

Oakland University Senate

Third Meeting
December 10, 1998

Minutes

Members present: Abraham, Alber, K. Andrews, S. Andrews, Bello-Ogunu, Benson, Berger, Bertocci, Blume, Boddy, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Dillon, Downing, Eberwein, Grossman, Halsted, Hildebrand, Hovanesian, Keane, Kleckner, Landau, Liboff, Long, Mabee, Macauley, McNair, Mitchell, Moore, Moran, Moudgil, Mukherji, Olson, Otto, Pettengill, Polis, Riley, R. Schwartz, Sen, Speer, Wood

Members absent: Blanks, Connellan, David, Doane, Ganesan, Gardner, Herman, Jarski, Johnson, Lilliston, Ott, Reynolds, Rozek, H. Schwartz, Sieloff, Simon, Sudol, Zingo

Summary of actions:

1. Approval of the minutes of October 15, 1998 (Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Polis)
2. Information items
 - a. Report on enrollments
 - b. Charter Schools update
 - c. Golf Course update
 - Motion to stop work on golf course (Ms. Wood, Ms. Buffard-O'Shea) Approved following approval of a motion to waive second reading (Mr. Riley, Mr. Pettengill)
 - d. Board of Trustees update
3. Motion to staff Senate standing committees (Mr. Andrews, Mr. Brieger) Approved.
4. Motion to establish a policy for awarding financial aid to home-schooled students (Mr. Grossman, Mr. Moran) First reading. Motion to amend the policy to include the ACT test (Mr. Dillon, Mr. Brieger)
5. Motion asking Senate concurrence with a College of Arts and Sciences resolution relating to faculty hiring procedures (Mr. Macauley, Mr. Andrews) First reading.
6. Resolution relating to classroom disruptions. (Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Bello-Oguno) Approved.
7. Resolution that the Senate advise the Board of Trustees that the Administration did not consult with the Senate or its committees regarding development of the second golf course. (Mr. Riley, Mr. Andrews) Approved following approval of a motion to waive the second reading (Mr. Grossman, Ms. Wood)

Mr. Downing convened the third meeting of the Oakland University Senate at 3:15 and called for a motion to approve the [October 15th minutes](#). Ms. Eberwein so moved, Mr. Polis seconded and the minutes were approved as distributed.

Enrollment

Turning to information items, Mr. Downing reported briefly on [fall enrollments](#). The overall headcount of 14,289 students is down slightly from where we were in 1997 with undergraduates accounting for 11,111, graduates 3178. FYES figures which drive the budget and state appropriations are up 1% to 4626. Undergraduate FYES numbers (3919) are up 1.1% while the graduate figures (707) are flat. Graduate students now account for 22% of the headcount compared to 20% in 1993. On campus students taking only one course dropped 9%; these students are being contacted to find out why they didn't return this fall. The number of full time students increased at all undergraduate levels and the average number of credits

taken increased from 10.7 to 10.9 which reverses a trend. The average ACT score went up to 20.8. Mr. Shablin, the Registrar, added that winter enrollments are even with last year, that 10,771 have already enrolled and that there are still a number of opportunities for students to register which should increase that number. Mr. Downing noted that the decrease in enrollments meant that the overall budget had to be reworked based on 10,550 FYES rather than the expected 10,623. That process is basically complete and budgets will be released to units before the end of the semester. Units which exceed their enrollment projections will be allocated some of the additional funds resulting from the added tuition.

Charter Schools

Ms. Pickard presented a brief update relating to charter schools and noted copies of the complete report are available if anyone would like one. She highlighted budget figures which indicate that, after three years of running in the red, the program is now in the black and that the \$150,693 profit is more than enough to cover the previous years' losses. The goal for this year is to assess the effect and impact of the charter schools, to look closely at the schools, their operations, curriculum and educational practices to ensure that they meet state, federal and OU's standards. Mr. Liboff asked if any of the profit will be used to add staff for monitoring the schools and program. Ms. Pickard replied that there are no plans to add staff, that the priority is to assess where we are. In reply to Mr. Polis's query, Ms. Pickard stated that there are around 2700 students currently enrolled in the 7 charter schools. Mr. Keane pointed out that the University gets 3% of the amount allocated by the state for each student. Mr. Bertocci asked whether we've lost any charter schools and Ms. Pickard answered that the Board has rescinded the charter for the Turtle Island School. How many OU faculty and students are involved in the charters, wondered Mr. Dillon. Not many, replied Ms. Pickard, adding that they would be looking into that as part of their assessment. Mr. Garfinkle asked about the curriculum standards and Ms. Pickard responded that the schools are responsible for their own governance and curriculum but that they must meet the minimum public school standards established by the state. Mr. Downing added that the Public School Academy Application Review Committee reviews and monitors the curriculum and organization of each charter school. One of the reasons the Turtle Island charter was revoked was because OU was not satisfied that they were meeting the academic requirements they had originally specified in their application. In reply to Mr. Andrew's query about the timetable for the assessment and how long the moratorium on new charters would last, Ms. Pickard stated that the assessment process is scheduled for 1998-99 and that OU would be looking at new applications sometime in the future without specifying exactly when new charters might be considered. [Updated financial figures and additional information from the 1998 Public School Academy Annual report is available at: <http://www.oakland.edu/senate/psa98.html>]

