



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, 18 April 1991
Eighth Meeting

MINUTES

Senators Present: Bertocci, Berven, Braunstein, Briggs-Bunting, Cass, Chipman, Dahlgren, Dillon, Eberwein, Fish, Griggs, Grossman, Hamilton, Hartman, Herman, Hovanesian, Kazarian, Lederer, Mabee, Mittelstaedt, Olson, Pettengill, Salomon, Schwartz, Stern, Tripp, Weng, Williams, Witt, Wood, Zenas.

Senators Absent: Abiko, Appleton, Beehler, Bricker, Cardimen, Champagne, Cowlshaw, Eckart, Eliezer, Frankie, Garcia, Heintz, Kleckner, Liboff, Long, Meehan, Mili, Miller, Pine, Reddy, Rosen, Schieber, Schimmelman, Stevens, Theisen, Tracy, Urice, Walter, Wedekind, Williamson, Winkler.

Summary of Actions:

1. Minutes of 15 February 1990 (Salomon; Tripp). Approved.
2. Minutes of 12 April 1990 (Briggs-Bunting; Stern) Approved.
3. Minutes of 30 April 1990 (Tripp; Stern). Approved.
4. Minutes of 14 March 1990 (Wood; Mabee). Approved.
5. Amendment to agenda item A.I., modifying the reporting date (Braunstein; Stern).
Subsumed into main motion.
6. Motion from the Committee on Human Relations calling for reports from academic units on activities and plans for dealing with issues related to cultural diversity (Garcia; Briggs-Bunting). Approved as revised by committee.
7. Amendment to agenda item A.2. to reserve part of the fund for counseling and academic assistance (Stern; Kazarian). Withdrawn.
8. Motion from the Committee on Human Relations recommending that an endowment fund be established for scholarships to increase the diversity of the student population (Garcia; Briggs-Bunting). Approved.
9. Resolution directing the Committee on Human Relations to examine issues related to student retention (Stern; Olson). Approved.
10. Procedural motion from the steering Committee to fill a vacancy on UCUI (Tripp; Briggs-Bunting). Approved.
11. Procedural motion from the Steering Committee to extend the Senate calendar as necessary (Cass; Eberwein).

Mr. Dahlgren called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m., explaining that Mr. Kleckner was unfortunately tied up for the day at a budgetary meeting with the president. He held forth the hope that the familiar chair might make an appearance toward the end of the day's session.

Meanwhile, he forged ahead with the work at hand, drawing the Senate's attention to four sets of minutes circulated within the week, three of them constituting the long-awaited record of the previous year's final meetings. These contributions to Senate lore were duly reviewed in chronological order. First the body considered the minutes of 15 February 1990 (Moved, Ms. Salomon; seconded Ms. Tripp), then those of 12 April 1990 (Moved, Ms. Briggs-Bunting; seconded, Mr. Stern), those of 30 April 1990 (Moved, Ms. Tripp; seconded, Mr. Stern), and finally those of 14 March 1991 (Moved, Ms. Wood; seconded, Ms. Mabee). All won unanimous approval without discussion.

Cheered by such consensus, the body proceeded to deliberate on the first of two items of old business presented by the Committee on Human Relations. This was a motion calling on each school or department to report its achievements and plans for increasing understanding of cultural diversity (Moved, Ms. Garcia; seconded, Ms. Briggs-Bunting). With Ms. Garcia engaged in scholarly activity in another state, Messrs. Herman and Tower represented the sponsoring committee. Mr. Herman introduced discussion by reporting that the Committee on Human Relations had agreed upon new language, incorporating helpful suggestions offered by senators during and after the 11 April session:

MOVED that each School or Department shall develop a program to increase understanding of racial and cultural diversity issues and to examine especially those racial and cultural diversity issues important to that particular discipline. Reports of accomplishments and programming, including ways in which the School or Department plans to implement planning in 1991-92, should be submitted by October 15, 1991, to the Senate Committee on Human Relations.

Thus, the committee subsumed into its own motion the Braunstein-Stern amendment to extend the reporting date from September 30 to October 15, sparing the Senate any obligation to vote on the amendment. When no discussion followed this announcement, Mr. Dahlgren called for a vote on the revised motion. Mr. Stern, who had not received the agenda, objected that there was a second amendment to be considered first but reconsidered after consulting the agenda. That cleared the way for a vote, and the motion won unanimous assent by voice vote.

