



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Eighth Meeting
April 18, 2002

Minutes

Members present: Abiko, Alber, Aubry, Bazaz, Binkert, Coppin, Eberly, Eberwein, Frick, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Hansen-Smith, Henke, Hildebrand, Khapoya, Kheir, Klemanski, Latcha, LeMarbe, Lipman, Mabee, Machmut-Jhasi, McNair, Mann, Moudgil, Mukherji, Olson, Rozek, Russell, Sangeorzan, Schmidt, Schott-Baer, Schwartz, Sethi, Shablin, Stamps
Members absent: D. Berven, K. Berven, Blanks, Clark, Didier, Downing, Emrich, Gardner, Haddad, Jarski, Long, Mosby, Osthaus, Otto, Schweitzer, Sevilla, Sieloff, Smith, Surrey, Willoughby

Summary of actions:

1. Motion to recommend approval of a Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering (Mr. Frick, Mr. Latcha) Second reading. Approved.
2. Motion to endorse the *Oakland University Profile 2010*. (Ms. Schott-Baer, Mr. Downing) Second reading. Postponed.
 - 2a. Motion to amend the motion to endorse the *Oakland University Profile 2010* by adding: "subject to the inclusion of "i. Oakland University will be committed to studying and perpetuating our cultural heritage. Oakland University's professors and students will make significant contributions to that legacy. ii. Oakland University will be distinguished by the high percentage of classes taught by professors." (Mr. Graves, Mr. Lipman) Approved.
 - 2b. Motion to amend the motion to endorse the *Oakland University Profile 2010* by adding "contingent on the inclusion of the word "professors" in the first bullet under Growth between the word "of" and "students." (Mr. Binkert, Mr. Graves). Approved.
 - 2c. Motion to postpone consideration of the *Oakland University Profile 2010* until the next meeting. (Mr. Russell, Mr. Henke) Approved.
3. Motion to recommend establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to study collaboration between Oakland and Thomas M. Cooley Law School. (Mr. Khapoya, Mr. Latcha). Approved.
4. Motion to authorize an additional Senate meeting. (Ms. Mukherji, Ms. Schott-Baer) Approved.

After calling the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m. the Provost began by announcing the establishment of the Michigan Alliance for University Technology Management (MAUTM). This came about because much of the money that the state received from tobacco settlements went to an alliance formed by the University of Michigan, Michigan State and Wayne State. While other universities tried for the grants they were only modestly successful. So, a number of the other state universities (CMU, EMU, MTU, OU) got together to form their own alliance (MAUTM) and to develop a proposal dealing with intellectual property issues. This proposal to

be submitted to the state asks for \$2-4 million in seed money to support inventions, strategic technology planning, investments, commercialization, patents and licensing services. He pointed out that this allows us to tap into available monies in Lansing and develop an organization to monitor these activities. There will also be possibilities for faculty involvement. Mr. Russell raised the question of the intellectual property issues that are covered in the various collective bargaining agreements and asked if these had been considered. Mr. Moudgil responded it is premature to think about this now but that yes, they should be considered if this proposal is successful.

Law school classes

Mr. Moudgil then announced that the Thomas M. Cooley Law School has approached Oakland to see if they could offer their initial year at Oakland with the idea of possibly expanding to additional years. Basically they would be renting classroom space in much the same way as Oakland rents space in Birmingham for the MBA program. Cooley was established in 1972, is fully accredited and is famous for its non-traditional student body which includes many part-time students who are employed at full time jobs. What's in it for Oakland? he asked. Well, ideally the academic areas would benefit. Cooley has agreed to pay a fee of 8-10% of their gross OU revenue to Oakland, this could be anywhere from \$25,000-120,000 for the fall semester. Their requirements are simply one classroom and one office and the Registrar is working to find them suitable space. Mr. Moudgil emphasized that this is just for the fall term but added that Cooley is interested in the possibility of joint programs, e.g. Masters in Taxation or Intellectual Property. If it can be worked out, these programs would begin in 2003 and would be primarily weekend classes. However joint ventures such as this would have to go through the normal OU governance structure. There may be future political advantages to Oakland since many Cooley graduates end up in Lansing in governmental jobs. It will also be good for Oakland to have the visibility of having law students on campus; he also thought there might be a possibility of updated classroom technology, money for library materials, the availability of additional legal materials on campus. He concluded that it seems like a good idea and a timely opportunity with benefits to Oakland.

Mechanical Engineering Ph.D.

