



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 10 November 1988
Third Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Abiko, Appleton, Barthel, Beehler, Braun, Brown, Burke, Cass, Champagne, Chipman, Christina, Coffey, Dahlgren, Downing, J. Eberwein, R. Eberwein, Eliezer, Fish, Garcia, Gerulaitis, Grossman, Hartman, Haskell, Herman, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Hough, Jackson, Karasch, Ketchum, Kleckner, Larabell, Lindell, Maschke, Miller, Millwood, Pettengill, Schimmelman, Sevilla, Sherman, L. Stamps, R. Stamps, Stern, Wilson, Witt.
Senators Absent: Bhatt, Cardimen, Frankie, Lauer, Martek, Olson, Pillow, Pine, Reddy, Riley, Rosen, Theisen, Tracy, Tripp, Wedekind, Williamson.

Summary of Actions

1. Minutes of 22 September (Gerulaitis, Pettengill). as corrected. Approved
2. Proposal from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee to revise policies on probation and dismissal (Dahlgren; Chipman). First reading.
3. Report from the Campus Development and Environment Committee on the revised campus master plan (Tucker).

Observing a crowd of people inspecting visual materials at the front of the room or gathered around tables apparently placed at random, Mr. Kleckner called "this raucous meeting" to order at 3:14 p.m. He introduced the session on a happy note with birthday greetings to the senior Senator Stamps (applause). Proceeding to business, he mentioned that the minutes of 20 October had circulated too late for people to be expected to have studied them and therefore proposed that only those of 22 September be officially considered on this occasion. With Ms. Gerulaitis moving approval and Mr. Pettengill seconding her motion, opportunity for discussion presented itself. Mr. Grossman asked that the parliamentary information on page 2 be corrected to indicate that a 3/4 vote of those present rather than a 2/3 vote is required to waive a second reading. The Senate then accepted the September minutes as corrected.

In the absence of old business, new business immediately came to the fore. Mr. Dahlgren, seconded by Mr. Chipman, introduced a motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee to revise university policies on academic probation and dismissal of undergraduates (complete text available on the 11/10/88 agenda, pp. 1-2). He then yielded the floor to Professor Kloosterman, chair of the sponsoring committee. Mr. Kloosterman explained that the proposal is intended to replace three currently operative policies on undergraduate probation and dismissal. These apply differently to students according to the dates when they originally entered Oakland University. Their overlap creates considerable confusion for

advisers as well as for students. Currently, a different GPA is required for every gradation of credit accumulated, and students often err in calculating the necessary equation. The proposal introduces a clear table with only six groupings of credit. It has the additional merit of eliminating some lingering confusion between GPA and API, while clearing up latent effects of N grades and their removal from the grading system.

With the floor open for questions, Mr. Christina wondered why not simply require a straight 2.0 GPA for academic survival. Mr. Kloosterman responded that Oakland, like most colleges, gives new students some time to adjust to their new environment. He noted that this system would operate somewhat more stringently than that now in effect. Ms. Braun worried about deceiving students about their prospects; she pointed out that it is exceedingly difficult to lift a 1.6 record to a 2.0. Mr. Schmidt, speaking for the sponsoring committee, explained that the scale allows for gradual lifting of the GPA as the student continues to make academic progress over several semesters. His census of students from last term indicated that students who were on probation usually succeeded fairly readily, although others fell flat on their faces. Mr. Kloosterman pointed out that this system allows time for counseling students and helping them correct their habits; his committee often refers them to Rhetoric courses that help them with reading, writing, and study skills. When Mr. Barthel inquired whether the university already works with a scale, Mr. Kloosterman reported that we have done so for a long time. The first of them, according to Mr. Hough, was developed by Professor James McKay. Mr. Stamps favored the existence of such a scale because it offered hope to a freshman who encounters initial difficulty upon arrival at college, whether for academic or social reasons, but who--given time--would get his act together; he offered himself as a case in point.

