

Oakland University Senate  
Sixth Meeting  
Thursday, 12 April 1990  
Gold Room C, Oakland Center

**MINUTES**

SENATORS PRESENT: S. Appleton, M. Arshagouni, D. Braunstein, K. Berven, D. Bricker, J. Briggs-Bunting, P. Cass, J. Chipman, M. Coffey, G. Dahlgren, R. Eberwein, J. Eckart, R. Edgerton, S. Frankie, J. Grossman, D. Herman, A. Hormozi, R. Horwitz, J. Hovanesian, K. Kazarian, K. Kleckner, C. Landry, A. Lindell, D. Miller, A. Nordheden, R. Olson, R. Pettengill, K. Salomon, F. Schieber, M. Sherman, L. Stamps, B. Theisen, R. Tracy, A. Tripp, J. Urice, T. Weng, R. Williamson, H. Witt, S. Wood, C. Zenas

SENATORS ABSENT: B. Abiko, V. Allen, K. Beehler, P. Bertocci, F. Cardimen, J. Champagne, J. Cowlshaw, G. Dillon, I. Eliezer, W. Fish, W. Garcia, B. Hamilton, P. Hartman, K. Kulig, V. Larabell, A. Liboff, F. Mili, A. Meehan, G. Pine, V. Reddy, J. Rosen, J. Schimmelman, R. Schwartz, B. Winkler

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by Provost Kleckner.

I. Old Business:

None.

II. New Business:

A. Motion from the Steering Committee to staff standing committees of the Senate (D. Braunstein, R. Tracy)

**MOVED** that the faculty nominated be confirmed as appointed to committees with terms as specified. (See Agenda for roster.)

Procedural Motion: Eligible meeting. For or vote at this

Mr. Kleckner first corrected this agenda to show Mr. Giblin as a continuing member of the Research Committee. Then, hearing no objection to calling the question, he did so and elicited unanimous approval of the motion.

B. Motion from the Committee on Human Relations to recommend emendation of the University's Equal Opportunity Policy (J. Hovanesian, D. Bricker)

**MOVED** that the Senate recommend to the President that the University's Equal Opportunity Policy be amended by replacing the word "sex" with the words "gender, sexual preference".

First Reading: Debatable, amendable but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Mr. Grossman asked whether sexual orientation might be a better expression than sexual preference. Ms. Wood believed the more appropriate word to be "sex" rather than "gender", citing the particular context here. Mr. Horwitz suggested that perhaps common usage should guide the committee on this issue, and the committee agreed to discuss its recommendation further and to perfect its wording before the next reading of the motion.

C. Resolution from the Committee on Campus Development and Environment regarding the *Campus Development Guidelines* (L. Stamps, R. Pettengill).

Be it **RESOLVED** that the Senate affirms the conclusion of its Committee on Campus

Development and Environment that the south central and southwest sections of the campus (bordered by Lonedale Road, Squirrel Road, Butler Road and the golf course) are valuable areas for instruction, research and interpretative natural study, and

Be it further **RESOLVED** that the Senate urges that these areas be excluded from future development, and

Be it further **RESOLVED** that the Senate urges any decisions affecting undeveloped areas of the campus be widely participatory and include consultation with those faculty, staff and students who by training or practice are knowledgeable about the ecological and educational value of such areas.

First Reading: Debatable, amendable but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Mr. Gamboa, chair of the committee, spoke to the rationale for its report discussing use of the "natural campus". He noted that in recent planning documents a portion of the natural campus has been identified as an area for future development. The Committee collected data from faculty regarding the use of this natural area in teaching. The Committee wanted to highlight the uniqueness of this natural, undeveloped land and recommends we "jealously guard this land". Mr. Gamboa also emphasized that the open, grassy areas are important ecologically.

Mr. Bricker sought clarification regarding the impact development would have on the natural campus, and Mr. Gamboa spoke to its impact on the research of many faculty and also on several teaching activities. Mr. Bricker asked whether the Committee's report might be appended to the proposal; Mr. Gamboa thought that would be a good step. Mr. Kleckner explained that the campus planning document only identifies areas as suitable for future development. The university is completely free to determine how or whether it chooses to undertake any development. He added that no plans to develop any such area are under consideration. However, this is not to say that future plans could not be made.