Turning to old business, Mr. Moudgil opened the floor for discussion on the proposed Ph.D. program in mechanical engineering. Mr. Stamps began with a question concerning the Budget Committee report, asking where the money would come from to initiate this program. Mr. Frick responded that the budget was originally constructed as though this were a stand-alone program when in fact, there is already a Ph.D. program in Engineering. He indicated that he'd consulted with the Provost and that the cost of the lab facilities had been reduced. Mr. Frick also noted that the cost of Ph.D. students working in industry is less than that of traditional students since many of them have research facilities at their workplaces. Mr. Moudgil confirmed that they had met after receiving the SBRC's report and he announced that Engineering will get the support needed. In reply to a query as to the proposed start of the program, Mr. Frick said that they anticipated a fall 2002 start. Following up on the budget needs, Mr. Stamps asked if the library needs have been resolved. The Provost responded that Mr. Frick has identified resources that will be made available to the library.

Mr. Grossman expressed concern over the statement in the Budget Committee's report that "We are not charged with making recommendations about allocation or re-allocation of university resources." He felt that the charge to the committee which includes, he quoted " To report to the Senate and its committees . . . on the university-wide budgetary implications of proposed new academic programs" encompasses this responsibility. Ms. Hildebrand asked for

clarification of the resources that will be made available to the library, pointing out that while one time money is helpful for book purchases, providing journal subscriptions is an on-going commitment and needs continuous funding. And journals tend to increase in cost. Mr. Frick asserted that all the needed resources are in place for the launch of the program. Mr. Moudgil indicated that the university would use soft money to provide the needed resources for the program rather than taking it from existing programs. Ms. Hansen-Smith noted that the budget is a concern every time a new program is begun and yet there is no feedback concerning the adequacy of the funding once the program is underway. Mr. Moudgil responded that he intends to review the programs rigorously and redirect resources if necessary. He added that there are some academic programs that are not tied to money alone but that must be maintained to ensure the integrity of the academic experience. Ms. Hansen-Smith asked where the money comes from when a program is approved, is it new money or money that is redirected from other programs. Mr. Moudgil responded that he has given the Dean's the budget information down to the last penny and that faculty should get this information from their deans or department chairs.

Ms. Eberwein commented that an important part of the process is the review by UCUI or the Graduate Council. As chair of UCUI, she reported that that committee had spent time reviewing departmental self-studies and program reviews and one thing is clear, that many units are hard pressed with regard to resources. As we look at adding new programs, we need to consider how they will affect the funding of existing programs. She felt that adding five year reviews for all new programs to see if they are meeting their goals, to look at revenues, enrollments, and faculty resources and in general, to consider whether or not the program is getting the resources needed would be a good idea. She hoped UCUI or the Graduate Council could play a role in conducting these reviews. Mr. Hansen reported that the Graduate Council has decided to revise their procedures and to work on producing a more valid report. They will be looking at admissions standards, progress standards and external reviews when there's no accrediting body or process. The Council anticipates a more rigorous process with new guidelines in place by next year. He indicated a willingness to collaborate with UCUI in order to standardize the process. Mr. Henke expressed his support for the program given the number of manufacturing firms in the area, adding that this is an opportunity to reach out the the community. The Senate then proceeded to vote upon and approve the following motion:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of a program leading to a Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering.

Oakland Profile 2010

Mr. Graves began the discussion by asking for clarification concerning the motion, can the document be changed or amended. The response was that the document cannot be amended but Senate endorsement could be "contingent upon" or "subject to" some additions or changes in wording. Mr. Graves, seconded by Mr. Lipman then

MOVED that the Senate endorse the [*OU Profile 2010*](#) subject to the inclusion of the following:

- i. Oakland University will be committed to studying and perpetuating our cultural heritage. Oakland University's professors and students will make significant contributions to that legacy.
- ii. Oakland University will be distinguished by the high percentage of classes taught

by professors.

These are to be added as bullets under "Strong undergraduate experience/strong academic programs."

Mr. Russell stated that the Senate Planning Review Committee is scheduled to look at the Profile next week and strongly urged the Senate to postpone any decisions on the document until the Planning Committee's report is available. Mr. Binkert stated that he would support endorsement conditional upon the addition of the word "professors" in the statement regarding growth.

