that are comparable to OU, adding that the University of Maryland-Baltimore was a good fit. Mr. Liboff remarked that one positive thing that might be accomplished with this move would be an improvement in students' attachment to Oakland. He wondered about intracollegiate sports opportunities and Mr. Macauley answered that there are over 1600 students involved in intramurals. Mr. Mehl told the group that we just hired a new director of campus recreation to bring more balance to intramural athletics. Athletics needs to be more than competitive activities, he noted, and the new recreation/sports center will provide expanded opportunities for intercollegiate, intramural and noncompetitive recreational activities.

Mr. Bricker appreciated the chance to hear about all the investigations and asked for more details about the aspirant group. Mr. Bissonnette replied that a peer group was generated by OU and the aspirant group was selected from that. Mr. Landsberg, when queried about students' response, indicated that students are slightly in favor of the change. Mr. Andrews commented that a recommendation to move to Div.I status would be enhanced by a report citing comparable benefits that other institutions have experienced who have already made the move, a report that would include revenue changes, commitments. The argument has been made that it will help fund raising; he wondered if there is evidence that it worked elsewhere.

Mr. Dillon pointed out that while the move would increase public recognition and be of interest to some students, he is nevertheless skeptical that we could do it without using money from the general fund. What additional dollars could we expect to see; are there any detailed projections concerning the costs and revenues and, if so, could they be made available? In reply, Mr. Bissonnette stated that they are developing realistic projections and that, after the transition, it seems to indicate that it is in our long range interest to switch to Div.I. Mr. Mehl reported out that the NCAA had provided 30 years of financial analysis which provides an excellent snapshot of revenues. Revenue consists of internal (example: ticket sales) and external (example:sale of university memorabilia, novelties) sources. In Div. II we don't have a way to enhance athletics without dipping into the general funds and we have little opportunity to capture outside sources of revenue because our visibility is so low that we are not marketable. Note the prevalence of U of M, MSU and Notre Dame shirts in local stores and try and find an OU one, he challenged. Mr. Downing pointed out that the change could have a positive impact on enrollments and thus generate additional revenue for the general fund. On a similar note, Mr. Macauley

opined that, based on information from his visit to the University of Maryland-Baltimore, the change would enhance student life and lead to more students residing on campus.

Mr. Mehl expressed his pride that Oakland's athletes and staff are tremendous ambassadors for the whole institution, the academic side as well as the athletic. The quality of the individuals involved need to be considered, he argued, and as an example, he cited Pete Hovland, the swimming coach for almost 20 years, who has just brought back three consecutive championships and has the top rated academic swim team in the entire country. Mr Kleckner stated that his brief tenure on this committee has convinced him that this idea is worthy of serious consideration. However, he isn't sure what the answers to the questions are or even whether there is enough time to get the answers to all of the questions that are being raised or to adequately consult with the university community.

As the room emptied, Mr. Connellan called for a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

Back to
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
SENATE
Home Page