Ms. Stamps asked about the appropriateness of the Senate to deal with this proposal and questioned the long-term impact of the Senate in this matter. Mr. Kleckner replied that the Board of Trustees will probably not vote to bind future Boards in any way--but assured the Senate that neither does the Board give any indication of a desire to sell land. Mr. Dahlgren requested clarification as to what Mr. Gamboa's committee defined as natural campus areas, and Mr. Gamboa described them as the natural wooded and grassy areas, particularly on the SW side of the campus. Mr. Kleckner noted changes in the immediate OU environment/locale that are not under OU control. He cited proposed road construction on Squirrel Road in particular.

Mr. Williamson asked whether there are any real plans to build a university conference center, possibly on a site the Campus Development and Environment Committee advocates be left natural. Mr. Kleckner stated that a survey to assess the usefulness of such a conference center for academic and other purposes was in progress, but that no commitments of any sort had been made. Mr. Bricker suggested we continue to document the university's use of this (southwest corner) area and be prepared to engage in "meaningful debate" when alternative uses for this "natural campus" are proposed. There was no further discussion.

D. Resolution on environmentally sound purchasing policies from the Committee on Campus Development and Environment (L. Stamps, R. Pettengill).

Be it **RESOLVED** that the Senate urges the University to assume a leadership role in maintaining the natural environment and preserving natural resources by giving full consideration in all of its purchasing and contracting activities to the use of biodegradable,

recyclable or otherwise environmentally sound products whenever appropriate choices are available, and

Be it further **RESOLVED** that the University endeavor when contracting for the provision of goods and services to incorporate in such contracts similar provisions for the use of recyclable or biodegradable materials.

First Reading: Debatable, amendable but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Mr. Gamboa noted a second, related proposal was recently submitted (to the university administration) suggesting the formulation of an Environmental Task Force. Mr. Olson asked how reasonable limits regarding cost and the relative merit of certain purchases would be operationalized. Mr. Gamboa responded that the task force would make recommendations, not purchasing decisions. Mr. Kleckner reported that the university is somewhat active in this area already, using carefully selected waste removal services, and that special attention is being paid to disposal of hazardous materials. Ms. Stamps reaffirmed that Student Congress resolutions on the same subject (recycling) were subsumed by this resolution and may be treated as supporting the resolution. There was no further discussion on the first reading.

E. Resolution from the Academic Policy and Planning Committee to endorse the [Strategic Guidelines for Oakland University](#) (A. Tripp, R. Tracy).

Be it **RESOLVED**, that the Senate endorses the document entitled, *Strategic Guidelines for Oakland University: Educating Students for the Twenty- First Century, Pursuing the Future--Building on the Past*, as constituting the fundamental principles which shall guide the operation and development of Oakland University for the coming years, and

Be it further **RESOLVED**, that the Senate endorses the continuation of a planning process in accordance with the recommendations contained in these guidelines, and

Be it further **RESOLVED**, that the Senate requests the President and the Board of Trustees to establish formally excellence, cultural diversity and collaboration and the focusing of resources toward these ends as the strategic guiding principles for Oakland University's further development.

First Reading: Debatable, amendable but not eligible for final vote at meeting.

Mr. Eberwein commended the committee on its work and inquired about the "assessment" statement on page 6. Mr. Appleton answered that this addition is based on new North Central Association expectations/requirements for institution-wide assessment of student achievement; Oakland will need to establish such a process. Mr. Chipman asked what assessment will likely include, and Mr. Appleton responded that it will be a process of evaluating academic and co-curricular programs to improve instructional outcomes for students. The OU process should be diagnostic in nature to promote usefulness of results. Mr. Chipman offered appreciation of the Committee's efforts to respond to the inputs of the community in this new draft.

Mr. Urice pointed up the zero-based funding approach in Appendix A. Mr. Tracy replied that, clearly, the university already moves funds from one sector of the university to another; he encouraged debate regarding movement toward zero-based budgeting in the future. Mr. Urice reinforced the need to clarify budget implications of the Guidelines. Mr. Urice sought further clarification of Appendix A.3 regarding the relationship between resource allocation and the articulated outcome criteria. Mr. Tracy

responded that the phrasing in A.3 asks for "other evidence" too and requested further Senate discussion to consider what that evidence should be.

