



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, June 3, 1982
Thirteenth Meeting
28, 129, 130 Oakland Center

MINUTES

Senators Present: Akers, Appleton, Arnold, Boulos, Briggs-Bunting, Brown, Champagne, Christina, Clark, Copenhaver, Coppola, Cowlshaw, Dawson, Downing, Eberwein, Feeman, Gerulaitis, Ghausi, Gregory, Grossman, Hammerle, Hetenyi, Hildebrand, Howes, Ketchum, Kleckner, Mallett, Miller, Otto, Pine, Russell, Scherer, Sevilla, Shallow, Somerville, Stamps, Strauss, Stokes, Sudol, Swartz, Witt.

Senators Absent: Burdick, Chipman, Eklund, Eliezer, Frampton, Gardiner, Heubel, Hightower, Horwitz, Lambric, Lindell, Moeller, Pak, Pino, Rhadigan, Sakai, Schwartz, Stanovich, Tripp, Wilson.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. He called attention to the day's agenda, then being distributed. Work proceeded at once on the first item of old business, the motion calling the President's attention to several issues pertinent to the role and mission statement (Moved, Mr. Miller; Seconded, Ms. Scherer). The Russell/Gregory amendment to delete section c from the main motion carried by voice vote, with no discussion. The Gregory/Briggs-Bunting amendment to delete section e from the main motion proved more controversial. Mr. Miller argued against deletion, preferring to leave the item on the list as a flag to emphasize the importance of the University's making program decisions consistent with available resources. This comment raised a question in Mr. Grossman's mind about the definition of "desirable size;" he wondered whether the term pertained to actual numbers of students or to the proportion between enrollment and resources Mr. Kleckner deduced from the previous day's discussion that the APPC was interested in a program's size in relation to resources. The amendment carried by a vote of seventeen ayes and sixteen nays. The main motion, doubly amended, received unanimous support. It now reads:

MOVED that in developing from the recommendation submitted by the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities a role and mission statement for Oakland University the President take cognizance of the following issues raised during the recent open hearing on the subject conducted by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee:

a. A rhetorical balance should be struck in the discussion of research and scholarship to bring it into balance with the discussion of teaching mission and public service,

- b. the notion of educational leadership might be incorporated into the discussion of the teaching mission and public service responsibilities of the institution,
- c. some remarks on admission standards might be desirable,
- d, a discussion of the nature of the Liberal Arts core of the curriculum is desirable, and
- e. a clarification should be given on the relationship between research-scholarship and the instructional mission of the institution.

Attention turned to the motion from the APPC on general education (Moved, Mr. Coppola; Seconded, Ms. Scherer), which proved much less clear on second reading than it had seemed on the first. Mr. Witt presumed that the professional schools would have no say in defining general education, though Mr. Kleckner saw nothing in the motion to suggest that they wouldn't. Ms. Boulos (seconded by Mr. Akers) proposed an amendment to add the words "with Senate approval" to items d(4) and d(5). She wanted to demonstrate the high importance the Senate accords general education by ensuring as much consistency as possible across the University. Mr. Ghausi immediately objected that there should be no need for the professional schools to keep coming back to the Senate every time they experienced problems in meeting accreditation requirements. Mr. Hetenyi argued, on the basis of grim Senate history, that a University-wide committee had a better chance of success in making specific decisions on courses than plenary sessions of the Senate. Mr. Feeman then inquired about the implementation schedule for initiating the general education system. Mr. Kleckner thought a committee for planning and development would be appointed in the fall and hoped that it could devise a program in time to make the 1983 catalog deadline; he suggested that the Senate could call for a review of the program after a reasonable period of time to look at the committee's work and examine the pattern of exceptions. The amendment was defeated by voice vote.

Ms. Gerulaitis then inquired about the committee described in section c. To whom would it report? How and by whom would it be appointed or elected? Mr. Coppola said the APPC had assumed it would report to the Senate. Ms. Gerulaitis (seconded by Mr. Christina), then offered an amendment to revise section c. to read "that the Senate appoint a University-wide committee to be charged with administering the program in General Education." Mr. Miller wondered why UCUI could not be charged with this job. Ms. Gerulaitis preferred a separate committee, aligning herself with the sentiments of current UCUI members as reported by Mr. Coppola. Mr. Stamps inquired who would appoint the committee if the Senate did not, and Mr. Kleckner acknowledged that the issue was still up in the air. The amendment carried by voice vote.