Senators began to display their mathematical powers. Mr. Barthel's computations convinced him that a student would need to secure grades in the 3-point range in order to redeem an early disaster. Mr. Hough responded that the proposed scale had been deliberately set in a way that demands strengthening performance over time. Mr. Downing demonstrated by his calculations that a student who began dismally could not possibly lift his GPA to 2.0 in one semester, even by doing 4.0 work. Without some lead time, then, failure would be inevitable. Mr. Horwitz commended the scale for extending fresh opportunity to new students who might make misguided curricular choices, "let's say engineering." Many such persons switch majors and achieve success in curricula better matched to their talents. Mr. Herman mentioned that students may repeat classes they have failed; doing so can result in a rapid lift of the GPA. Mr. Chipman observed that the Senate is free to look at the whole probation and dismissal policy de novo, should it wish, but reminded his colleagues that we have always worked with some sort of scale. Mr. Kleckner then drew the discussion to a close by explaining that the current array of policies is one of the last vestiges of the old N-grade system of the early 1970s. The number of students affected by it decreases each year. He also noted that the Academic Standing and Honors Committee can still deal specifically with particular cases of students who may be having difficulties. Pointing out that this is a first reading of the motion (contrary to the agenda, which fell into error on that score), he held out hope for further reflection on these issues in December.

Deferring Good and Welfare to the end of the meeting, Mr. Kleckner then moved directly to the next major item of business: a report from the Campus Development and Environment Committee on the [campus master plan](#). He reminded the "old Oaks" in his audience that the Ann Arbor firm of Johnson, Johnson, and Roy (JJ&R) had developed the university's original master plan back in 1972. That company has since been summoned back to update the plan. It has now produced a report, the topic of this special Senate forum. He introduced Alan Miller

and Senator Schimmelman, former chair of the Campus Development and Environment Committee, as authorities on the plan who were present to provide information, then turned over the meeting to Professor Richard Tucker, current chair of that Senate committee.

As befits an historian, Mr. Tucker provided background information. He reported that representatives of JJ&R had engaged in long consultation with people at Oakland over the past year or so, including Ms. Schimmelman and members of her committee. After doing so, they returned to their drawing boards to synthesize ~ Senate Minutes Thursday, 10 November 1988 Page Four materials and develop a plan that gives us their ideas about how to proceed in an orderly and integrated way over the next decade or so. If approved by the Board, this plan will then become the basis for Oakland's physical development in the predictable future. He emphasized that the planners were unconstrained by concerns about funding; there is no guarantee that money will be forthcoming to accomplish the projects the JJ&R people accommodate in their plan. As the slow stages of planning for our hoped-for new science building gradually unfold, we are reminded that construction projects never emerge instantly. Some parts of the draft plan may never come to fruition at all. What we have here, Mr. Tucker explained, is a planning document to which members of this community should refer in making decisions. Its elements cannot possibly be engraved in stone, nor is it reasonable to expect unanimous consent for any of its proposals. Intended as a guide rather than a strait jacket, the plan should ensure us of integrated discussion of future campus development decisions. He reported that the Campus Development and Environment Committee met last month without the drawings later made available to the Senate and with only one copy of the draft report, parts of which were photocopied for members to study. On the basis of such limited evidence, the committee felt satisfied that it is now time for the university to move ahead, accepting this report as satisfactory. He explained that financial problems imposed constraints on the committee's work, since only twelve full copies of the draft report exist on campus.

Turning to the easels on which large drawings of campus areas were displayed and over which overlays of projected roads and buildings could be drawn, Mr. Tucker pointed out several issues that had lately caught his attention. He called special attention to the wetlands preservation area that is protected by Michigan statute and then identified several locations suggested by JJ&R as sites for possible future development. Improved sports and recreation facilities appeared on an overlay as eventual possibilities. In response to a suggestion from Ms. Schimmelman, he then interpreted the color coding of the drawings. Existing academic buildings were shown in dark blue, projected ones in light blue; existing administration and student-services facilities in purple, projected ones in pink; housing in hues of brown; recreation areas in shadings of green; maintenance facilities in black; parking in grays (including projected parking garages). Cultural and public affairs facilities were shown mainly clustered on the east campus.

