



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Third Meeting
November 21 , 2002

Minutes

Senators present: Alber, Aubry, Bazaz, Bertocci, D. Berven, K. Berven, Coppin, Didier, Downing, Dunn, Eberly, Eberwein, Etienne, Goldberg, Graves, Grossman, Haskell, Henke, Hildebrand, Kamil, Khapoya, Klemanski, LeMarbe, Long, Mabee, Machmut-Jhasi, Mann, Metzler, Moudgil, Mukherji, Olson, Osthaus, Otto, Papazian, Polis, Porter, Rozek, Schott-Baer, Schwartz, Sen, Sethi, Smith, Vincent, Willoughby
Senators absent: Clark, Frick, Gardner, Giblin, Haddad, Hansen-Smith, Jarski, Latcha, McNair, Schmidt, Schweitzer, Stamps, Surrey, Tomina, Wendell, Zingo.

Summary of actions:

1. Information Items:

Report on visit to Cooley Law School Advisory Committee visit to Lansing- Mr. Khapoya School of Nursing ten-year accreditation and Dean Search

2. Motion to approve the October minutes. (Mr. Henke, Ms. Papazian) Approved.
2. Motion to approve a revised Constitution of the School of Nursing. (Ms. Vincent, Ms. Aubry). Second reading. Approved.
3. Motion to recommend approval of a Bachelor of Art in Studio Art (Mr. Downing, Mr. Graves) Second reading. Approved.
4. Motion to revise the name and charge of the Academic Computing Committee (Coppin, Ms. Mukherji) Motion withdrawn.
5. Motion to amend the method by which the chair of UCUI is appointed. (Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Olson) Second reading. Approved.
6. Motion to set a deadline for a report from the General Education Task Force II. (Mr. Schwartz, Ms. Schott-Baer) Approved.
7. Motion to staff senate standing committee. (Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Olson) Approved.

Information items

Calling the meeting to order at 3:15, the Provost then recognized Mr. Khapoya who reported on a visit by the advisory committee to Cooley Law School.

Cooley Law School

Mr. Khapoya and the other members of the eight member advisory committee visited Cooley Law School on Friday, November 15th. Some facts gleaned from their visit include the following: Cooley is the 2d largest law school in the country, 30% of the students come from Michigan and the attrition rate is 25%; they have had an open admissions policy but are now tightening up their requirements; they have exchange programs with Canada and Australia.

Cooley would like to offer a full program at Oakland (Oakland County is the 3d largest county in the U.S. without a law school) and have asked the ABA for its approval. Discussions concerning library needs have been ongoing and Cooley has a collection of law books ready to come to Oakland but needs a place to house them. Cooley is also planning on offering post-graduate programs in Intellectual Property and Taxation. Cooley is expanding, is awash in applications and is hoping for a branch campus at Oakland with possibly up to 800 students. The advisory committee asked about differences in institutional culture, Cooley is private and so decisions can be made quickly, Oakland is public and usually requires more decision-making time. President Leduc of Cooley thought these differences could be managed. Mr. Khapoya concluded by saying he was very impressed with the school, that Cooley is very interested in partnering with Oakland. He felt it would be beneficial to both and envisioned Cooley students taking Oakland classes in cognate areas and the possibility of multi-disciplinary programs. Also tuition discounts would be available to Oakland employees and their families who would like to enroll in the law program.

Ms. Didier added that a library group also visited Cooley and did a presentation on Oakland's goals and the OU Library's resources and services. The Library is currently providing services to Cooley students, particularly materials on reserve. Mr. Grossman asked does the Steering Committee foresee a resolution coming to the Senate concerning whether or not Oakland should get involved with the law school. Mr. Moudgil stated that it would be appropriate for the Steering Committee to bring such a resolution to the Senate. The Provost also added that 8% of the gross amount paid by OU-Cooley students would be allocated to Academic Affairs. Mr. Polis asked about classroom space; are the Cooley students displacing OU students? The answer was no. In reply to Ms. Eberly's question concerning joint appointments, Mr. Moudgil responded that he thought that would be automatic. Asking for clarification, Mr. Polis wondered if the students enrolling in the masters programs in intellectual property and taxation would already be lawyers; the answer was yes.