Immediately thereafter, Mr. Dahlgren invited Mr. Herman to speak to the second motion from the Committee on Human Relations. This one proposed establishment of an endowment fund for scholarships (Moved, Ms. Garcia; seconded, Ms. Briggs-Bunting). Mr. Herman reported that the committee also had new wording to offer for this proposal in an effort to conform more closely to traditional Senate diction:

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the sum of one million dollars be dedicated to endow scholarships to enhance the diversity of the university's student population.

The chair then called upon Mr. Stern, sponsor of an amendment to reserve some portion of this fund, as needed, for advising and academic assistance (seconded, Ms. Kazarian). Mr. Stern reported that he had just learned from Mr. Herman that his amendment was perceived by the Committee on Human Relations as weakening the main motion, even though he had intended his modification as a friendly one. That being the case, he and Ms. Kazarian withdrew their amendment. Still concerned with the university's responsibility to ensure that students it recruits to enhance cultural diversity be given every opportunity to succeed in their college

experience, he declared his intention to offer a substitute motion enjoining the Committee on Human Relations to examine issues that would improve retention. Mr. Bertocci then raised a point of order; although sympathetic to Mr. Stern's intention, he objected to introducing a new motion when another was already on the floor. He proposed that the original motion be discussed and brought to a vote before the Senate proceed to unanticipated new business. The secretary mentioned that the Good and Welfare portion of the agenda allowed for introduction of new business designed to promote the general good. When Mr. Dahlgren then invited responses to the revised motion, Mr. Bertocci inquired whether the sponsoring committee had any real hope of such an endowment fund's being established or whether it was just engaging the Senate in a hortatory exercise. Mr. Herman responded that committee members felt strongly that something must happen to enhance the undesignated endowed scholarship fund, which is the university's principal internal source of support for minority students. They did not wish their proposal to hinge entirely on Squirrel Road money. No further questions arising, the motion was approved without dissent.

Mr. Dahlgren then called upon Ms. Tripp, who introduced a procedural motion from the Steering Committee naming Robert Eberwein to replace Frank Schieber for the 1991-92 academic year as the College of Arts and Sciences representative to the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction (seconded, Ms. Briggs-Bunting). This motion carried with neither discussion nor dissent.

Next came a motion from the Steering Committee to extend the Senate calendar for discussion of a possible conference center (Moved, Ms. Cass; seconded, Ms. Eberwein):

MOVED that the Senate business year be extended as necessary to respond to recommendations that may be forthcoming in the report of the Ad hoc Subcommittee on Conference Center Planning.

Mr. Bertocci presumed that any additional Senate meeting called this year would be for that one purpose and no other, and Mr. Dahlgren assured him that it would be a single-purpose meeting. Mr. Fish then wondered how open-ended the motion might prove. Mr. Dahlgren thought it likely that a special session would be called for Monday, the 29th of April, and Mr. Pettengill indicated that an early May date might be necessary as well. Any business would definitely be dispatched within the spring term. When Mr. Bertocci raised concerns about attendance, Mr. Pettengill acknowledged that the Steering Committee was concerned about that too. Mr. Braunstein, who would be away on the 29th, wondered how many of his fellow senators expected to avail themselves of the long weekend between winter and spring terms. A show of hands showed that most of those present expected to be available for a meeting on that date. Mr. Bertocci then referred to the agenda, which described this discussion as the first reading of this motion. He wondered whether the matter could be brought to a vote. Ms. Eberwein pointed out that the motion was described as eligible for vote at that session; it should, she confessed, have been designated as a procedural motion, which is the normal way for handling calendar extension. Thus reassured about its power to make an immediate decision, the Senate approved the motion by voice vote.

Arriving at the Good and Welfare portion of the meeting, Mr. Dahlgren turned to Mr. Stern for introduction of the motion he had announced his intention to offer:

MOVED that, in order to improve the percentage of students graduating from

Oakland, the Senate Committee on Human Relations agrees to carefully examine issues which would improve retention of affirmative action students at Oakland University.

When the chair questioned the term "affirmative action students," Mr. Stern professed himself open to semantic suggestions. Mr. Dahlgren thought it might be better to speak of the students admitted under the new scholarship program, but Mr. Stern replied that his concerns were not limited only to that relatively small group. He felt strongly that the university community needed to do all in its power to assure a high success rate among the students it admits. If the motion were intended to apply to all students, Ms. Tripp questioned why the issue should be referred to the Committee on Human Relations. She also objected to the assumption that a student who increases our diversity is necessarily one who needs extra help; she thought the new scholarship program might be used in part to attract candidates for the Honors College. Mr. Stern argued only that, if we are committed to bringing in students under this scholarship program, we need to support them in academic as well as fiscal ways.