Harking back to the enrollment report, Mr. Liboff commented on the budget process and the incentive plan mentioned earlier and the idea that more students in an academic unit would result in additional monies for that unit. He called attention to the *Oakland Post* article about the underfunding of supplies and services budgets and stated that a budget review should look at that. Mr. Downing responded that the administration is aware of the issue and that he has discussed position allocations and S & S budgets with the President. Plans are to increase the Academic Affairs allocation in 1999-2000 by \$1.2 million, with \$234,000 of it for supplies and services, \$250,000 to cover part-time faculty expenditures and the rest for faculty positions and searches and other needs. Mr. Downing and Ms. Schaefer are working on figuring out how much can be added to the base this year and how much next year. He added that the incentive program is incremental to that.

Golf Course

Turning to the next information item, Mr. Downing provided an update of what has occurred since the Board of Trustees meeting. The university administration is working with the biology faculty, the Golf Course manager, and the golf course architect to develop alternative routes to preserve the research areas. Mr. Gamboa reported that the architect brought three options to them, one of which looked feasible. He added that they spent some time in the field and pointed out to the architect two alternatives that would move the holes farther from the research areas. With regard to the concerns expressed about the use of pesticides and other chemicals, Mr. Downing noted that OU faculty and golf course staff members have been in touch with Michigan State University regarding minimal impact use of chemical agents.

Mr. Brieger, chair of the Campus Development and Environment Committee, reported that the committee is involved in the discussions, albeit in an *ex post facto* mode. In the spirit of its charge, the CDEC will conduct a review of the proposed golf course and hopes to have a completed report ready by the next Senate meeting. Mr. Garfinkle asked why not have all construction stop until the report is completed. The Committee doesn't have that kind of power, Mr. Brieger replied; we are not in a position to stop anybody. Mr. Downing emphasized that no construction will take place on the west side of campus until all concerns about the research and academic areas have been addressed. Since the CDEC is going ahead with its investigation, why can't the Committee recommend to the Board that construction cease, wondered Mr. Riley. Mr. Brieger pointed out that the Senate can do that in any case, with or without a report. Mr. Moran noted that the financial and academic implications should be reviewed by the Senate Budget and Planning committees and Mr. Brieger agreed although he noted that CDEC tends to take a broad view of its charge.

The chair of the Senate Planning Review Committee, Mr. Dillon, reported that they have been gathering information and have distributed a [memo](#) to the Senate in which they express concern over the impact this new development will have on academic endeavors on campus. Mr. Downing noted that they are clearly moving in the direction of solving the academic concerns which is why there will be no construction in that area for awhile. Mr. Liboff pointed out that while a lot of attention is being given to the biology faculty, there is also the Kettering Magnetic Laboratory in the area which is an academic concern of the physics faculty. Mr. Downing stated that it is his understanding that the cart paths on the original plan were far enough away from the lab and that as new plans are developed, they will have to make sure that an adequate distance is maintained. Mr. Brieger indicated that his committee will be contacting all the academic units that have an interest in the area for their comments. Mr. Moran stated that the Senate Steering Committee should ask the Senate Budget Review Committee to investigate the economic and financial implications of the new golf course.