Several Senators questioned Appendix C. Does APPC have as a charge the planned review of the *Strategic Guidelines*? When will an actual "plan" emerge? Mr. Tracy acknowledged some ambiguity in the definition of a "plan" and stressed his belief that the *Strategic Guidelines* document is a plan for resource allocation based on the university's philosophy and goals. Thus, this document is the "plan". Mr. Grossman raised concerns regarding recommendation 6 on page 11, seeing the document to attach similarity between graduate teaching assistants and the use of part-time faculty. Mr. Tracy responded that the APPC would agree that the use of full-time faculty is most effective and noted that the *Strategic Guidelines* articulate the need for caution in increasing the role of graduate students as primary instructors.

Mr. Fish inquired about paragraph 6 on page 7 regarding increasing graduate programs and expressed a wish to consider parameters for so doing. Mr. Tracy observed that our ability to come up with new programs surpasses our ability to fund them. He expected the numbers of graduate students/programs to increase slowly over the next few years. Mr. Edgerton questioned the Committee's treatment of responses from academic units regarding research concerns, noting that faculty in some units had submitted formal petitions to include in the *Strategic Guidelines* specific statements on research. He asked that these petitions be circulated to Senators and then considered for addenda to the *Strategic Guidelines*.

Considerable discussion ensued. Several Senators expressed concerns about the Committee's projections regarding students from Macomb County (page 3 of the *Strategic Guidelines*) and about changes in size, distribution and nature of Oakland's student body. Mr. Tracy noted the APPC's recommendation that we enhance the attractiveness of O.U. to both high school graduates and transfers and at the same time increase retention efforts. Mr. Kleckner reminded the Senate of our current policy to maintain stable enrollment. Mr. Braunstein noted that to the extent units move toward increased graduate education they will be less impacted by demographic trends in undergraduate admissions. Mr. Fish questioned the feasibility of enhancing undergraduate admissions, retention, and increased graduate enrollments all at the same time, and Mr. Tracy observed that these are challenges to the community, not guaranteed outcomes. Mr. Bricker sought and received confirmation that the opening section of this document (pages 1-4) is background and explication of data, and that the recommendations appear later.

Mr. Williamson pointed out that the document does not address the difficulty OU will encounter in recruiting and retaining faculty as well as students. Mr. Tracy agreed that faculty will be harder to recruit in the future, an issue he believes important to this and other planning committees. Mr. Edgerton described the APPC's work as a "sustaining, maintaining document" when instead we need to be improving. He stated he believes this is a weak document relative to the problems the university faces. Mr. Tracy asked the Senate to give attention to the section of the *Guidelines* (page 9) regarding focusing resources and making choices. Mr. Braunstein observed he does not believe, practically speaking, we can expect to improve all programs at once. Rather, a planning procedure allows us to make focused improvements in some programs while maintaining others. He noted the painfulness of the process, but that it is a necessary one.

Mr. Horwitz cited his difficulty with where money will come from to fund the proposed centers of excellence and questioned the process by which these choices will be made. Are we ready as an institution to change our mission? Mr. Brieger wondered about the public-relations utility of this document, e.g. to persuade the legislature of OU's need for greater resources. Is there enough "matter" here to be useful? Mr. Kleckner observed that no document is likely to evoke a dramatic positive response in the legislature. Ms. Tripp saw a "110% pie", in the resource allocation discussion and noted

concern among her colleagues regarding the need for improvement in undergraduate programs and for increasing the resources needed to do so. Mr. Tracy responded that throughout the document issues are raised and suggestions made that would positively impact undergraduate education. still, Ms. Tripp would like to see references in the summation regarding undergraduate concerns. At this juncture, discussion ended for the initial reading of the motion.

F. Motion from the Steering Committee to extend the Senate business year (D. Braunstein, D. Bricker).

The motion would permit the Senate to meet past the end of the current semester to deal with those items introduced on this meeting's new-business agenda. Upon a call by the chair for a vote, the body concurred unanimously.

### III. Good and Welfare

None

### IV. Information Items

A. The new science building is still under consideration in Lansing. It is now anticipated that the Joint Capital outlay Committee agenda of April 26 will include authorization to proceed with second-stage architectural planning.

B. Mr. Kleckner--noting much interest in the details of the several accords which the university reached with representatives of the University Student Congress, the Association of Black Students and Raices--indicated that the full text of these accords had already been published and distributed as a special edition of the *OU NEWS*. He added that work to carry out the accords had begun and would continue throughout the coming year. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Penny Cass