



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
S E N A T E

Oakland University Senate

6th Meeting
Thursday, February 18, 1971
3 p.m., 128-130 Oakland Center

AGENDA

Submitted by Frederick W. Obear, for the Steering Committee

A Old Business

Motion from the Academic Policy Committee (Mr. Hildum)

That the Senate adopt the following resolution:

COMPETENCY IN VARIOUS SUBJECTS TESTED IN THE COLLEGE LEVEL EXAMINATION PROGRAM, ADMINISTERED BY THE EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, IS ACCEPTABLE IN FULFILLMENT OF OAKLAND UNIVERSITY GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS. Second Reading, eligible for final vote

2. Motion from the Academic Policy Committee and the Athletics Committee (Mr. Hildum and Mr. Dovaras)

THAT THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BE AUTHORIZED TO GRANT CREDIT FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION COURSES. EXCEPT AS PART OF A PHYSICAL EDUCATION MINOR, NO MORE THAN FOUR CREDITS IN P.E. COURSES MAY BE PRESENTED BY A STUDENT TOWARD GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS. Second Reading, eligible for final vote.

a. Amendment proposed by Mr. Stern, seconded by Mr. Tipler:

TO ADD THE WORD "SKILLS" IN THE SECOND SENTENCE BEFORE THE WORD "COURSES."

3. Motion from the Academic Policy Committee, the Athletics Committee, and Dean Laszlo Hetenyi

THAT THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION BE AUTHORIZED TO ESTABLISH A TEACHING MINOR IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TO ACCOMPANY ANY OF THE TEACHING MAJORS, BOTH ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY. THE RULE THAT ALL PROGRAMS MUST INCLUDE AT LEAST EIGHT CREDITS OF FREE

ELECTIVE SHALL BE WAIVED FOR THIS PROGRAM. Second Reading, eligible for final vote.

Note: Extensive comments in support of these two motions appeared in the agenda for the January meeting.

B. New Business

1. Recommendation from the Steering Committee (Mr. Obear)

a. THAT THE MOTION BELOW BE MADE ELIGIBLE FOR FINAL VOTE AT THIS MEETING.

Comment: In view of the fact that the Senate has discussed at length the Student Congress Constitution in at least two meetings during the fall term, the Steering Committee strongly urges that a final vote be taken on this matter at this meeting.

b. THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMEND TO PRESIDENT O'DOWD THAT THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY CONGRESS BE ACCEPTED AND PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR APPROVAL WHEN AND IF THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS ARE APPROVED BY THE STUDENT BODY.

(1) Article III, section 1, shall be changed to:

The University Congress shall:

(a) have primary responsibility for recommending, establishing where appropriate, and interpreting university policy in areas of student life and share with the University Senate the responsibilities for the consideration of the university policy in areas which involve both academic and student life concerns. It is understood that the University President acting as chief executive officer of the Board of Trustees has opportunity to review and act upon all Congress legislation.

(b) advise the President of the University on all matters he wishes to bring before it.

(c) have the right to initiate proposals on all matters relevant to the general welfare of the university.

(d) have the right to take formal notice of any action taken by the university or any representative thereof, and, by resolution, to approve or disapprove of such action.

(2) Article III, section 8, shall be entirely deleted.

Comment: This new Statement of Powers for the University Congress has been proposed by a joint *ad hoc* committee of the Senate and the Congress, and has the endorsement of the steering committees of both bodies, and of President O'Dowd and Vice President for Student Affairs Appleton. As suggested in previous Senate debate, it provides that primary recommending responsibility for student affairs policies shall reside in the Congress, and that the Congress and the Senate will share responsibility for "areas which involve both academic and student life concerns." It proposes no changes in the Senate's primary responsibility "for consideration of university academic policies;" in fact, approval of the Congress Constitution would require no changes at all in the Statement of Powers of the University Senate as described in section IV of the University Constitution.

A statement of guidelines for the implementation of these ditto powers was drafted by the Congress, endorsed by the *ad hoc* committee, and is reprinted below in its entirety. It illustrates how several areas might be typically classed as student affairs areas and other as shared areas. It further calls for the establishment of conference committees to attempt to resolve differences when substantially different proposals arise from the two bodies. However, in the event of irreconcilable differences, it also recognizes the right of either body to present its resolution on any subject directly to the President.

Finally, both the Senate and the Congress recognize that the ultimate authority in all areas of university policy lies with the President and the Board of Trustees. In essence, this proposal establishes a new route through which student opinion may be formally expressed through the recommendations of the Congress, just as faculty opinion has traditionally been formally expressed through the Senate.

