



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, March 11, 1982  
Seventh Meeting 128, 129, 130  
Oakland Center

### *MINUTES*

**Senators Present:** Akers, Appleton, Arnold, Briggs-Bunting, Brown, Chipman, Christina, Clark, Copenhaver, Dawson, Downing, Eberwein, Eklund, Eliezer, Feeman, Frampton, Gardiner, Gerulaitis, Ghausi, Grossman, Hanmerle, Heubel, Hildebrand, Horwitz, Ketchum, Kleckner, Lambric, Lindell, Mallett, Moeller, Pine, Pino, Rhadigan, Sakai, Sevilla, Somerville, Strauss, Stokes, Swartz, Tripp, Wilson, Witt.

**Senators Absent:** Boulos, Burdick, Champagne, Coppola, Cowlshaw, Gregory, Hetenyi, Hightower, Howes, Kurzman, Miller, Otto, Pak, Russell, Scherer, Schwartz, Shallow, Stamps, Stanovich.

Mr. Kleckner called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m., explaining that President Champagne was in Washington to meet Mr. Reagan. He then called for consideration of the minutes of the February 11, 1982, meeting, which were approved as distributed upon the motion of Mr. Arnold, seconded by Mr. Ghausi.

The Senate then proceeded with exceptional energy to debate the only item of business before it: a new motion from the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to replace a proposal which the Senate remanded to the committee in December. Mr. Dawson, seconded by Mr. Akers, placed this new/old or middle-aged motion on the floor:

**MOVED** that the graduation requirements?general education, major, and overall degree?for an undergraduate student shall be those stated in the University catalog extant at the time of graduation unless the student specifies an earlier catalog. The specified catalog may not pre-date the first semester or session of the student's matriculation and may not be more than six years old at the time of graduation. Undergraduate students who return to the University after not having been enrolled for three consecutive fall and winter semesters or who change enrollment from one school or college to another may not follow the requirements in a catalog earlier than that in effect at the time of their return to the University or change of enrollment. Upon petition of individual students, Committees on Instruction or their equivalent groups are authorized to make exceptions to these regulations.

Questions immediately arose about definitions of key terms. Ms. Tripp asked Mr. Sudol, the chair of UCUI, whether "matriculation" meant at Oakland University or included community colleges at which students may systematically prepare for admission to Oakland. Mr. Sudol

indicated that matriculation here was intended, and Mr. Kleckner remarked that the policy which had allowed students to use existing OU catalogs to guide their curricular choices in community colleges has been removed. Ms. Tripp then queried whether "three consecutive fall and winter semesters" included spring and summer, should a student attend classes in the warm season while absenting himself in the cold. Mr. Grossman wondered where undecided students fit into this pattern, whether they are pressured to switch programs in the course of declaring a major. Mr. Sudol said the motion made no attempt to classify undecided students, at which point Messrs. Grossman and Appleton suggested that it would be to a student's advantage to remain undecided as long as possible. Mr. Dawson reminded them, however, that the student would be bound by the catalog at the time of decision on a major.

Mr. Horwitz raised objections to the idea of binding a student to a catalog not available until the time of graduation. He thought such a requirement demanded omniscience of students and advisers, and he anticipated multitudinous petitions of exception. He would prefer to use the catalog at date of entry into a program as the standard, with appropriate adjustments. At the least, he felt it necessary to limit implementation of this revised policy to new or readmitted students as of August 15, 1982. In response to his request for a definition of "change enrollment", Mr. Sudol indicated that it denoted a switch from school to school, not to changes of major within a school or movements from an undecided to committed state. Mr. Horwitz's question about how advisers could get an accurate list of students missing the specified three or more semesters brought Mr. Bartalucci's explanation that such returnees pick up registration materials separately and could be advised although not compelled to adhere to a changed policy.

Mr. Grossman saw no rationale for discrimination against someone missing three semesters, considering that non-traditional students might be penalized for unnecessary absences while more plodding traditionalists idle along one course a semester in accordance with yellowing catalogs. He advised retaining the original catalog as a standard for anyone. Mr. Sudol observed that students would not be penalized if returning to programs with fairly stable requirements, and Mr. Kleckner reminded the Senate that?up until about ten years ago?it was Oakland University policy to hold students to the catalogs in effect at the time of graduation. Mr. Witt commented that it would be far easier to advise by the current catalog than a series of its predecessors. Mr. Kleckner inquired of Mr. Sudol whether this legislation was intended to make students follow current catalogs, and Mr. Sudol said that it was; he believed that the most rapidly changing programs were in the professional schools, where they would affect more traditional than non-traditional students. When Mr. Horwitz invited UCUI members to join his committee on instruct in reviewing the anticipated flood of petitions, Mr. Sudol noted that the school could automatically approve the use of either of the two most recent previous editions. Mr. Kleckner then asked Mr. Horwitz whether deletion of the last seven words of the first sentence would alleviate his concerns but found that it would not, as students graduating next year would still be anxious about future developments.