Acknowledging that the overall aesthetic balance of the campus offered a less tangible area for discussion, Mr. Tucker mentioned an urban clustering of buildings as a possibility for the main (northwest) campus but indicated that a more rural, informal setting might also be preserved. He called attention to a semicircle to the east of the library that planners project as "the commons": this is proposed to remain open, green space (even at the cost of ripping up some of the currently crumbling walkways). An intriguing issue for his committee had turned out to be the currently unpaved access road across campus. Members of the Campus Development and Environment Committee felt aversion to providing more direct cross-university access to the main boulevard soon to be created by Squirrel Road widening (a process that must entail

careful moving of trees currently lining that road). He emphasized that nobody had any intention of paving this access road.

With an open forum then provided for questioning, a student inquired how Oakland could have a road linking its east and west campuses without letting general traffic through. Mr. Miller indicated that the old Wilson farm road had recently undergone improvements. Noting its multiple current uses, he foresaw its eventual function as a gravel road to be used by all service vehicles and some emergency ones. He thought that the gravel surface and slow, cumbersome traffic would discourage most drivers from envisaging it as a thoroughfare. Commuters, he pointed out, could save no time by taking it, nor could they save wear on their cars. People using this road recently have tended to be pleasure-seekers rather than persons in a hurry to get somewhere. Mr. Eberwein later recurred to this issue, expressing concern about a possible peripheral road problem that might make our campus a virtual freeway exit between Adams Rd. and a six-lane Squirrel. President Champagne placed his trust in the university's position. All around our campus, he mentioned, is a "university-image area" that has been designed to discourage traffic from streaming through. He expected that it would remain much easier and more efficient to stay off the campus than to try cutting through it. Such talk prompted Mr. Stern to wonder when Squirrel Rd. construction would be accomplished; he presumed that the road commission's timetable would differ from the university's. Mr. Miller reported that spring 1991 is the projected date of highway widening. Auburn Hills, he stated, regards the intended Squirrel Boulevard as its most important artery. Mr. Champagne added that the ultimate master plan for Oakland County highways envisages Squirrel advancing far north. Mr. Kleckner invited anyone interested to examine the copy of Oakland County's five-year road plan that is on display in his office.

Access to JJ&R drawings turned out to be an issue. Mr. Christina wondered whether senators could get copies of the drawings displayed in the room. Mr. Tucker explained that they had to be returned to Ann Arbor for finishing touch-up work before presentation to the Board. He wondered what plans existed for distributing copies of the plan, once approved. Mr. Miller said there would be a hundred copies for distribution. When Ms. Beehler asked how long the drawings would be here, Mr. Miller replied that no fixed time had been agreed upon; he thought they could remain a week or ten days.

Mr. Kleckner called attention to the plan's provision of spaces for people to congregate. He mentioned the redesigned and expanded library mall, the projected expansion of Wilson Hall, expanded potential residence areas, a small enclosure tucked into the cluster of science buildings, and the creation of setbacks at all entries to distinguish the grounds as a campus. Mr. Ketchum worried, however, that the library would become the most isolated building on campus in terms of parking. His reading of the charts suggested that it would be accessible only to pedestrians and bicyclists. Mr. Miller agreed, noting that the arrangement was an intentional one, designed to preserve green space for people to gather. Mr. Kleckner explained that the plan was to keep vehicular traffic at the edges of the central campus. Mr. Ketchum, unconvinced, judged it a mistake to isolate the university's most important building. This led Mr. Kleckner to suggest that the first new building sited near the library might have to be a parking garage. The space behind the library going toward Varner Hall struck Mr. Ketchum as an appropriate choice for a garage or an underground parking structure. Ms. Schimmelman suggested options beyond the ring road by the Lepley Center, while Mr. Hough proposed a parking structure abutting the library and science building.

Recognizing that a conflict continually arises between the desire to maintain green spaces and the need for accessible parking, Mr. Miller stressed that an overwhelming value maintained by all campus groups involved in planning called for provision of open, green spaces where people could gather. Still, Mr. Tucker responded, nothing precludes building a parking structure. Ms. Schimmelman, however, noted the problem of isolating Varner Hall with a parking lot; she thought a building between the library and Varner more companionable. She pointed out a five-minute-circle walk on one of the drawings and thought it would get anyone quickly to the library. Mr. Champagne later recurred to this discussion, assuring people that the issue of parking lots had received abundant attention over the past year. JJ&R, a firm with ample experience in campus development, had chosen to open out attractive view areas from the main buildings, thereby creating a serene environment conducive to intellectual pursuits. He thought it shortsighted to blacktop the campus for the sake of saving a brief walk.

