

Oakland University Senate

1 May 2009

Minutes

Members present: Berven (D), Berven (K), Bhargava, Condic, Doane, Eberly-Lewis, Eis, Goslin, Graetz, Grossman, Hawley, Hightower, Howell, Ingram, Keane, Larrabee, Lemarbe, Lombardo, Machmut-Jhashi, Meehan, Moore, Moudgil, Murphy, Nixon, Pelfrey, Polis, Preisinger, Shablin, Spagnuolo, Sudol, Townsend, Voelck (represented by Frank Lepkowski), Williams (represented by Sumi Dinda), Wood

Members absent: Brown, Debnath, Dvir, English, Frick, Giblin, Khattree, Kusow, Law-Sullivan, Medaugh, Mili, Mittelstaedt, Mitton, Moran, Penprase, Rammel, Russell, Sangeorzan, Tanniru, Thompson, Townsend, Wharton, Wiggins, Zou

Summary of Actions:

1. Roll Call.

Motion to discontinue the Budget Review and Planning Review Committees and

2. create a new Senate Planning and Budget Review Committee. Mr. Meehan, Mr. Nixon. Approved.

2a. Amendment to the membership of the SPBRC. Ms. Howell, Mr. Murphy. Approved.

Mr. Moudgil called the special session of the Senate to order at 1:35. After the roll call, Mr. Moudgil read the amendment to the main motion.

MOVED to amend the membership of the committee to read as follows:

Ten faculty comprised of one faculty member from each School and the Library, three from the College, and one at-large member appointed to staggered three-year terms by the Senate upon nomination of the Steering Committee, which shall designate one of these as chair; an administrative professional appointed by the AP Assembly for a three year term; and, *ex officio* and non-voting, the Director of Budget and Financial Planning, the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, the Senior Associate Provost for Undergraduate and Graduate Education (or designee).

Mr. Moudgil noted the increased number of representatives from CAS. Mr. Goslin asked whether the figure of ten members is correct, to which Mr. Moudgil responded that the School of Medicine was not included in the composition, but can be later added when the unit is fully launched. Mr. Meehan thanked Mr. Goslin for offering his revision of the language of the amendment. The vote on the amendment was called, and approval was unanimous.

Mr. Moudgil then turned to the main motion:

MOVED that the Senate Budget Review Committee and Senate Planning Review Committee be discontinued and replaced by the **Senate Planning and Budget Review Committee** as a standing committee of the Senate effective Fall 2009 with the following charge and membership:

Charge:

1. To work with the President, vice-presidents, deans, and directors to review university plans, goals, objectives, role and mission.
2. To advise the President and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding priorities for institutional and academic resource allocations.
To receive from the President reports on available resources and their allocation to
3. the university divisions, and to advise the President regarding priorities for such allocations.
To receive from the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs reports on available resources and their allocation to the university's academic programs, and to advise
4. the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding priorities for such allocations.
To make recommendations to the Senate on any changes affecting the
5. academic organization of the university especially as to how these changes advance the university's mission and goals and affect the university's budget.
To report to the Senate after reviewing new programs (1) on their contribution to the overall mission and goals of the institution and (2) on the adequacy of the budget for
6. the program and an assessment of the budget rationale. The review should answer the questions of whether the program furthers the university's mission and whether the program can be viable with the resources available.
7. To report to the Senate upon reviewing recommendations for the discontinuance or major reorganization of existing academic programs as may be proposed especially as these decisions affect the overall budget and mission and goals of the university.

Mr. Grossman stated that he shared Mr. Russell's statement regarding the proposed motion with Curt Chipman, former chair of the APPC (prior to the committee's split), who voiced his strong opinion that the motion should be defeated. Ms. Pelfrey also spoke against the merger, citing a conversation she had with a member of SPRC, who indicated that the committee had no business to conduct in the fall semester. She suggested that the committee could be put to full use if people 'got their ducks in a row' and submitted materials to the committee in a timely way. Ms. Townsend articulated that it would be helpful for an informed vote to know why the committee was split. Mr. Grossman said that he couldn't speak to that since he wasn't involved, but noted that the committees were charged to meet with each other at least once a year. Mr. Meehan observed that the charge to the committees is broader than only reviewing new programs. Mr. Moudgil added that the charge to the new committee includes interaction with the president and provost regarding university resources. Mr. Doane offered his experience as a past member of the APPC when Mr. Chipman was chair, and noted that the workload was beyond intimidating. The tasks were huge, and the argument for keeping the current arrangement is persuasive.

Mr. Murphy asserted that the perception that the committees are taking a long time to do their reviews is a bogus one. The data collected for the past three years shows that no proposal review has exceeded three months before approval.

The motion was called. The secretary proceeded with a roll-call vote: 16 in favor, 15 opposed, two abstentions.

Abstention: Berven (D), Lombardo

Yes: Bhargava, Condic, Eberly-Lewis, Eis, Goslin, Graetz, Hawley, Hightower, Ingram, Moore, Moudgil, Nixon, Preisinger, Shablin, Sudol, Voelck (Lepkowski)

No: Berven (K), Doane, Grossman, Howell, Keane, Larrabee, Lemarbe, Meehan, Murphy, Pelfrey, Polis, Spagnuolo, Townsend, Williams (Dinda), Wood

The provost cast the tie-breaking vote. The motion passed.

Good and Welfare

Ms. Berven raised a question about mid-semester evaluations, wondering if there is a place when an instructor can check a box to indicate that a student is not doing unsatisfactorily. Mr. Shablin indicated that Banner does not currently have that capability, but that he would look into the possibility. Ms. Wood suggested that perhaps an "S" could be added without altering the system entirely.

Lastly, Mr. Moudgil thanked the Senate Steering Committee for their hard work and effort in taking on complex issues over the year, and expressed gratitude to the Senate as a whole for their participation in furthering the work of the university.