In response to Mr. Lipman's question about the proposed use of this document, Mr. Moudgil responded that the Profile was the result of extended discussion among the deans and chairs and that the university hopes to use it in the fundraising campaign. He indicated that the Profile may evolve as they work with donors and fund raisers since it wouldn't be a good idea to be locked into something that would require months to change and that might result in a loss of donations. He emphasized the need for outside donations since state allocations are not going to grow and the university cannot raise tuition to cover all the university needs. In response to Ms. Hansen-Smith's question about whether professors meant full-time or part-time, Mr. Graves indicated that he intended it to mean full-time tenure track faculty. The motion to amend by adding i and ii as listed above as was then approved with 3 nays, 1 abstention. [Henke, Olson, Frick voted nay; Sethi abstained]

Mr. Stamps remarked that the Profile should be dated. Ms. Eberwein reported that UCUI reviewed the Profile and that committee members found the bullets vapid and repetitive of other documents on campus. She affirmed that no single page can describe the university, also that aside from the first bullet, all the remainder apply equally well to graduate study. Mr. Moudgil responded that the Schools with strong graduate programs expressed concern during early discussions about the Profile and wanted them featured. He added that the undergraduate experience is common to all schools but that Oakland is distinguished by the strength of its undergraduate scholars who are involved in research. When the presentations were made last spring many faculty could not see themselves in that document so it was decided to focus on distinctive undergraduate experience as a theme. The decision was made to also include graduate programs since our graduate programs are distinctive. Mr. Goldberg commented that you could cover both by the phrase "strong academic programs" but Mr. Stamps stated that he liked having them listed separately. Mr. Moudgil also preferred the separation, noting that, when it comes to graduate programs, we simply cannot compete with U of M.

Mr. Binkert stated that he would support endorsement conditional upon the addition of the word "professors" in the statement regarding growth and proposed the following amendment:

MOVED that the Senate's endorsement of Profile 2010 be contingent on the inclusion of the word "professors" in the first bullet under Growth between the word "of" and "students." (Moved Mr. Binkert, Seconded Mr. Graves) .

The bullet would then read: "Oakland University will be a growing university in terms of numbers of professors, students, academic programs, campus and student services and technological enhancements. The motion was approved.

Attention then returned to the main motion, with the additions noted about. Mr. Lipman, seconded by Mr. Grossman then proposed:

MOVED that the Senate endorse the Profile 2010 as presented to it this date and as amended, and
Be it further **MOVED** that any revisions to the document be reviewed by the Senate.

Mr. Lipman was concerned over the idea that this is a living document and may change and explained that he wanted the Senate to be informed of and have a chance to respond to changes. Mr. Binkert supported the motion, adding that academic units are always asked to justify their requests, to report what they have done to support the Strategic Plan; he assumes we will be asked to justify what we are doing using the Profile. This motion gives the Senate the chance to exercise some control over its wording since it wasn't involved in the development. Mr. Moudgil noted that an attempt was made to gather input; he shared the Profile with the Academic Council, the Deans and Chairs and the input gathered was incorporated into the document. He didn't feel that it was put together by the administration. Mr. Grossman pointed out that the Academic Council and Deans may not have shared this information with their faculty. Ms. McNair suggested that in the future a group putting together a vision document should include Senate representatives. Mr. Stamps expressed his appreciation for the Profile, noting that it is good to have a vision but unfortunately not all deans and chairs shared the Profile with their faculty.

Mr. Henke stated that it is not clear why the Profile has been designed. Is it a vision or a profile, he asked. If it is to be used as a marketing tool it should be designed for that purpose; if it is a vision, then it should represent our aspirations, where we want the institution to go. A vision statement should be concise, clear, and should include the core values association with the institution and the envisioned future. He pointed out that the profile basically tells the public we are doing three things, undergraduate and graduate instruction and service. There is a sense of disconnection between the mention of the "small campus" environment along with many references to growth, between the focus on attracting high quality students and the emphasis on growth. He did not see in the Profile any compelling reason for a high quality undergraduate to come to Oakland. Mr. Russell interjected that all these concerns will be considered by the Senate Planning Review Committee when they review the document. Mr. Grossman, the parliamentarian, directed attention back to the motion to add the requirement that revisions to the Profile be reviewed by the Senate. This addition was then approved with one no and four abstentions. [Hansen-Smith voted nay; Stamps, Henke, S.Klemanski and Frick abstained]

Mr. Russell then **moved** to postpone further discussion of the main motion, now amended and with subject to and contingencies specified, until the next meeting and Mr. Henke provided the second. After several members spoke in favor of postponing in order to get input from the Senate Committees, the Senate proceeded to approve the motion to postpone. .

