



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## Oakland University Senate

Third Meeting  
December 6, 2001

### *Minutes*

Members present: Abiko, Aubry, Bazaz, Bertocci, D. Berven, K. Berven, Binkert, Clark, Coppin, Didier, Eberly, J. Eberwein, Emrich, Gardner, Graves, Grossman, Hansen-Smith, Hildebrand, Jarski, Khapoya, S. Klemanski, LeMarbe, Lipman, Mabee, Mann, Machmut-Jhasi, Moudgil, Mukherji, Oden, Olson, Osthaus, Otto, Polis, Rozek, Russell, Schott-Baer, Schweitzer, Sevilla, Shablin, Sieloff, Surrey, Willoughby.

Members absent: Alber, Blanks, Downing, Frick, Goldberg, Haddad, Haskell, Henke, Long, Schmidt, Schwartz, Sethi, Smith, Wedekind, Zingo.

#### Summary of actions:

##### 1. Information items:

--General Education process update--Ms. Awbrey

2. Approval of the November minutes (Mr. Willoughby, Mr. Sevilla)

3. Motion to re-endorse the Senate Feb.19, 1999 motion concerning faculty liaisons to the Board of Trustees. (Mr. Khapoya, Mr. Russell) Approved following approval of motion to waive the second reading (Mr. Lipman, Mr. Russell)

4. Motion to recommend approval of the School of Nursing constitution. (Ms. Emrich, Ms. Sieloff). First reading.

After calling the meeting to order at 3:14 Mr. Moudgil, noting the great interest in general education, introduced Ms. Awbrey who provided a [brief update](#) on the progress of the General Education Task Force.

#### General Education

Ms. Awbrey began by explaining that the Senate Planning Review Committee was in the process of reviewing the learning outcomes and that Senate consideration would occur after the Committee had completed their report. She then provided a brief summary of the process beginning with what prompted the review, namely: a) The Strategic Plan with its emphasis on the pursuit of excellence and quality undergraduate learning; b) The 1999 NCA visit in which the team expressed concerns that there were no learning outcomes (This was in contrast to the 1980 visit when OU was praised for their General Education component); c) The dialogue dinners held in the fall of 2000 in which faculty indicated what general education should offer their students.

From this initial setting, certain themes emerged regarding knowledge and skills and values. She noted that the entire [list](#) is on the general education web site. The General Education Task

Force I was appointed with membership from across campus and was charged to identify [learning outcomes](#). These outcomes were taken to external groups, to the Student Congress and to the faculty and staff via open forums and are now being reviewed by the Senate Planning Review Committee. After going over the general education principles, Ms. Awbrey then went over some of the most frequently asked [questions](#).

She noted that the NCA will expect to see some progress by the time they return in 2004. She urged the Senate to view this in the same way as when a new degree program is developed and reassured the group that all will come to the Senate before implementation. Mr. Polis asked if the addition of the "Wellness" component would add to the number of credits required for general education; Ms. Awbrey answered possibly. Mr. Sevilla suggested the possibility of 3 credit courses for some general education classes. In response to Mr. Osthaus's query, Ms. Awbrey replied that the learning outcomes may be incorporated into a course currently being taught, may already be part of a current course or a new course may need to be developed. Mr. Grossman asked about the Self and Society category and whether the psychology, sociology categories would be competing with each other. Ms. Piskulich responded that what is important is whether or not the course meets the learning outcomes for self and society. Mr. Grossman felt we would need to have interdisciplinary courses to meet this requirement; also that the learning outcomes were so numerous, students would have to take a lot more classes to meet them. Mr. Binkert thought that, with 21 skills and values, it will be difficult for transfer students and asked how transfer credits will be evaluated. Ms. Awbrey responded that OCC has just revised their general education and what they devised meshes very nicely with OU's proposals. She added that a committee is currently looking at the issues with regard to the MACRAO plan.

In response to Ms. Didier's query about a possible information literacy course, Ms. Awbrey thought it might fit in the writing area. Mr. Mann asked who would assess the learning outcomes and Ms. Awbrey indicated that she would like to see embedded assessment so the OIRA or Provost's office would be able to pull the information out for North Central. Another kind of assessment might be a student learning portfolio or website where students could post their work as part of a capstone course. She added that lack of assessment is one of North Central's main concerns. Mr. Mann stated that we would need a lot more people, both for assessment and support of students if this is expected of them. Ms. Piskulich responded that one of the current Task Force subcommittees is looking at the issue of institutional support.