Ms. Vincent then reported that the School of Nursing received the maximum possible score for the accreditation of their program. Also that the Dean search is progressing well and that Nursing is pleased that they will soon be occupying new facilities in O'Dowd.

Following the roll call, the Provost entertained a motion to approve the [Minutes](#) of the October 17th meeting. Mr. Henke so moved, Ms. Papazian seconded and the minutes were approved as distributed.

Nursing Constitution:

The first item of old business was a motion to recommend approval of the new Constitution of the School of Nursing. Mr. Grossman asked what sort of changes were incorporated into the latest version of the document and was told that only minor editorial changes distinguish this version from the earlier one. But, Ms. Vincent had one final change which the Nursing faculty had approved, namely to strike "the chairperson and" from Article IV, section x, item 3 [e.g. 3. present to the Assembly a slate of nominees for ~~the chairperson and~~ membership of all other standing committees]. That change was agreeable to the Senate. Thus, the motion to approve the Constitution was then approved:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board approval of the new Constitution of the School of Nursing.

with the understanding that this change would be made.

Studio Art

Mr. Downing announced that colleagues from the Department of Art and Art History were present to answer any questions that might arise. Mr. Grossman noted an error in the text of the motion as printed in the agenda, e.g. it should say Bachelor of Arts, rather than Art. Ms. Klemanski commented that we have three new programs recently approved, e.g. mechanical engineering, information systems, and wellness, health promotion and injury prevention, all of which are underfunded. She suggested that the Senate should approve new programs with the caveat "contingent on the availability of funding." Mr. Moudgil responded that Dean Frick had assured him that the mechanical engineering program could be launched by rearranging existing resources; but that if money isn't available, the Deans need to look at their resources and determine whether or not to go ahead with the programs. Mr. Downing stated that, for this program, budget ramifications are minor, that most of the faculty will be part-time. A full time faculty position would have to go through the regular process for new faculty allocation. Mr. Grossman asked about a report from the Senate Planning and Review Committee. None has been received but Mr. Russell, a member of the committee, reported that the SPRC was in favor of the program. Ms. Eberwein commented that generally the Senate practice has been to approve programs based on the soundness of their curriculum, and not concern itself with funding. With no further discussion forthcoming, the Senate then proceeded to approve the following motion:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees approval of a program leading to a Bachelor of Arts in Studio Art.

[The full text of the proposal, related documents and responses from the various Senate committees are available at: <http://www.oakland.edu/senate/studart1.html>]

Academic Computing Committee charge

At the request of the Academic Computing Committee, the Steering Committee has withdrawn the motion to amend its name and charge.

UCUI Chair

The next item, a motion to change the way in which the Chair of UCUI was selected, was opened for discussion. Ms. Lombardo, current chair of UCUI, reported that the committee was in favor of this change. The Senate then proceeded to approve the motion:

MOVED that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education be named the permanent chair of the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction by amending the membership list as follows:

Membership: One faculty member from each organized faculty, appointed to staggered three-year terms by the Senate upon nomination by the Steering Committee, each of whom shall represent UCUI to the Committee on Instruction or equivalent group in her/his academic unit ~~and one of whom shall be chair~~; the Director of General Studies; two undergraduate students designated by the University Student Congress; the above to be voting members. In addition the following shall serve ex-officio and non-voting: the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education **as chair**; the Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee); and the Registrar (or designee)

[strikeouts indicate deletions; bold type additions]

General Education Task Force II

Next the Senate dealt with a motion establishing a timeline for the General Education Task Force II's report (Moved Mr. Schwartz, seconded Ms. Schott-Baer) Mr. Schwartz explained

that this motion came about because of the College of Arts and Sciences dissatisfaction with the progress being made on general education program revision. A College resolution¹ expressing concerns had been received by the Steering Committee; Mr. Schwartz stated that this motion attempts to address those concerns. Ms. Awbrey responded to a query about the feasibility of the deadline by answering that the deadline was feasible but that the report would still have to go through the governance process. Ms. Eberwein explained that the College resolution dealt with a lack of confidence in the process. Mr. Graves reported that the chairs had discussed this and had approved the following resolution:

We, the undersigned chairpersons in the College of Arts and Sciences, share the concerns expressed in our Assembly's resolution on the current general education proposals. However, we respectfully disagree with our Assembly's recommendation that the General Education Task Force II be disbanded and a new task force appointed. We believe that the present Task Force II, through further consultation with various departments, the College Assembly, and other representative bodies, can develop a general education program worthy of Oakland University and should continue working to do so. (Signed: Peter Binkert, Karl Boelter, John Cowlshaw, Paul R. Graves, Shea Howell, Barbara Mabee, David Maines, Bruce Mann, Kathleen H. Moore, Jack Nachman, Michelle Piskulich, Robby Stewart, Susan Wood)

Mr. Schwartz explained that the Steering Committee wanted to support their colleagues on Task Force II who have been charged with this task and that they have confidence in their ability to produce an proposal that can be debated and eventually voted upon. Mr. Polis asked if the motion is defeated, does that mean there's no deadline. The Provost responded that we need to move forward in a responsible way. Ms. Papazian reported that the College meetings were very energetic and that many ideas expressed there need to be shared with Task Force II. However she added, it doesn't make sense to toss out two years of work without having had a change to see the product, that we need to respect the efforts put forth by the Task Forces. The motion on the floor makes sense since it helps move the process forward and Senators will eventually have a change to express their opinions. Mr. Berven disagreed, pointing out that the Task Force produced three scenarios and have decided they didn't like any of them. Mr. Downing noted that one concern was that the train had left the station and that decisions had been made; however, he noted the process is ongoing, that consultation is still taking place and needs to continue as the Task Force develops its plan. Ms. Eberly pointed out that academics often go through multiple drafts of publications before they are finalized; this process is much the same. The Task Force has listened to and agreed with many of the concerns that have been brought up and the entire process still includes opportunities for improvement along the way.

Mr. Russell then moved to amend the motion by adding the following to the end of the motion: "for formal Senate action during the 2003-2004 academic year." Following Mr. Downing's second, Mr. Grossman asked if that means the Senate will be looking at a new general education program; he added that the report needs enough specificity so that Senators can see what the catalog copy will look like. Mr. Henke asked whether or not this amendment would give the university enough time to have things in place in time for the North Central return in 2004. Ms. Awbrey thought the good faith effort evident in the work done by the Task Forces would be sufficient to address North Central's concerns. The Senate then voted upon and approved the amendment.

Returning to discussion of the main motion, in reply Mr. Osthau, Ms. Awbrey stated that the Task Force has received much input from the community, that they will be looking closely at all

the feedback and consulting with units. The Senate then proceeded to approve the main motion as amended with the following Senators voting nay: [Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Berven, Ms. Smith, Mr. Osthaus, Ms. Berven]

MOVED that General Education Task Force II continue to consult widely and develop a plan for general education as directed by the Senate at its meeting of April 11, 2002, and that it present a report to the Senate by March 31, 2003 for formal Senate action during the 2003-2004 academic year.

Senate Standing Committees

The motion to fill the vacancy caused by a sabbatical on the Senate Planning Review Committee for the winter term was moved by Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Olson and approved by the Senate.

F. Good and Welfare:

Mr. Henke distributed a draft version of a proposed vision statement:

Oakland University fulfills its distinctive role among Michigan public universities by steadily enhancing an intellectual and ethical environment that prepares students to lead and serve in the local and world communities.

He explained that a vision statement is very general and differs from a mission statement which includes more specifics and from which goals and objectives derive. He asked the Senate to send comments to the Committee (himself, Ms. Eberwein, Ms. Jackson or Mr. Russell) adding that a motion to approve a vision statement will be on a future Senate meeting.

Ms. Didier invited the Senator to visit the library and take a look at the new carpeting that is being installed. This time a special machine that can move entire stacks without unloading the volumes is being used, which will shorten the installation time by a considerable amount.

With no further items for the good and welfare of the group, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Submitted by,
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

¹College of Arts and Sciences Resolution: The Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences has serious reservations about the current general education proposals and little faith in the current process. It asks that that the Oakland University Senate appoint a new committee to reevaluate general education.

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page