Ad Hoc Committee to Study Law School Collaboration

Turning to the next item of business, Mr. Khapoya, seconded by Mr. Latcha then

MOVED that the Provost appoint an *ad hoc* committee to study possible collaboration with the Thomas M. Cooley Law School.

Mr. Lipman opened the discussion by asking if this action precluded any consideration by Senate Committees and Mr. Grossman asked to whom would this committee report. The Provost responded that the committee would report to him and that faculty would be involved in the process. Mr. Khapoya remembered that OU once had the opportunity to collaborate with the Detroit College of Law but that didn't work out. We need to look at the issues, he stated, and noted that the only involvement needed right now is time to spend considering the opportunity. Ms. Alber agreed that we should explore it, but expressed concern over the fact that classroom space would be given over for law school classes. Because there was no classroom space on campus for her class, she was forced to teach on on campus course at Rochester High School. Mr. Moudgil pointed out that we are opening a new Education Building this fall so additional classrooms will be available; also he noted the Law School will be using only one classroom Monday-Friday. There may be classes on weekends if a master's program is launched but that is still under consideration. He argued that Oakland can't afford to let this opportunity slip away, that it means additional dollars for Oakland along with the possibility of future public relations considerations. Mr. Grossman asked who would be appointed and the Provost responded that he didn't have anyone in mind yet, since he wanted to see if the motion would pass, but that he would appoint faculty who are knowledgeable and interested. With no further questions or concerns forthcoming, the Senate proceeded to approve the motion.

Additional Senate Meeting

A procedural motion to authorize additional meetings was then proposed by Ms. Mukherji, and seconded by Ms. Schott-Baer:

MOVED that the Senate meet on May 2, 2002, in order to consider the following items if still pending:

- a. motion to endorse the Oakland University Profile 2010

Mr. Grossman offered a friendly amendment which was accepted to add Senate committee appointments to the list of items. The motion was approved.

Good and Welfare

Mr. Russell announced to the Senate that he is continuing to follow up on the promised creation of walking trails that Ms. Schaefer assured the Senate would part of the development of the new Scharf golf course. Last year we were told that progress was being made and he is checking to see how much progress and will report back.

Mr. Schmidt and Ms. McNair then presented a brief report on their experiences as faculty representatives attending the March Board of Trustees meeting.

With no further business, Mr. Moudgil entertained a motion to adjourn and the meeting ended at 5:22 p.m.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

Oakland University Profile 2010 (original version)

A university of distinction with a visionary undergraduate experience.

Key Elements of the Profile

Strong undergraduate experience/strong academic programs

- Oakland University's central mission will be to provide a high-quality and challenging undergraduate education, including a visionary general education program, that offers undergraduates an enriching and diverse combination of liberal arts, professional education, and cultural and social experiences.
- Oakland University will create a learning experience that prepares students for a rapidly changing workplace and to be leaders for the future.
- Oakland's teaching, research and service activities will be enhanced by the integration of new information technologies.

Quality graduate programs

- Oakland University will be graduate-intensive, with expanding graduate programs to meet market demands.

Diversity

- Oakland will continue to embrace and encourage diversity through programs, faculty, staff, students, partnerships and community outreach.
- By participating in diverse programs, and cultural and social experiences, Oakland students will be better prepared to be effective leaders in tomorrow's workplace and society.

Inspired faculty

• Oakland University's academic experience will be strengthened by the dedication of its faculty to the teaching-learning process, research, scholarship and creative endeavors.

Quality students

- Oakland University will focus on attracting high-quality incoming first-year students to further enhance the educational and social environment of campus.

Research

- Oakland will be known for its expertise in applied research that impacts the people of Michigan and beyond.
- Oakland will enhance its research expertise through growing external support, and creation of a business incubator, and research and development park.

Community, corporate, government, educational and individual partnerships

- Oakland University will be recognized regionally for building collaborative relationships with business, industry, education and government to meet the demands of a highly educated workforce and a high-performance workplace.
- Oakland will build relationships with individuals and corporations that support the planned and unplanned needs of the university to ensure continued excellence.

Community outreach

- Oakland University will be recognized regionally for quality and responsive community outreach, including educational services, the cultural and performing arts, and sports. This outreach will further enhance the enriching and diverse combination of liberal arts, professional education, and cultural and social experiences for campus.

Growth

- Oakland University will be a growing university ? in terms of number of students, academic programs, campus and student services, and technological enhancements.
- Oakland will retain the best features of a small-campus setting while being large enough to offer a broad array of programs and services.

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page