



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

19 October 2006

Minutes

Members present: Andersen, Berven (D), Berven (K), Clark, Deng, Downing, Eberly, Eberwein, Eis, Frick (represented by Bhushan Bhatt), Goslin, Graves, Grossman, Hamilton, Haskell, Ingram, Klemanski, Lee, LeMarbe, Lepkowski, MacDonald, Miller, Mittelstaedt, Moudgil, O? Mahony, Osthau, Otto, Reger, Russell, Schweitzer, Shablin, Stein, Townsend, Tracey, Voelck, Wendell, Williams, Wood

Members absent: Blackburn, Dillon, Fink, Giblin, Goldberg, Hightower, Khattree, Latcha, Lilliston, Magnan, Mili, Polis, Sevilla, Silberman, Sudol, Thompson, Twardy

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Items:

- Budget Update?Mr. Russi
- Joan Rosen Writing Studio?Ms. Robertson
- Scheduling Task Force Update?Mr. Stewart
- Calendar Update?Mr. Downing, Mr. Shablin
- 2. Approval of Minutes of 21 September. (Mr. Downing, Ms. Mittelstaedt)
- 3. Motion to approve changes in membership of Academic Conduct Committee. (Ms. Stein, Ms. Williams). Second reading. Approved.
- 4. Motion to approve changes in the membership of the Athletics Committee. (Mr. Lepkowski, Ms. Stein). First reading.
- 5. Motion to staff Senate standing committees. (Ms. Andersen, Ms. Wood). Approved.

Calling the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m., Mr. Moudgil invited President Russi to present the annual [budget update](#) to the Senate. Taking the podium, Mr. Russi remarked that he would provide a snapshot of the state budget and its specific impact on Academic Affairs. Beginning with a grim overall unemployment forecast in Michigan, he noted that the economy will not solve the budget situation in the State. Priority funding has been directed to community health and corrections, with higher education coming in third. Making the case in Lansing for higher education is occurring amid a competitive environment among the fifteen public institutions. Increasing tuition and fees is a controversial strategy among elected officials, not only in the state government, but also at the federal level. He remarked that the expression of support for the value of higher education by elected officials has not always translated into funding.

Mr. Russi presented a chart comparing the sources of general fund revenues in 1992, 2002 and (projected) 2007. Sources of revenue from tuition totaled 41% in 1992; this year the figure is

projected at 67%. State appropriations for the same years: 56% in 1992, 31% in 2007. The increased dependence on student tuition is a major issue, and the competition for state dollars is intense. Oakland has been positioned relatively favorably among Michigan institutions, but this has been achieved with much hard work and advocacy.

In terms of support for Academic Affairs, Mr. Russi noted that the top priority is, and has always been, support for faculty. He pointed out that 63 new and replacement faculty positions have been approved for 2007. Referring to a budget allocation chart, faculty positions have indeed assumed the lion's share of the funds, followed by the Macomb University Center, General Education Support, Advising, and so forth. He also highlighted support for the new Writing Center, established with the generous gift of Professor Emerita Joan Rosen and her husband.

Next, Mr. Russi reported on three areas of support for academic programs: research support (including an increased share of indirect cost recovery); budget incentives to support future enrollment growth (on- and off-campus incentives and student course fees); and the capital campaign (now in its first year of a public phase, and reaching a level of 70 million dollars). Lastly, Mr. addressed the overall picture of budget reductions and cost containments between FY2003-2006. He noted that this is an extremely important aspect of the budget, as it reflects Oakland's commitment to responsible financial stewardship.

At the conclusion of Mr. Russi's presentation, Mr. Russell asked about Proposition 5. Mr. Russi responded that in his view most policymakers do not support it, and that in his own opinion the goal should be to get away from year-to-year funding but that producing a fixed formula is not the solution.