Mr. Witt could not imagine changes so drastic taking place in a year, but Ms. Clark called on her advising experience to testify that students predictably choose to avoid increasingly stringent academic requirements. Mr. Horwitz pointed out that evolving standards for major standing would pertain as well as curriculum requirements. Mr. Chipman saw no problem of implementation if the student checked the appropriate catalog when applying for graduation, but Mr. Grossman raised question about where minors and concentrations fit into this scheme and who would review petitions of exception for less-than-degree programs. Mr. Bartalucci thought the operating assumption was that a student cannot complete a minor without also

achieving a degree and observed that such applications for graduation are reviewed by departments or committees.

After raising so many questions about the proposal. Senators turned their attention to possible refinements. Mr. Dawson, seconded by Ms. Briggs-Bunting, moved to delete the final sentence since such a mechanism for review already exists and is assumed to represent a general practice. Thereupon, Mr. Grossman, seconded by Ms. Gerulaitis, moved to amend the main motion by striking the penultimate sentence. When Mr. Hammerle observed two separable parts of that sentence and wondered which Mr. Grossman intended, Mr. Grossman said he would be glad to separate the issues of returning students and enrollment changes but hoped to see both struck from the motion.

Mr. Appleton then suggested wording for UCUI to consider with the hope of making use of this extended Senate discussion while respecting the purposes of the original proposal. He offered as an informal substitute motion:

MOVED that the general education and overall degree requirements for an undergraduate student shall be those stated in the University catalog at the time of the student's matriculation at Oakland University provided that this catalog is not more than six years old, or in any subsequent catalog. Major and co requisite requirements in programs requiring formal admission to major standing shall be those in force at the time admission is granted. Students enrolled in programs which do not require formal admission to major standing may follow the requirements stated in the Oakland University catalog at the time of their matriculation at Oakland University, providing this catalog is not more than six years old, or in any subsequent catalog.

Mr. Witt objected that the substitute motion actually shortens the period of choice available to students in pre-professional programs, while Mr. Sudol disliked the id. that a student who started in Management could withdraw for three semesters, undertake a major in Arts and Sciences, and get away with a six-year-old catalog? a situation Mr. Grossman observed to be quite possible under the original motion for a sluggish student consistently enrolled. Mr. Grossman and Mr. Sevilla both wondered whether the 1980-82 catalog (officially published in 1980 but still in effect this winter) would be counted as seven years old or six in April of 1987. Mr. Sudol trusted the administrative staff to unravel this mystery.

Despite Mr. Hammerle's hopes of moving ahead on the agenda, Mr. Wilson felt it important to request that this proposal be reviewed by the University's counsel before the Senate votes at its next meeting. Mr. Kleckner explained that a disclaimer in the current catalog distinguishes it from a contract, but Ms. Briggs-Bunting wanted that a student who felt penalized by such a change could sue the University on the grounds of "detrimental reliance." She too urged review by an attorney.

After this discussion, Mr. Kleckner noted with relief the absence of new business. No private resolutions were proposed for the good of the order nor information item; for its enlightenment. The interim presiding officer moved directly, therefore, to matters of general interest. He informed the Senate about President Champagne's trip to Washington, and he advised Senators to plan on additional April meetings to cope with the anticipated press of committee business. He noted that the CAMP report would soon appear, with a special issue of the *O.U. News* offering a summary next week for general information; copies of the full report

would also be available in decanal offices and the library. Ms. Briggs-Bunting requested that this material be made available to the *Sail* for Monday's issue, but Mr. Feeman said it would not be ready for Monday printing. Mr. Kleckner then advised his colleagues that committee preference sheets would soon appear in faculty mailboxes. He hoped that Senators and other persons with extensive University experience would volunteer for such assignments and urged that those appointed commit themselves to regular attendance and active service.

Ms. Gerulaitis then introduced the question and answer section of the meeting by inquiring about the infamous Heater-Heist. Mr. Kleckner explained to his attentive audience that a memorandum dated February 16 was distributed late for no known reason. The heater-hoisters therefore supposed that their victims had received ample warning whereas the offended parties had no notice of plans before the nocturnal break-ins. Owners may reclaim their private property by going in person to a storage area and identifying their belongings. Thus reassured, the Senate adjourned at 4 p.m. (Moved Mr. Horwitz; Seconded, Ms. Briggs-Bunting).

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

*Back to*

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**S E N A T E**

*Home Page*