Ms. Pigott reported that she had contacted the Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality concerning an Environmental Impact Statement and was told there was none on file. She asked if there is such a statement, particularly because of the wetlands in the area. Ms. Schaefer responded that the developer is responsible for obtaining all the permits and that what is required is a wetlands permit (ours says that we are planning on three wetland crossings) and that has been filed with the DEQ. Mr. Rogers, director and manager of the Katke Golf Course, reported that the consultant hired to help us with this project expressed the opinion that he had never seen a project that had as little impact on the environment as does this one and that getting state approval would not be a problem. Ms. Pigott pointed out that normally construction can't be started until all permits have been obtained and that there should be an environmental impact statement. Ms. Schaefer stated that there is no requirement for an

environmental impact statement and that no work will be done in the wetlands areas until the permits are approved. Mr. Downing reported that a copy of the consultant's report on the wetlands is available in the permit application form. Mr. Rogers emphasized that the golf course will have a very minimal impact on the land involved.

Ms. Eberwein found herself heartened by what she's heard and the actions planned by the committees but pointed out that it is all *ex post facto*, that a decision was made without Senate consultation. In thinking back to previous Senate debates, she is struck by how much our aspirations have dealt with the abundance of land and is concerned as land is taken up by projects unrelated to the academic mission of the university instead of projects that would bring academic luster to the institution.. A round of applause followed her statement that it is not just a fiscal decision but an academic one and that the Senate should have had a role in the decision to convert this land to a golf course. Mr. Downing responded that the new plans being considered by the Board of Trustees has Senate consultation built into the process. Ms. Schaefer reported that the Master Plan is in need of updating and that a comprehensive planning process will begin in January to look at the Plan. She assured the Senate that the consultative process will be as broad as it can be. Ms. Berger pointed out that shared governance is not sharing power or a democracy but a way to bring all issues relating to the mission of the institution to those who have a vested interest in it. She quoted from the Webster's dictionary which lists as obsolete a definition of the word "consult" which includes the words, 'to mediate, plan or contrive' and hoped that we are not using that definition of the word. Mr. Downing agreed that broad consultation is necessary but made the point that the decision was made last June and that now we can only go forward and ensure that the concerns expressed are addressed.

Mr. Riley noted that the footprint of the golf course is much larger than any other project on campus and thus the impact on the environment is correspondingly greater. If the intent of the Board is to consult, he stated that there is nothing to stop the Board from going back and reconsidering their decision other than money and argued that if they are serious about consulting, they would reconsider. Ms. Wood then moved that the Senate declare a moratorium on all construction until all committees made their reports. She reworded it to:

MOVED that the Senate demand that all work, including chopping down trees, on the golf course cease until the appropriate committees have made their reports to the Senate.

Ms. Buffard-O'Shea seconded. Mr. Downing turned to Mr. Andrews, the parliamentarian, who stated that ordinary motions are not covered by the Senate constitution; substantive motions are and require two readings. Mr. Downing ruled it a substantive motion requiring two readings. Ms. Eberwein expressed her inclination to support the motion but wondered how long it would take for the committees to complete their reports. The SPRC chair, Mr. Dillon, stated that their report is completed and was distributed earlier in today's meeting. Mr. Moran, incoming chair of SBRC, stated that they could probably have their report ready in January if they got the information in time. Mr. Liboff commented that perhaps Senate Planning should look at the overall academic impact of the golf courses. Mr. Downing again pointed out that the contracts have been signed. Mr. Moran said that while he is not sanguine about the ability of this body to stop the construction, we nevertheless need to insist that we have a say in these decisions.

In reply to Mr. Grossman's query about who could give the order to stop construction, Ms. Schaefer stated that it would be the OU Foundation. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea asked what will happen if this motion is approved. Mr. Downing responded that the Senate motion will be forwarded to all appropriate bodies. Ms. S. Andrews asked how much construction could actually occur in the winter and added that he applauds the Senate for making this motion and taking a stand. With regard to construction Mr. Downing stated that they can work in all but the worst weather. Mr. Andrews pointed out that this is not the first time the Senate has dealt with the issue of the use of the South Campus and quoted from an April 1990 Senate resolution. He opined that it is important that the Senate not let this moment pass without taking some action. In the minutes of that April meeting the Provost of the day stated that nothing would be built without discussion and input. This project is under the auspices of the OU Foundation, Mr. Disend emphasized, and he thought it unlikely that they would halt the project.

Ms. Benson spoke in favor of the motion, adding she is also concerned about proposals to widen Adams Road and the impact that would have on the faculty subdivision and the golf course and on parking and access to campus. Ms. Schaefer reported that there is currently no plan to widen Adams that is acceptable to Oakland and that, as a state institution, Rochester Hills has to work with us to find an acceptable solution. There is a 60 foot clearance on the golf course side of Adams which should accommodate the widening of the road. She also reassured the group that the University will work with the subdivision to ensure that their needs are met. The director of the Lowry Center spoke next, commenting that more information is needed and reported that a number of the trees next to the soccer field are tagged and it is not clear what is going to happen to them.