The Provost indicated that budget restrictions will affect how much can be done. Mr. Grossman asked just what Task Force II is doing. Looking at different models and budget issues responded Ms. Piskulich. Ms. Eberwein remarked that some aspects of this proposal appeal to her, that it is like creating a new university very much like the early Oakland experience. She noted that current general education classes are very large and could get even larger if fewer general education courses were taught. She stated that general education classes need to be much smaller if the learning outcomes are to be properly assessed. As Chair of UCUI, this committee is reviewing a number of departmental self-studies and finding departments are already overburdened. If general education gets a lot of attention, what happens then to the other courses she asked.

Ms. Awbrey indicated that if money becomes available from the Capital Campaign, some of it may be allocated to the general education process. Mr. Berven asked if what we are currently doing in general education courses meet any of the learning outcomes. Possibly, stated Ms.

Awbrey, but added that North Central had a lot of criticism of our general education program. She added that the faculty who attended the dinners all agreed that we don't have coherence in our gen ed program. Ms. Hansen-Smith asked why the learning outcomes have to be taught in the general education classes and not in the major and suggested that there should be incentives to departments to incorporate learning outcomes into the curriculum. Ms. Awbrey commented that general education learning outcomes impact all students. Some may be included in a major but that wouldn't include all students and even for the students in that major, it doesn't mean that the students wouldn't benefit from having the outcomes taught earlier. Ms. Piskulich pointed out that currently taught courses could be submitted to the General Education Committee as fulfilling the learning outcomes. Nothing precludes current general education classes from being submitted as fulfilling the general education criteria; the question is whether they fit under a coherent plan and satisfy the learning outcomes.

Mr. Moudgil encouraged this, added that courses that fit need to be identified, that this would minimize the disruption and alleviate the budget implications. He added that we need to improve the system, not disrupt it. Ms. Piskulich indicated that money is available for new course development and for modifying existing courses. The Provost commented that the faculty on this task force are trying to design something that is good for the university and that will enrich the students educational experience. He added that concerns about how this will impact academic units will be addressed and he will do all he can to alleviate any adverse effects. Mr. Lipman stated that we should not let North Central decide what we should do, that we should focus on what is right for Oakland. Ms. Awbrey concluded by stating that the Task Force was told to leave their turf at the door and to focus on what is best for the students.

With discussion of the General Education process complete, the Senate then turned to the business of the day, beginning with the roll call which found a quorum present. The [minutes](#) of the November meeting were approved. (Moved by Mr. Willoughby, seconded by Mr. Sevilla)

#### Faculty Liaison to Board

There was no old business so the Senate directed its attention to a motion from the Steering Committee to reendorse a motion the Senate approved on Feb. 19, 1999 requesting a faculty liaison position on the Board of Trustees. (Mr. Khapoya so moved, seconded by Mr. Russell) There was no discussion, Mr. Lipman, seconded by Mr. Russell moved to waive the second reading. The motion to waive was approved by the requisite majority. Mr. Grossman asked how the Board responded to the initial motion and Mr. Polis responded that it was brought up, the Board said thank you, we will consider it at a later date. Mr. Russell indicated that the Senate could reendorse the motion, subject to a 2002 start date. There was general consensus on this and the motion was then approved unanimously.

#### School of Nursing Constitution

Ms. Emrich then moved the approval of a revised School of Nursing Constitution, seconded by Ms. Sieloff. Copies of the Constitution showing all the changes and a clean copy of the revised version were e-mailed to all Senators. Ms. Emrich went over the major changes. Mr. Russell asked about the section dealing with the appointment of the dean, noting that nowhere does it say that the Nursing faculty or the NCAP would be consulted, only that the NCAP would have input with regard to rank. Ms. Emrich indicated that they would take this under consideration before the next senate meeting along with a number of additional suggestions that came from the floor.

### Good and Welfare

In the Good and Welfare category, Ms. Hildebrand asked why we haven't yet received our telephone books and why the online directory isn't kept updated. Mr. Grossman expressed interest in getting a directory with the names in alphabetical order. Mr. Moudgil indicated he would look into this. With no further business the usual motion to adjourn was entertained and the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Submitted by  
Linda L. Hildebrand  
Secretary to the University Senate

1/15/02

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

*Home Page*