Guidelines proposed by the Congress: The University Congress has the authority to administer the allocation of student activities fees (\$5 now collected at registration).

The Congress will recommend directly to the university administration policies and programs which affect the residence halls, the Oakland Center, commuter programs, student organizations, the Health Center and other areas of student life to be identified. In these areas of campus life, certain authority may be delegated by predetermined arrangement to the Congress to recommend policy. Since the great majority of users of the Oakland Center are students, and the major of the space in the Oakland Center is devoted to student activities it seems reasonable to assign to the Congress primary responsibilities of recommendation of the policies of the Center. It is clear, however, that if a proposal from the Congress should significantly affect the interests of faculty or staff users of the Oakland Center that the University Senate and the various campus collective bargaining groups would have ample opportunity to express their views directly to the President.

Placement policies, resource services including financial aid, public safety and the student special services illustrate areas where the administration will certainly seek both faculty and student input. In order to facilitate speedy consideration, the Congress may wish at any time prior to submission of a proposal to the administration to voluntarily present it to the Senate for consideration or joint committee deliberation.

Further, it is understood that the President may wish to submit any Congress proposal to the faculty (AAUP or Senate) for consideration. It is assumed that the reverse could likewise be useful.

Ideally, in areas of shared concern, any policy recommendation should be the result of full agreements of both the University Senate and the University Congress. Such agreements in the aforementioned areas of shared concern could be obtained by joint committees of equal representation of the Senate and Congress and submitted for approval of both bodies. If no agreement is obtained from the joint committee conference, or if either body rejects the conference committee report, each body may submit its own proposal to the President of the University. The President shall consult with the chairman of the University Senate Steering Committee and the President of the University Congress as to the final decision. Tentative resolution of areas, unspecified as shared concerns or as primary responsibility of the University Congress, could be undertaken by joint meetings of the respective steering committees, subject to approval by both bodies.

2. Resolution from the Steering Committee and the Academic Policy Committee (Messrs. Hildum and Obear)

a. THAT THE DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF I (INCOMPLETE) GRADES BE CHANGED FROM: "THE END OF THE NEXT SEMESTER THAT THE STUDENT IS IN RESIDENCE" TO "FOUR WEEKS AFTER THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT SEMESTER THAT THE STUDENT IS IN RESIDENCE."

b. THAT EXTENSIONS OF THIS DEADLINE BE GRANTED ONLY IN EXCEPTIONAL CASES, AND REQUIRE THE APPROVAL OF THE PROVOST.

c. THAT THE WORDS "BEYOND THE CONTROL OF THE STUDENT" BE ADDED AFTER THE WORDS "SEVERE HARDSHIP" IN THE CATALOG ENTRY.

Comment: The catalog entry governing the I (incomplete) grades would then be changed to read:

I (incomplete)

The "I" (incomplete) grade is a temporary grade that may be given only after the thirteenth week in a course in which a student is unable to complete the required work because of severe hardship beyond the control of the student. An "I" grade does not become official until approved by the Provost.

The "I" grade must be removed by completing the required work before the deadline set by the instructor but in no case later than four weeks after the beginning of the next semester that the student is in residence, or a grade of "N" will be recorded. If more than three semesters intervene before the student resumes residence, then the grade becomes an "N" grade. Extension of these deadlines will be granted only in exceptional cases, and require the approval of the Provost.

The Steering Committee recommends approval of these changes in the I grade policy in an attempt to deal with several problems that have arisen recently:

First, the committees believe most students do not need or use the entire next semester to complete their work; many simply forget about the I grade until near the end of the next semester (and about one fourth forget it permanently). There would obviously be great

advantages in requiring all students to complete the Incompletes early in the term when the subject matter is still fresh in their minds, and while the work loads in their other courses are still relatively light.

Second, a number of students who either did not work at the passing level in a course, or who did not complete more than a small part of the work load in the course have been urging their instructors to give them I grades rather than N grades. This then permits them to repeat the course later with the same instructor without formal registration or payment of tuition. If the student completes the course satisfactorily on the second try the instructor can report the grade as a completion of the Incomplete. This has the effect of depriving the university not only of the student tuition but also of the State aid which is appropriated on a credit-delivery basis. Furthermore it discriminates against those students whose instructors will not cooperate in this subterfuge.

This change in legislation would permit all students who are working satisfactorily in a course and encounter a genuine hardship near the end of the term to obtain a short extension to permit them to finish. Approval of reasonable requests for I grades by the Provost's Office could then be made somewhat more routine than at present, since the possibility of serious abuse would be minimized.