Turning to budget matters, Mr. Liboff asked how much interest has been paid on the loan for the golf course development. Ms. Schaefer answered that there is no loan, that the financing is through the Economic Development Authority which issued bonds and we are paying interest on the bonds which have been sold to private bondholders. The interest is to be paid over 25 years. So, if everything stopped now we would have to repay the bondholders, queried Mr. Liboff. Yes, replied Ms. Schaefer, noting that the costs would also include the finance charges and interest already paid. Mr. Riley moved, seconded by Mr. Pettengill, that the second reading be waived and the Senate approved the motion to waive by the required 3/4 majority. The discussion continued.

In reply to Ms. Speer's question about the positive aspects of the proposed development, Mr. Disend explained that the motivation behind this is to produce new revenue for the University. Currently President's Club members pay a certain amount over a fixed period of time and many will soon be completing their commitment and so revenue will fall. The construction of a new golf course will permit a restructuring of the President's Club and access will be tied to a continuing commitment of dollars. He estimated that an additional million dollars will be raised annually from the new course. Ms. Speer then asked what happens to the money and Mr. Disend explained that those funds that are designated for specific units go to those units and the remaining unrestricted funds go to the institution. In reply to her query about Foundation grants, Mr. Disend listed the Honors College, the Animal Care Facility and the renovation of the Admissions Office as projects that have been supported by Foundation funding. Has the money ever been used directly for research or educational purposes, inquired Ms. Buffard-O'Shea. Yes, replied Mr. Downing and cited the acquisition of a DNA sequencer as an example. Ms. Buffard-O'Shea asked what percent is used for instruction and research and Mr. Downing estimated that it is around 50%.

Mr. Moran averred that the problem with the golf course is that it represents a short-sighted idea of how to raise money for the institution. He asked about the discrepancy between Mr. Disend's statement that Sharf gave money for the golf course and the *Oakland Post* article in which Mr. Sharf said he was asked to give the money specifically for a golf course. Mr. Disend responded that Mr. Scharf was given a list of projects that needed funding and that the golf course was not on that list. Asking for clarification of the revenue raising aspects of the new course, Mr. Andrews asked if previous President Club members would have access to it. Yes, indicated Mr. Disend, as long as they pay \$5000 up front and the \$1000 per year. How does this compare with fees at other courses wondered Mr. Andrews. Mr. Rogers stated that one can't draw comparisons between country club or private courses. OU's course is operated as a public course open to a limited group of people. Players choose to play here as a way of both supporting the institution and getting pleasure out of the play. Other schools use their football teams to get outside support of their institution; OU's golf course is a way to get community involvement in and support for the university.

Mr. Polis pointed out that the Board of Trustees basically has said that they are going ahead with the golf course after hearing a number of people speak out against it and asked shouldn't we be spending our time looking at the problem of consultation. Ms. Wood responded that the people who spoke at the Board meeting were speaking as individuals; this motion is coming from the University Senate. While she doesn't know if the motion will get the Board's attention she stated she is really concerned about the dangers to the ecosystem and feels the Senate should take a stand. Mr. Garfinkle commented that a consultation process is in place and is not being adhered to; the Senate should have been consulted and this motion makes that point. Ms. Berger added that this is only one of a series of *fait accomplis* and that we mustn't let this one go by without comment, that we must make a statement. Ms. Buffard O'Shea opined that it is a good idea to tell the Board of Trustees that the Senate is unhappy with their decisions and process, that we are concerned about the lack of consultation. A vote was then taken on the motion which was approved.

Mr. Downing stated that he will forward this motion to President Russi and Russi will send it to Board of Trustees and OU Foundation. He noted that the information item update on the Board of Trustees has already been covered by the previous discussion. Before moving on to new business, Mr. Andrews brought up another item of concern, namely the recent Board discussions about how the university should grow and other projects and asked about the participation of the university governance processes in the development of new proposals. Mr. Downing stated that it is the intent of the Board to consult with appropriate bodies prior to Board action.

New Business: Senate standing committees

Having completed the information items, the Senate turned its attention to three items of new business. The first, a motion to staff Senate standing committees was moved by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Ms. Berger. Mr. Andrews called attention to a change from the printed agenda and informed the Senate that Mr. Gamboa was being nominated for the Campus Development and Environment Committee rather than Ms. Savage. Ms. Eberwein, noting that the Research Committee has yet another vacancy, asked in which area and was told the vacancy was created by the departure of a Health Sciences individual. With no further discussion the motion was approved.

