



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

Eighth meeting
April 13, 2000

Minutes

Members present: Andrews, Benson, Boddy, Braunstein, Chapman, Coppin, Early, Eberly, Eberwein, Esposito, Estes, Fink, Garfinkle, Grossman, Hildebrand, Marks, Mayer, K. Moore, Moran, Mosby, Nakao, Pfeiffer, Polis, Rozek, Russell, Schwartz, Shablin, Sieloff, Stamps, Wood
Members absent: Alber, Blanks, Brieger, Buffard-O'Shea, Carter, Didier, Dow, Downing, Emrich, Gardner, Herman, Kleckner, Liboff, Long, McNair, Mili, Mitchell, Olson, Otto, Rusek, Sharma, Sudol

Summary of actions:

1. Approval of the minutes of the March 16, 2000 meeting. (Ms. Eberwein, Mr. Coppin)
Approved.
2. Procedural motion to staff Senate standing committees (Ms. Sieloff, Mr. Schwartz)
Approved.
3. Procedural motion to staff the Police Oversight Committee (Mr. Braunstein, Mr. Polis)
Approved.
4. Resolution to adopt Senate rules of operation. (Mr. Russell, Mr. Moran) First reading.

The last meeting of the 1999-2000 Senate was called to order at 3:15 and the [minutes](#) of the March meeting were approved following a motion by Ms. Eberwein and a second by Mr. Coppin.

Information items

Mr. Esposito reported on the following information items:

- a. The Enrollment Planning Committee has completed a draft report which is available on their web site (<http://www2.oakland.edu/admissions/draft2.htm>). He encouraged everyone to read the report and the responses and to send comments to either of the co-chairs. After the university community has had time to respond to the report, the Committee will meet to consider the comments and feedback and may make any revisions it deems appropriate. In May the report will be shared with the President who will consider it over the summer and provide his initial reaction. The report will then go through the campus governance process (the appropriate Senate committees and the Senate, AP Assembly and Student Congress) beginning in the fall semester with the recommendations of these bodies due on November 15th. The Provost expects to give the final version to the President by December 1st. Mr.

Stamps asked about open hearings and Mr. Esposito indicated that there is one scheduled for next week. He added that additional hearings may take place in the fall. Mr. Garfinkle expressed concern about the need to maintain standards while increasing the enrollments; he also suggested that increasing the number of applications should be considered so that standards could be maintained. Ms. Wood thought that retention issues were important and that the idea of increasing enrollments and retaining students might be mutually exclusive. The Provost responded that Mr. Johnson would be asked to prepare a report on OU's ACT and SAT scores and GPA's over the last 10 years at Oakland, adding that this would be useful data as we look at enrollment policies.

He asked if anyone disagreed with the process he had outlined. Hearing no comments or concerns about the process, he continued by announcing the creation of two new task forces. The [Task Force on Graduate Study and Research](#) will consider what would be the best organizational structure for these two areas, either as presently constituted under one individual, or as separate entities. Also what services we would expect those offices to provide. The [Nursing/Health Sciences Task Force](#) will consider the organizational structure that will best serve the students; he added that he will look to the committee for recommendations, that he has not come to any conclusions concerning this area. Mr. Garfinkle opined that it is not only the structures that matter but also who is in the administrative position. Mr. Esposito agreed and added that the Senate will have the opportunity to review the reports and that everyone will have a chance to express their opinions.

Mr. Esposito reported that the proposal to amend the Senate Constitution failed to receive enough votes and so we will have a University Senate as it has been always structured; he added that the Senate will have a full agenda given the number of Task Force reports and important issues that will need to be reviewed in the fall.