Without further questions, Mr. Moudgil thanked Mr. Russi for sharing the budget update with the Senate and moved on to the second informational item. Ms. Jeannie Robertson was invited to present information on the newly established Joan Rosen Writing Studio in the Writing Center. Ms. Robertson began by noting that the Writing Center was launched with funding from the Mitzelfeld and Rosen families. Now in a permanent site at Kresge Library, the center offers an array of services for students from all disciplines and schools by trained peer-tutors and writing consultants. Advice for writing rationales and admission statements for students applying for graduate and professional schools, as well as grant-writing advice for faculty is now available. Ms. Robertson distributed brochures detailing the available services, and encouraged all faculty to incorporate the writing center in their courses. She also extended an invitation to the dedication of the writing center, when a commissioned mural by studio art major Casey Conlon will be unveiled.

Mr. Moudgil thanked Ms. Robertson for the update and for her leadership in the center. He then invited Mr. Stewart to give the Senate a status report from the Task Force on Classroom Usage and Scheduling. Mr. Stewart summarized the work of the Task Force, noting its charge, background issues, findings and plans. According to Mr. Stewart, enrollment growth has reached a point where the limitations of classroom resources are readily recognized. Resource management is necessary now more than ever. He remarked that the major academic units differ tremendously in how and when they utilize the current modules for classes, and that many units appear to under-utilize early morning or evening classes while others use these modules regularly. Moreover, our current capacity to track classroom usage is limited. Mr. Stewart identified three alternative plans for scheduling classes that the Task Force is

considering, and will explore the potential benefits and costs associated with each. A final report from the Task Force will be submitted to the Senate Steering Committee in December.

Mr. Moudgil lauded the thorough work of the Task Force, and thanked Mr. Stewart for his informative report. The final informational item was presented by Messrs. Downing and Shablin. Mr. Downing noted that the university calendar could now be generated several years in advance, which is information that our students and colleagues in Student Affairs have been seeking for quite some time. Mr. Shablin presented a draft calendar for the next three years. He commented on a few features of the calendar, including the start date of the term and exam period. In addition, a 16-week spring/summer term will be implemented, allowing students to take advantage of financial aid options.

Mr. Grossman asked whether the timing of December commencement -- on the last day of exams -- would have an impact on students. Mr. Shablin responded that it would have minimal effect given the small number of Saturday classes.

The secretary then proceeded with the roll call. A motion to approve the [minutes](#) from the September meeting was put forth by Mr. Downing and duly seconded by Ms. Mittelstaedt. The minutes were approved without correction.

Old Business

Turning next to old business, Ms. Stein made the motion from the Steering Committee to approved changes in the membership of the Academic Conduct Committee.

MOVED that the membership of the Academic Conduct Committee consist of the following:

Fifteen faculty members, of whom one shall be chairperson; four students and two alternates; and the Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee), who shall be *ex-officio* and voting.

Without discussion or comment, the Senate voted to approve the motion.

New Business

Mr. Lepkowski's motion to approve changes in the membership of the Athletics Committee was duly seconded by Ms. Stein.

MOVED that the membership of the Athletics Committee consist of the following:

Four faculty, two students, one staff member, one member of the Professional Advisors Committee, one external community member, serving three-year terms; the Faculty Athletics Representative, who shall serve as chair; and the Athletics Director, *ex-officio*.

Ms. Wood inquired about the process of choosing the external community member. Mr. Stewart replied that the person selected for that role is an individual of high integrity concerned with academic issues.

Mr. Grossman offered a friendly amendment to add ?non-voting? to the role of Athletics Director, and to amend the spelling of ?adviser.?

The final item of new business involved staffing Senate standing committees (Ms. Andersen, Ms. Wood.)

MOVED that the persons listed below be appointed to the committee designated:

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE--
Carolyn O'Mahony (SEHS) 2006-2007

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT COMMITTEE--
Peg Royteck (SEHS) 2006-2009

Good and Welfare

Mr. Grossman, noting an article that appeared in the *Oakland Press*, asked about the possibility of a university football team. Mr. Stewart brought up the issue of Title IX, which would require six additional women's teams and two fewer men's teams in order to establish a football team. Given that scenario, Mr. Stewart's view is that the possibility of a football team is virtually nonexistent.

Mr. Lepkowski's motion to adjourn was met with general approval at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi
Secretary to the University Senate

posted 1/18/07

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