New Business: Financial Aid for Home-Schooled Students

Mr. Grossman moved the next item of business, a motion from the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee to establish a policy for financial aid assistance for home-schooled students; Mr. Moran provided the second. Ms. Theisen, chair of the Committee, provided some historical background, stating that last year the Senate Steering Committee had recommended that a motion dealing with admissions and financial aid for home-schooled students be separated into two separate motions. The admissions policy was approved last year and now the Committee is bringing forth this policy so that home-schooled students can apply for financial aid. Although it will probably affect only a handful of students initially, Ms. Ariza, Director of Admissions, expects the number of home-schooled applicants to grow. Ms. Theisen stated that students can qualify for financial aid if they have a high school diploma or GED or by taking specified standardized tests and of those standardized tests, they have selected the ASSET test as the one best suited for Oakland's students. Mr. Anderson, Director of Financial Aid, explained that their research indicated that the ASSET test was the most used and most general, that it is offered by all the community colleges. He added that very recent changes in the federal regulations have added another option, that is, achieving certain scores on the ACT.

Mr. Garfinkle asked how difficult it is for these students to get a GED. Ms. Theisen replied that it isn't hard but that it is not a requirement of admission to OU. Ms. Berger asked why they couldn't take the ACT and Ms. Theisen replied that they can and that is why they will propose an amendment to the motion. Mr. Downing noted that the ACT is not required for admission to OU. Home schooled students can take the ACT or get a GED or take the ASSET test to determine if they qualify for financial aid, stated Ms. Theisen. A friendly amendment was proposed which would add the ACT as an option; this was accepted by Mr. Grossman but not by the seconder, Mr. Moran. Mr. Dillon then moved and Mr. Brieger seconded a motion to amend the proposal as follows:

Home schooled students without a GED who wish to apply for financial aid will be required to take one of the following two tests and obtain passing scores (as defined in the federal regulations) in order to demonstrate the "ability to benefit" condition necessary for any federal and state financial assistance:

1. the ASSET Program: Basic Skills Tests (Reading, Writing, and Numerical
2. the American College Testing Service (ACT) Test

In reply to Mr. Grossman's question about passing ACT scores, Ms. Theisen reported that they are 14 for English, 15 for Math. Ms. Eberwein asked why we need Senate legislation on this; why not just let them go with the federal regulations. Ms. Theisen responded that this proposal was based on information from our feeder schools and what they offer. Since the ASSET is used the most and is the most comprehensive, the Committee felt it would best meet OU's needs.

New Business: College Assembly resolution

Attention then turned to the next item of business, a motion from the College asking Senate concurrence with a College Assembly resolution asking for amendments to the Faculty Hiring Procedures. The motion was moved by Mr. Macauley and seconded by Mr. Andrews. Mr. Landau opened the discussion by asking if there is a procedure in place if a department feels the administration is violating this policy (assuming the changes are approved) by making an implicit or explicit *a priori* expectation regarding the candidates. Mr. Macauley replied that it

would be a separate issue but Mr. Bertocci pointed out that it wouldn't happen if this change is approved. Mr. Moran thought that the same enforcement process would apply as would happen anytime there is a potential legal problem when appropriate procedures are not followed. Mr. Downing noted that the motion includes recommendations to both the President and the Board. He pointed out that the Board deals with policies and that, since this is procedural, a recommendation to the President would suffice. Ms. Otto asked for clarification: that a search could not be stopped if a pool of candidates did not have a specific ethnic group or gender represented but a search could be stopped if there is evidence that recruiting hasn't been wide spread enough. Mr. Bertocci replied yes, that was correct. Ms. Abraham, from the Office of Diversity and Compliance, commented that the Strategic Policy initiatives include goals for the institution that include diversity and that the institution needs to find ways to achieve a diverse work force. Ms. Eberwein pointed out that the concerns were about *a priori* expectations and not an attempt to guard against enhancing the diversity on campus. Mr. Bertocci stated that when a unit was recruiting last year, the expectation was expressed that all searches must have one person of color. He added that he agreed with the Strategic Plan, that the university should try to increase diversity on campus; that hiring units should engage in vigorous and wide ranging searches for new hires.