Regarding the constitutional amendments, Mr. Moran spoke as one who had strongly supported the amendments. He stated that when he came to Oakland he was struck by how heavily the past weighed on the present and decried the inertia of the institutional culture, the inability to change and the fear of change that he feels is present here. He stated that the leading body of governance in the institution, the Senate, is now discredited in the eyes of half the faculty. He recognized and praised the efforts put forth by the Provost to get the amendments approved by the Board and urged everyone to work towards the rejuvenation of the Senate. Ms. Eberwein responded that the outcome of the referendum reminds us that there is clearly a difference of opinion and indicates that change may be needed. She felt that the decision against the amendments was not a vote against any change, but rather a vote against that particular set of amendments. There is nothing to prevent the faculty on the Senate from forming a caucus so that faculty views are clearly delineated. And she stated that research on faculty governance structures might be useful in clarifying what makes them work or not work.

New Business

Moving on to new business, Mr. Esposito recognized Ms. Sieloff who moved that those individuals listed in the agenda be appointed to the designated Senate Committees along with two late additions, Darlene Schott-Baer of the School of Nursing to Academic and Career Advising and Austin Murphy of the School of Business Administration to the Senate Budget Review Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schwartz. Ms. Eberwein expressed

concern about the number of committees with vacancies and the fact that a number of the committees were lacking chairs. She stated that the Budget committee used to be a coveted seat and that, given the vacancies, perhaps it is time to reconsider the structure of the budget and planning committees. Mr. Moran, a former chair of the Budget Review Committee, stated that the committee was not consulted with regularity and not consulted on matters of much importance. He added that the North Central Accrediting team was surprised to find that the Budget committee did not have any input into the budget process. With no further discussion the Senate approved the motion.

A second motion to appoint members to the Police Oversight Committee for a two year term was moved by Mr. Braunstein, seconded by Mr. Polis. Mr. Grossman also agreed to serve on this committee, thus completing the staffing. The motion was approved.

Good and Welfare

Under the good and welfare rubric, Mr. Russell introduced the following resolution which was seconded by Mr. Moran:

WHEREAS actions of the University Senate are frequently interpreted as expressing the opinion and will of the faculty a mechanism should exist to validate this interpretation on each Senate action, and

WHEREAS the University Senate is composed of elected representatives of the organized faculties; appointed representatives of the students, administrative professional staff, and the president; and those holding automatic seats as the chief academic spokespersons for the total faculty and for the respected organized faculties a method is needed to ensure the accountability of each group of Senators to their respective constituencies

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate adopt the following rules of operation:

1. Agendas be organized similar to those of the Board of Trustees with reports followed by a roll call to determine if a quorum is present followed by items requiring votes.
2. Votes on all Senate actions be recorded for the minutes and public record.
 - a. Yes votes be recorded for all Senators present for unanimous votes.
 - b. Senators voting no or abstaining be noted for votes with small numbers in those classes and votes for all other Senators present being recorded as yes votes.
 - c. Roll call votes be taken whenever there is a significant division.

Comment: Due to the nature of the above proposal I recommend that it be included on the agenda for the first meeting of the fall semester as the first item of business. This reading should be considered the second reading for the resolution since the five months between now and the September meeting should be sufficient time for discussion by all groups in the university and time

for Senators who do not wish to have their votes made public to resign their positions.

Ms. Benson asked why the resolution was needed. Mr. Russell responded that a Senate may vote on something and approve it when, in fact, a majority of the faculty present at the meeting might not support it. He added that a quorum should be present or no action should be taken and that votes should be recorded. Ms. Benson expressed concern about untenured faculty who might feel uncomfortable disagreeing with tenured colleagues or who might face reprisals. Ms. Sieloff commented that recording votes is normally done in large organizations and Ms. Early stated that, as an untenured faculty member, she wouldn't mind having her vote recorded and wouldn't care to be tenured at a place where she could not express her opinions safely. Mr. Polis thought that requiring a quorum might cause a problem since there frequently isn't a quorum present and worried that it might hold up some important legislation. And Ms. Awbrey pointed out that there's not a quorum present today. Mr. Russell indicated that this change in procedure will be an incentive to get the faculty to show up for Senate meetings and to vote.

With no further business to occupy the group, the meeting was adjourned.

Submitted by
Linda L. Hildebrand
Secretary to the University Senate

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

9/12//00