A related issue arose later, with Mr. Barthel's query about what provisions were being made for handicapper access to the library. He wondered how the interests of persons in wheelchairs would be protected while green spaces were being preserved. Mr. Miller acknowledged that no special provisions had been built into the plan beyond siting of some eventual parking structures. Yet Ms. Garcia reminded people that Oakland enrolls many blind and crippled students for whom five and ten-minute walkways are hardly realistic. Mr. Ketchum added to this a reminder about the effects of time and weather. Planning, he cautioned, should be done with thoughts of the worst possible scenario--such as late winter night returns from the library. He reasoned that the campus master plan should not discourage use of facilities.

Mr. Hough's curiosity focused on the possibility of bicycle and pedestrian paths. His projections of this area "once subdivisionitis has its way" led him to visualize the campus as an attractive alternative routing for its neighbors who live nearby and work in the Tech Park. Mr. Miller pointed out several paths on the JJ&R drawings. When Mr. Hough pursued his question by asking whether these were intended for purposeful trips or for recreation, Mr. Tucker observed that they were only visible on the main campus. It was Mr. Hough's argument that the university, situated in the midst of an enormous growth area, should be hospitable to walkers and bicyclists, whom he defined as "high class traffic." Noting the plan's silence on that point, Mr. Tucker and Mr. Kleckner agreed that the Senate discussion was serving its purpose in helping to generate and sharpen the agenda for further work. Later, Mr. Champagne picked up on this topic, declaring himself in favor of providing walkways in campus beauty areas. Mr. Hough, however, announced himself more concerned about purposeful striding. Would we have bike paths, he asked, for the use of people who work in the Tech Park and prefer not to pedal along a six-lane Squirrel Boulevard? Both Mr. Tucker and Mr. Miller responded that plans for that thoroughfare already call for bicycle paths on either side. Mr. Tucker declared himself interested in looking at possibilities.

Mr. Stamps concluded from the discussion that attempts at widespread consultation on this crucial matter of campus planning had broken down. The Senate debate convinced him that wider airing of such issues as bicycle paths and parking would be needed. Referring to Professor Charlotte Stokes's recent lecture on public art in Oakland County and on our campus, he urged consultation with professionals blessed with a sense of aesthetics. He liked to think in terms of buildings talking to each other, a figure of speech he derived from Ms. Schimmelman's image of companionable structures. Although glad to hear that we can make future changes, if we want, he confessed himself ill at ease to think that the JJ&R draft plan was rapidly being set in concrete. He urged widespread distribution of planning materials and public display of drawings to encourage community responses. Mr. Kleckner replied that what the

university has here is a consultant's report based on discussions with lots of people; it tries to incorporate consensus, even though some dissent on particular points remains inevitable. What our planning consultants heard loud and clear from everyone they met was a concern for preserving the rural nature of the campus. This Senate forum, he noted, offered a chance for people to say whether the plan looks way out of line. If not, then we can still discuss elements of any particular future decision without being locked into this plan. But how, Mr. Christina wondered, can we know exactly what the plan says? How can enough of us study these charts? Following up on these queries, Mr. Stamps asked those present to raise their hands if they had been among those consulted in this process. Only half a dozen hands rose.

Mr. Champagne then expressed his appreciation of the Senate's participation in this forum and explained how matters looked to him. What we have before us, he stated, is a first pass at an intelligent, reasonably designed campus plan that establishes a primary criterion: that the campus must remain distinctively recognizable as a center for learning. Having discovered that Oakland has much less land to work with than many of us thought, he considered it appropriate to affirm the university's commitment to preserving its natural environment. Work with JJ&R had impressed him with the pleasing fact that this institution is still developing and is still in a position to shape its environment. He pointed out the complexity of concerns entailed in the projected siting of new buildings with a view to their basic purposes and their service needs. It pleased him that the proposal was evoking lively discussion.