With attention restored to the main motion, now amended, Mr. Grossman asked if the Senate were actually in the process of passing a University-wide general education requirement that it would not have to review further. That turned out to be the case. Ms. Clark hoped that the committee establishing the eventual program based on this general policy would give serious attention to transfer problems. Mr. Ketchum objected to language which seemed to confuse the charge to consider exceptions with the authority to determine them; he wanted the language to say that the committee was charged with making decisions. Mr. Coppola indicated willingness to add "and approve" to "consider" in d(4) and (5). Mr. Miller agreed that power to approve or

disapprove was certainly intended.

The Senate's role in general education elicited considerable discussion. Mr. Witt wondered what approval mechanism existed beyond the committee, and Mr. Hetenyi pointed out that the Senate always holds the prerogative to over- rule one of its committees. Ms. Gerulaitis thought that Senate-appointed committees always made recommendations to the Senate, although Mr. Kleckner pointed out that some simply report their actions. Mr. Stamps thought the committee would plan a program, bring it to the Senate for general approval, then make specific decisions on implementation. Mr. Coppola said that the APPC had assumed that the committee would bring a general program to the Senate for approval before making specific exceptions although it had not stated this expectation in the motion. Mr. Grossman indicated that he would feel more comfortable with clearer language, whereupon Mr. Copenhaver suggested adding to c. "and to report to the Senate." Mr. Kleckner doubted that such diction would help those who wanted nothing to happen before Senate action. Mr. Copenhaver thought it normal for a governance body to entrust authority to its committees, and Mr. Kleckner acknowledged that such trust sometimes exists. Mr. Stevens, a non-Senator, then suggested adding a new section e.: "The implementation of a University-wide General Education policy shall be subject to Senate approval" (Moved, Ms. Briggs - Bunting; Seconded, Mr. Ghausi).

Mr. Feeman listed the decisions the Senate would be making at this meeting: instituting a University-wide general education policy, mandating a 36-credit requirement, and establishing a committee with a specified charge and particular responsibilities; he wondered what the Senate would review the next time. Mr. Kleckner observed that the motion then before the Senate would approve a general policy; the amendment would allow the Senate to consider the distribution system and pool of courses. The idea of approving or rejecting specific courses worried Mr. Hetenyi, who again cited unfortunate Senate precedent. He wanted the committee to bring a general plan before the Senate for approval but did not want to subject the actual pool of courses to open review. Mr. Witt agreed that he was more concerned about the initial setting of distribution areas than specification of courses. Mr. Kleckner assumed the committee would act accordingly. Mr. Stamps, however, worried that broad terminology could result in unclear definition of distribution areas unless at least a few examples of each category were offered. President Champagne and Ms. Gerulaitis urged that the committee should present a broad framework to the Senate, which could send it back for detail if necessary. Mr. Appleton's memory supported Mr. Hetenyi's as an argument against trying to build a consensus on programmatic details in open meetings. He thought it would be a discouraging process for persons making the effort, and he was willing to bet that no such plan would be implemented in 1983 if actually worked out point by point on the Senate floor. Mr. Christina appealed to the earlier close vote at that day's meeting to demonstrate that the Senate operates by majority rule rather than consensus; he thought the eventual general education program should be able to carry that much support. Mr. Kleckner thought it reasonable to leave some discretion to the committee. The amendment carried by voice vote. Mr. Appleton then inquired whether the committee would bring a detailed package to the Senate or an overall design. Mr. Kleckner saw no need to obligate or constrain the group in any way not specified in the amended motion. The main motion, thus modified, won unanimous approval:

MOVED that the Academic Policy and Planning Committee's recommendations regarding general education found in the CAMP Report be adopted; to wit:

a. That a very high priority be assigned to insure that sufficient resources be made

available to provide a strong component of General Education which would be common to every undergraduate program at Oakland University,

b. that this component constitute at least thirty-six credits of every baccalaureate degree, and

c. that the Senate appoint a University-wide committee to be charged with administering the program in General Education;

(1) The primary responsibility of such a committee will be to approve and maintain a pool of courses that may be used to satisfy the requirement;

(2) it is likely that the initial pool will closely resemble, but will not be restricted to, the current one that exists in the College of Arts and Sciences;

(3) inclusion of courses from the professional schools in this pool is to be encouraged;

(4) those courses offered by the Department of Rhetoric to satisfy the writing proficiency requirement would be part of the pool so that the thirty-six credits could include this work;

(5) only courses approved for the pool could be used to satisfy the requirement, and no courses in the pool would be excluded from a study merely because they are required within the major program.

d. that the following responsibilities would be included in the committee's charge:

(1) To define areas via groups of courses and set distributional requirements over these areas,

(2) to invite and consider approval of additional courses for the pool from the Schools and the College,

(3) to monitor the program and to recommend to the College or appropriate Schools the offering or development of courses needed to strengthen the program,

(4) to consider and approve the exclusion of certain courses in the pool from students of particular programs at the request of the sponsors of that program, and

(5) to consider and approve exceptions for specific programs to the General Education requirements.

e. the implementation of a University-wide General Education policy shall be subject to Senate approval.

The next item of business was the second reading of a motion from the Steering Committee to transmit to the President documentation from the APPC hearings concerning specific CAMP program proposals (Moved, Mr. Akers; Seconded Ms. Boulos). Mr. Stevens reminded the Senate of the tortuous and torturous processes any program must go through to get on the books in the first place; he found it a bit cavalier to consider disestablishing a program without a comparable process. Ms. Briggs- Bunting inquired whether Senate passage of the motion as stated would constitute endorsement of CAMP recommendations and learned from Mr. Kleckner that it would not. She also wondered whether the Senate was simply shuffling papers, but Mr. Russell pointed out that the papers to be forwarded by this motion were actually the first line of defense for threatened programs. Ms. Scherer also confessed qualms about seeming to endorse the CAMP recommendations and thought it silly to transmit to the President papers he already possesses, like any other Senator. President Champagne interpreted the resolution as imposing on him a moral obligation to study carefully papers he has already read. Mr. Grossman pointed out that the Senate has had no chance to hear testimony on the other side; he did not see the CAMP Report itself as the opposition. Mr. Cowlshaw speculated that defeat of the motion might obligate the President to erase material from his memory. Rather than impose such a burden of ignorance, the Senate passed the motion by voice vote:

MOVED that the Senate forward to the President for his consideration the written materials presented to the APPC in conjunction with their conduct of the open hearings on issues related to the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Mission and Priorities.

The final motion concerned implementation of the CAMP Report in accordance with CAMP'S own recommendations for faculty retraining and program review (Moved Mr. Russell; Seconded, Mr. Christina). Mr. Russell introduced discussion by pointing out that, if faculty layoffs are involved in any program phase-outs, the current contract requires further Senate action. President Champagne thought the caution well taken, although he had no intention of violating the contract. Mr. Miller expressed concern about the establishment of a new vice presidency for academic planning and services in section VII, recommendation 13. He wished to record a dissent to the idea of leaving so Important a process to one person and tried to formulate an amendment to require that the new vice president report to the Senate at least once a semester on plans and developments. Mr. Hetenyi suggested editing the amendment in a way that would ensure application of normal governance procedure; Mr. Russell pointed out that the APPC is already charged with ongoing program review and should be automatically involved in such processes as the new vice president would be responsible for implementing.