Mr. Bello-Ogunu inquired if there is a way of determining if a department has indeed made an sincere effort to recruit from a diverse pool of candidates. Mr. Macauley replied yes, that section B includes a description of the search plan plus there is administrative observation of the searches to ensure that the plan as approved was followed. Ms. Otto concurred, stating that the recruiting process is normally well documented. Ms. Abraham noted that applicants are asked to voluntarily provide information on their backgrounds and those statistics give us some idea of how successful we have been in creating a diverse pool. Mr. Bertocci explained that the problem seemed not to be the process but rather the fact that the results did not meet the diversity expectations. Regarding Ms. Eberwein's concern about prior notification, Mr. Bello-Ogunu suggested that formal expectations should be made clear at the beginning of a search. Mr. Downing responded that, although it varies from unit to unit, it is usually the case that the Search Committee meets with the Dean and Ms. Abraham prior to the search to establish guidelines. Mr. Bertocci opined that Ms. Abraham's office needs to be strengthened, that academic units may need assistance in networking and developing diverse pools and that her office, busy with its monitoring activities, doesn't have the ability to provide that kind of support.

Good and Welfare: Senate Resolution -Classroom disruptions.

With no further discussion forthcoming on the College motion, Mr. Downing turned to the Good and Welfare part of the agenda and recognized Ms. Eberwein who brought a resolution to the Senate on behalf of her colleagues in the Departments of English and Rhetoric, Communications and Journalism. She expressed her concern over the disruption of Mr. Shine's journalism class which was disturbing not only to Shine's class but also to those classes in the area. This concern led her to check past Senate records and although she found a outdated 1972 procedure for dealing with campus unrest, she found no Senate policy regarding this matter, and particularly no procedure or policy for dealing with outside agitators. She then presented the following sense of the Senate resolution to direct the Steering Committee and AAUP to review any existing policies and to update and revise the policy to the Senate and bring it to the Senate:

RESOLVED that the Senate affirms the right of students to learn and faculty members to teach without classroom disruption and calls upon the university to develop and rigorously implement a policy barring such disruptions. To that end, we instruct the Steering Committee to review Oakland University's existing classroom disruption policy, to update that policy in light of national AAUP guidelines, and to bring that revised policy to the Senate for its discussion and approval. We hold that freedom of speech, the right of assembly, the right to picket and demonstrate, along with other First Amendment rights are best served through free discussion but that such discussion should never disrupt classroom teaching that should epitomize such rights. When and where appropriate, the university should offer a forum for such discussions but not at the expense of classroom teaching.

Mr. Bello-Ogunu seconded the resolution which was then approved by the Senate.

Good and Welfare: Senate Resolution: Golf Course/ Board of Trustees

Mr. Riley was recognized next and introduced the following resolution which was seconded by Mr. Andrews:

Be it resolved that

The University Senate advise the members of the Board of Trustees that the administration did not consult with the University Senate before December 10, 1998 regarding the development of the R & S. Sharf Golf Course and,

Be it resolved that

The members of the Board of Trustees be advised that the administration did not consult appropriate Senate Standing Committees, or give adequate information with which to determine whether the development of the golf course was in the best interests of the University, before bringing the item to the Board agenda in June 1998 for their decision.

Mr. Downing ruled that this was a substantive motion requiring two readings. Mr. Riley explained that the Board of Trustees needs to be informed and made aware that it doesn't always get the correct information, noting that last week the statement was made that the Senate had been consulted. The Board should be made aware that there was no consultation until after the fact. Mr. S. Andrews found it interesting that the shared governance failed in this instance and expressed amazement that something with this impact wasn't brought forth for discussion. Ms. Woods stated that she hopes the Board will get a sense of how divisive this has been and added that she realizes that neither Mr. Downing nor Ms. Schaefer had been appointed when all the decisions were made. She also expressed her concern that this rift may have a negative impact on our recruiting efforts for a new Vice President for Academic Affairs. Mr. Liboff pointed out that this resolution could have been stronger and that the ill-will engendered by this cannot be easily done away with. Mr. Grossman, seconded by Ms. Wood, moved that the second reading be waived. The Senate approved that motion by the required 3/4 majority and then completed its work for for the day by approving the main motion.

No further good and welfare items were forthcoming and Mr. Downing entertained a motion to adjourn at 5:35 p.m, Mr. Grossman so moved, Mr. Downing seconded and the meeting

adjourned.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

[Return to Senate Home Page](#)

dec8min
rev1/7/99