Mr. Chipman proposed that anyone feeling concerns about what the Committee on Human Relations ought to be doing should make recommendations to that committee to help its members formulate their agenda. If people wanted them to move retention issues to their front burner, then it would be appropriate simply to urge the committee to devote effort to improving retention. Both Mr. Herman and Mr. Tower assured the Senate that the committee would be open to such a proposal and would be more than happy to work toward Mr. Stern's goal. Mr. Herman voiced the hope that proposals emanating from individual academic units would spell out initiatives for improving success rates in individual departments. Mr. Grossman objected, however, to introducing substantive business at the last regular meeting of the Senate, thereby forfeiting the usual advantage of a second reading. Mr. Stern, recognizing that this Senate would soon enter into history and not expecting to serve the body in the next academic year, hoped that a commitment could be made. The secretary proposed that he introduce his proposal in the form of a resolution, which requires only one reading and is an appropriate tool for referring business to a committee. Responding favorably to that suggestion, Mr. Stern introduced his resolution (seconded, Mr. Olson):

RESOLVED that the Senate instructs its Committee on Human Relations to examine carefully issues that would improve retention of students at Oakland University.

Enlivening the Good and Welfare session still further, Ms. Tripp took advantage of what she expected to be her last Senate meeting for awhile to express great concern about the library's needs, especially in light of the NCA review. She asked assurance that something was being done for its benefit. Mr. Dahlgren reported that President Champagne had made a firm commitment to enhance the library acquisition budget by \$200,000. annually for the next three years; this represents a first-order commitment by both the president and the provost. Mr. Pettengill provided some perspective on issues now facing the library faculty; these included reconsideration of the current approval plan for new books and a possible change in balance between book and journal acquisitions. Over the years, he pointed out, we have shifted more and more of the budget toward serial acquisitions at the expense of monographs. As journal costs soar, however, it becomes necessary to rethink that policy. Mr. Dahlgren described the situation as fluid. Mr. Braunstein spoke on behalf of faculty members whose research interests draw them to specialized or apparently minor journals, warning that

cutbacks in that area would be painful. Mr. Pettengill responded to his concern by reporting that librarians are considering alternative means of providing access to such materials. Ms. Tripp pronounced herself grateful for assurance that the library will be supported more adequately and hoped that the president's commitment would be recorded in the minutes.

Mr. Dahlgren then yielded the chair to the secretary so that he could represent the provost at the reception honoring Thomas Kirchner as the recipient of the year's Outstanding Administrative-Professional Award. Other senators expressed restlessness to follow him as soon as possible. Mr. Pettengill, therefore, offered only a brief report on the activities of the Ad hoc Subcommittee on Conference Center Planning. First, he established what his group had not done, which was to consider possible physical locations for any such facility. That very real concern belonged in the purview of the Campus Development and Environment Committee. His committee had been considering a range of other matters:

- relationship of a new conference center to existing Oakland University conference facilities
- models for conference centers connected with universities
- the shifting local situation in terms of likely competition (e.g. the sale of Duns Scotus property in Southfield for development as a conference center)
- actual campus and community needs for such a facility
- fiscal concerns
- provisions to be included in any bids for proposals

When Ms. Eberwein asked what sort of recommendations his subcommittee might be bringing before the Senate, Mr. Pettengill said that most would relate to the final point about provisions that must be included in any call for proposals. He responded affirmatively to her inquiry about whether there would be a written report circulated before the 29 April meeting.

Mr. Fish then asked whether any other group on campus might also be considering such questions -- perhaps in the president's office or Mr. Cardimen's. Mr. Pettengill said that he knew of no such action, though Mr. Stern called attention to disturbing rumors. Mr. Pettengill pointed out that the Board has put all conference center activity on hold and has issued no call for proposals. When Ms. Tripp inquired whether his committee had looked into the issue of a possible additional golf course, Mr. Pettengill said that they had not, though they recognized that access to golfing would prove attractive in marketing a conference center. That matter, too, should be dealt with by the Campus Development and Environment Committee. Ms. Tripp then drew the discussion to a close by asking what recommendations the Senate might be asked to make. Mr. Pettengill thought his subcommittee's proposals would focus on specific provisions. He was unsure whether the Senate would be asked to recommend positively or negatively on the central question of whether the university should develop such a center. On that note, the acting chair declared the meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane D. Eberwein
Secretary to the University Senate /I- .

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page