Another element of that discussion emerged with Mr. Grossman's inquiry about how the plan dealt with the future of the university's child-care center. Mr. Kleckner pointed out that the plan suggests eventual relocation of that facility to an area across Adams Road. Mr. Champagne elaborated on that point, noting that the Lowry Center is currently located on the edge of campus in an area over which the university has little control. Given that child care will become increasingly important to our community, it struck him as prudent that Oakland should reserve substantial land for future development. The site that has been suggested for this purpose is a beautiful one, he noted, and well suited to accommodating a cluster of facilities. Nothing says that a child-care center must go there, however; the plan simply makes a suggestion. This discussion prompted Mr. Stamps to express concern about the traffic impact of any changes in the university's day-care and performing arts activities on the east campus. When Mr. Champagne remarked that the city of Rochester Hills has great control over traffic issues, Mr. Stamps inquired whether the university can still exert some influence.

Another line of thinking was introduced by Ms. Stamps, who had spotted residence halls and apartments on the plans. She asked what plans existed for housing options and who would be eligible for apartments (only married students, graduate students, perhaps some undergraduates?). Mr. Kleckner responded that nobody had begun thinking about such matters. The plan simply says that, if we ever need to build new housing, certain places look like promising sites. Mr. Miller mentioned that the planning premises include a 20-25 year time span and a growing student population. He recognized that the word "apartments" might be misleading.

Mr. Tucker mentioned that some members of his committee felt particular concern about social interaction on campus, especially for students. Although landscaping to promote such possibilities does not appear on the plan, he reasoned that these matters remained open to shaping by those interested in them. He specifically alluded both to Professor Stokes's lecture and to Mr. Appleton's findings some years back about the habits of our commuter students,

who often do their studying in their cars. Mr. Stamps, still interested in the social or aesthetic interactions among buildings, inquired whether there was any sense in the plan of trying to unify buildings at least to the extent of keeping the color of the stripes the same. He confessed to being tempted to spray white paint over the orange stripes on O'Dowd Hall that mark it off from every other building on campus. Mr. Tucker took this deviation as a symptom of a serious issue.

Mr. Sevilla then inquired about planning for a conference-research center that appears on the plan and about possible tie-ins with the Tech Park. Mr. Champagne recurred to earlier aspects of the day's discussion, noting that the plan offers yet another land bank that allows Oakland to develop a tie-in with the Tech Park, should that ever be needed. It would also provide space for possible research development. Assuring his colleagues that there was no possibility that Oakland University would ever give this land away to the Tech Park, he maintained that no discussion about selling any campus land had ever occurred outside the ever-active rumor mill except for whatever might be demanded for highway right-of-way. The Board, he affirmed, fully realizes the critical importance of keeping all our acreage for the university itself. When Mr. Tucker inquired what the label "future growth area" might mean on the plans, Mr. Champagne acknowledged that nobody yet really knows. He expected the university to survive for another century or more and thought it responsible on our part to leave to future generations enough land reserves to develop this campus as needs emerge.

With the witching hour of five rapidly approaching, Mr. Tucker drew the forum to a close by promising to see what could and should be done to shape his committee's discussion the following week. The Campus Development and Environment Committee has scheduled a gathering for Friday, 18 November, at 3 p.m. in Dodge Hall 204. Visitors are welcome. He encouraged full community participation in this matter of considering the revised campus master plan and identified himself as one of the prominent persons on the firing line this year to whom interested parties could turn with questions and problems. Other offices to reach include the president's, the provost's, and Mr. Miller's (Campus Facilities and Operations). Mr. Kleckner pledged to keep the JJ&R drawings available on campus for viewing in the near future and to make the 100 copies of the final printed report widely available. He concluded the discussion by reminding those present that the plan simply offers us suggested guidelines for future growth.

There were two additional information items offered by Mr. Kleckner, both related to the preceding forum. He held out the hope that he would soon be able to report a contract with an architect for the new science building. Planning for that structure should begin sometime soon. Meanwhile, road construction continues near the campus. So far as I 75 is concerned, the provost stated cryptically that "what you see is what you get." University Drive construction should be concluded by winter. Everything else will get worse before it grows better in terms of congestion.

On that cheering note, he welcomed Ms. Braun's motion for adjournment at 5:04 p.m.

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

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page