Mr. Stevens reiterated his call for specific votes by the Senate on program discontinuance analogous to the votes now required for program approval. He and Ms. Briggs-Bunting asserted the Senate's responsibility to deal directly with each phase-out. Mr. Russell noted that the President has not yet said that any program will be closed, and President Champagne said that he had already agreed to the language of recommendation 13 that "Prior to complete phasing out of a program an opportunity for review should be provided, if requested by program faculty." Mr. Grossman commented that the Senate is not now voting yes or no on specific

programs because it lacks information; its constitution, however, accords it the right to recommend on all matters of academic importance. Mr. Russell noted that the procedure used before for closing a program included faculty assemblies and the Senate, and he expected that precedent to hold good. Mr. Stamps did not feel that the Senate was now approving or rejecting any phase-out nor that it could do so without budgetary information. Mr. Stevens had had the impression that the APPC hearings and current Senate resolutions sidestepped normal governance processes and that this week's deliberations represented the limit of Senate consultation. Mr. Russell pointed out that the AAUP as well as the Senate would have a role in any phase-outs involving faculty layoffs, although Mr. Ketchum warned that a new contract could introduce changes. He urged the Senate to pass language ensuring its involvement.

To reassure concerned Senators, Mr. Christina then offered an amendment to add to the main motion the sentence "Prior to initiating the complete phasing out of a program Senate review of the program is to be sought" (seconded, Ms. Briggs-Bunting). Mr. Russell asked what would happen if the Senate should refuse to approve a phase-out. President Champagne asserted that he could still make his own recommendation to the Board, as Senate actions are advisory to him, not binding. He preferred revising the sentence in recommendation 13 to read "Prior to the complete phasing out of a program opportunity for review by the Senate should be provided," deleting the necessity for faculty request and avoiding the ambiguous word "approval." Mr. Russell suggested adding the phrase "by the President" after "sought." Mr. Feeman wondered about the word "complete," uncertain whether it would cover temporary cessation of admissions to a program. Mr. Hetenyi felt uncomfortable with undue specificity for fear of visiting legal entanglements upon the University.

Mr. Christina then modified his amendment to read: "Prior to initiating the phasing out of a program. Senate review of the program is to be sought." Mr. Shallow thought the legislation useless. Mr. Grossman wanted to know whether there would be a yes/no vote on specific programs and learned that there might be. Mr. Stamps inquired what programs were involved and was told by Mr. Christina that the motion as a whole refers only to CAMP recommendations and need not set a broad precedent. He thought the amendment redundant but hoped it would make his colleagues more comfortable. Mr. Russell asked whether it was clear that no such initiations of phase-outs had yet taken place. Neither President Champagne nor Provost Kleckner had yet seen such proposals cross their desks, nor did any dean report a sighting. They assured Mr. Cowlshaw that the CAMP Report represented no such initiation. Mr. Cowlshaw then noted that the wording is all subject to the word "request" and forces nothing on the President. The amendment 'carried by voice vote, as did the main motion thus amended:

MOVED that the Senate request the President when considering CAMP recommendations concerning program reductions and/or eliminations to follow the appropriate general recommendations of the CAMP Report?specifically the recommendations in Section VII, subsections 4 and 13. Prior to initiating the phasing-out of a program. Senate review of the program is to be sought.

No new business and no private resolutions for the general good were presented. By way of information, the presiding officer reported that the role and mission statement would soon be revised in light of Senate discussion. As it will influence budgetary decisions, the President would welcome Senate approval of the perfected statement before the budget is officially adopted in mid-summer. The President and Provost thought it possible to come back to the Senate in July with the role and mission statement and therefore requested the body not to adjourn at the end of the day's session but rather to recess until July 7 and 8. A show of hands requested by Mr. Strauss -revealed a clear majority of Senators available for consultation at that time.

President Champagne then offered recent budgetary news to the effect that the Senate expected to adopt its state budget in the near future, recommending for higher education the '82 budget as diminished by this year's three budget cuts. The House and Governor have yet to present their budgets, and the appropriations bill is unlikely to be signed until September or October. It is not expected to equal last year's original appropriation. A special supplementary legislative measure likely to be introduced by Mr. Jacobetti, however, would require restoration of the eighty-million-dollar cut. Mr. De Carlo deserves credit for his work in promoting this measure. When Mr. Gregory asked if there were any information available on the state's problems with the September bond flotation, President Champagne cited mixed views around the state. By general agreement, the Senate recessed, sine die, at 4:32 p.m.

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

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