3. Motion from the Academic Policy Committee (Mr. Hildum)

The following motion to replace present regulations on major standing:

THAT STUDENTS BE REQUIRED, AT SOME POINT IN THE INTERVAL FROM 56 TO 72 CREDITS, TO FILE WITH THE REGISTRAR A DECLARATION OF MAJOR ON A FORM ORIGINATING WITH THE DEPARTMENT AND SIGNED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OR A DESIGNATED MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT TO SIGNIFY THAT THE STUDENT HAS CONSULTED WITH AND RECEIVED THE APPROVAL OF AN APPROPRIATE ADVISOR IN PLANNING HIS PROGRAM. FAILURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN THE STUDENT BEING BARRED FROM REGISTRATION.

Comment: APC agrees with many complaints against the present process: that it multiplies paperwork needlessly, that it forces departments to enter into bogus conditional agreements with students to enable them to register, and that it in fact does not guarantee adequate advising. We feel that our proposal still has the virtue of asking the student to give some thought to his program before it's too late, that it eliminates the fiction of admission to major for those departments which have no use for it but makes it possible for those who wish to keep the gate, and that it sharply reduces paperwork.

4. Motion from the Academic Standing and Honors Committee (Mr. McKay)

THAT THE SENATE AUTHORIZE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACADEMIC PROBATION AND DISMISSAL POLICY DESCRIBED IN THE ATTACHED REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC STANDING AND HONORS COMMITTEE. First Reading

Comment: This proposed new policy is a modification of the present standards in an attempt to

compensate somewhat for the effects of the new grading system on student grade point averages. There are two major changes:

- a. It slightly raises a dividing line between probation and dismissal. (For all students with 80 credits or more, the minimum GPA for good standing remains 2.0, the graduation requirement.)
- b. It places limits on the number of N grades which a student may receive and remain in good standing.

The details of the policy and the committee's rationale are given in detail in the attached document.

Finally, the committee would like to call to the Senate's attention a persistent problem which we face in interpreting grades and grade point averages. As an example, in a recent term, the class averages in freshmen exploratory sections ranged from well below 2.0 to about 3.6. The committee feels that this is probably more likely to be due to wide variation in grading standards than to real fluctuation in the performance of the classes. Unfortunately, the committee has been unable to take this information into account and seems unlikely to be able to do so in the near future. The committee is forced to assume, in spite of the facts, that the grading system is fairly and uniformly applied throughout the entire university. We would like to ask all faculty to make every effort to bring our assumptions closer to reality.

5. Proposal from the Steering Committee (Mr. Obear)

THAT THE CONSTITUTION OF OAKLAND UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND OTHER OFFICIAL AND RELATED DOCUMENTS BE MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE CHANGE OF TITLE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROM CHANCELLOR TO PRESIDENT. Procedural motion, eligible for final vote

6. Proposed constitutional amendment, submitted by the Steering Committee (Mr. Obear) First Reading

THAT ARTICLE V, SECTION I, OF THE UNIVERSITY CONSTITUTION BE CHANGED FROM: "TWO SENATORS SHALL BE ELECTED FROM AMONG THE ADMINISTRATIVE- PROFESSIONAL STAFFS, INCLUDING THE LIBRARIANS..." TO "TEN SENATORS SHALL BE ELECTED FROM AMONG THE ADMINISTRATIVE-PROFESSIONAL STAFFS..."

Comment: During the past year, both student and A-P delegations visited the Steering Committee to request increased representation, and the committee agreed to consider these proposals prior to the election of a new Senate.

After consultation with a number of members of the President's Commission on University Governance, the Steering Committee has concluded that the report from that commission will not be ready prior to the elections for the 1971-73 Senate. We therefore submit this amendment as an interim measure, which can of course be changed if or when a new system of govern is adopted.

Since the students have now organized the University Congress as their main representative body, the Steering Committee does not recommend any change in student representation in the Senate. The Administrative-Professional staff has continued to express great interest in working within the Senate, and the Steering Committee recommend to the Senate the adoption of this amendment.

Note: The establishment of two new organized faculties since the last Senate election will increase the number of elected faculty seats from 33 to 39. If this amendment is adopted, the new Senate will consist of 63 Senators distributed as follows:

Faculty 39
Administrative-Professional 10
Ex officio (Provost and deans) 8
Students 3
Presidential appointments 3
Total 63

7. Report of Steering Committee activities (Mr. Obear)

- a. The committee regrets to report the demise of the Professional Affairs Committee of the Senate. That committee feels that its functions have been completely subsumed by the AAUP, and has asked to be discharged.
- b. The Steering Committee has asked the deans of the schools and college to consult with their faculties, and submit nominees for honorary degrees at the June 5 commencement.

FWO:JED:jp
attachment

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