



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

18 January 2007

Minutes

Members present: Andersen, Berven (D), Berven (K), Cardiff, Dillon, Downing, Eberly, Eberwein, Eis, Fink, Frick, Goldberg, Goslin, Grossman, Haskell, Hightower, Klemanski, Latcha, Lee, LeMarbe, Lepkowski, MacDonald, Magnan, Miller, Mittelstaedt, Moudgil, Murphy, O'Mahony, Reger, Russell, Shablin, Silberman, Stein, Sudol, Thompson, Townsend, Tracey, Twardy, Voelck, Wendell, Williams, Wood

Members absent: Clark, Deng, Giblin, Graves, Hamilton, Ingram, Khattree, Mili, Otto, Polis, Schweitzer, Sevilla, Stamps, Zhu

Summary of Actions:

1. Informational Items:

---Academic Conduct Appeals Process? Mr. McIntosh

---Classroom Scheduling Task Force ? Mr. Stewart

2. Approval of Minutes of 19 October (Mr. Downing, Mr. Bhatt)

3. Motion to approve changes in the membership of the Athletics Committee. (Mr. Lepkowski, Ms. Stein). Second reading. Approved.

4. Motion to endorse a Tracking Schedule for new programs. (Ms. Andersen, Mr. Latcha). Second reading. Approved.

5. Motion to approve a new program leading to the Bachelor of Arts with a major in International Relations. (Ms. Mittelstaedt, Mr. Lepkowski). First reading.

6. Motion to staff Senate standing committees. (Ms. Stein, Mr. Lepkowski). Approved.

Calling the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m., Mr. Moudgil welcomed senators to the first meeting of the winter semester. Turning to the first informational item, he invited Mr. McIntosh to explain a [revision to the Student Handbook](#) that deals with the academic conduct appeals process. Students who wish to appeal a decision rendered by the Academic Conduct committee must meet one of two criteria: substantial new evidence unavailable at the hearing, or procedural error during the hearing process. In the past, the appeal letter was reviewed by the Steering Committee, who could then make its own recommendation as to the sanction. The process is now to be amended so that the Steering Committee can grant to the Provost (or his designee) the authority to determine whether the appeal has merit. If the case has merit, then the case will be reverted back to the Dean of the Students Office for a rehearing with a newly constituted Academic Conduct committee.

Mr. Stewart was then invited to address the second informational item ? the [report of the Classroom Scheduling Task Force](#). As Chair of the task force, Mr. Stewart acknowledged the hard work of the committee, which worked throughout the summer and fall to put forth their

recommendations. He outlined seven recommendations: 1) documents (in appendix of Task Force report) submitted by the registrar should be reviewed, amended as necessary, and officially adopted as policy; 2) purchase of R25 and X25 software to facilitate scheduling and to analyze space efficiently on campus; 3) enrollment growth should be discussed in a deliberate manner so the constituents can become more proactive in planning for the future; 4) publication of class schedules at least four terms into the future ? this discussion revealed major difficulties because of sabbaticals, new hires, and a variety of other reasons; 5) Plan #1 should be considered a modification of existing modules (the least degree of change) and therefore the least effective; 6) Plan #2, a more flexible set of modules, which includes three day and two day per week scheduling (2 + 1), is recommended for adoption; 7) Plan #3, which extends the week to Saturday, should be tabled indefinitely.

Mr. Frick inquired whether the committee sought student opinion. Mr., Stewart replied that a student representative served on the committee and that students were surveyed informally by individual committee members. According to Mr. Stewart, students expressed a range of opinions; some students wanted classes held two days a week, some three, some one. He observed that students' comments were very close to faculty responses and concluded that Plan #2 would offer flexibility for a diversity of scheduling needs. Ms. Stein observed that Plan #2 did not appear to accommodate classes in the School of Education that meet once a week. Mr. Stewart remarked that the Task Force looked only at general purpose classrooms and not the space controlled by individual units.

Mr. Grossman raised the issue of bringing any proposed changes to the Senate as was done with implementing the present scheduling a few decades ago. Ms. Berven then asked whether the two-night per week modules were new. Mr. Stewart explained that these modules, 5:30-7:17 p.m. and 7:30-9:17 p.m., are not new, but that they are not widely used. He added that departments should be encouraged to use both, and not just the preferred earlier module.

Mr. Moudgil asked Ms. Awbrey to comment briefly on the effects of scheduling on student retention, noting data that has indicated rates of retention and graduation are directly impacted by increased contact with faculty. Ms. Awbrey observed that in fact research has shown that students enrolled in MWF classes are more likely to attend those classes, particularly in courses such as Calculus, which are not as effectively taught once per week. More frequent engagement with faculty allows students more time for questions and for time with their cohorts, particularly for first-year students. She added that the First Year Task Force is considering the recommendation of a mandatory first-year seminar, and that more classroom space would be available on Fridays for these courses. Mr. Moudgil then thanked Mr. Stewart and the members of the task force for their hard work and the timely delivery of their report.

The secretary proceeded with the roll call. Mr. Downing's motion to approve the [minutes of October 19](#), seconded by Mr. Bhatt, was approved.

Old Business

Mr. Lepkowski made the following motion, which was duly seconded by Ms. Stein:

MOVED that the membership of the Athletics Committee consist of the following:

Four faculty, two students, one staff member, one member of the Professional Advisers Council, one external/community member, serving three-year terms; the Faculty Athletics Representative, who shall serve as chair; and the Athletics Director, *ex-officio* and non-voting.

No comments or questions were forthcoming, and the Senate voted to approve. The second item was moved by Ms. Andersen, seconded by Mr. Latcha, and approved by the Senate without discussion.

MOVED that the Senate endorse a [Tracking Schedule](#) for new program proposals.

New Business

MOVED that the Senate recommend to the President and Board of Trustees approval of a program leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree with a liberal arts major in [International Relations](#).

Ms. Mittelstaedt's motion to approve the new program was seconded by Mr. Lepkowski. Mr. Wendell then asked about the Senate Budget Review Committee's response regarding a study abroad component in the program. Mr. Moudgil invited Mr. Klemanski, Chair of the Department of Political Science, to respond. Mr. Klemanski noted that students are currently able to pursue study abroad opportunities and are encouraged to do so, but that it is unreasonable to require this component. He further commented that internships were emphasized in the program, so that students would gain experience locally or elsewhere in internships that could have an international interface. Mr. Wendell wondered about the SBRC's claim that the new program budget was counting current students rather than new students. Mr. Klemanski stressed that this was not the case, and that in fact the number of students counted in the pro forma budget was a modest estimate. Ms. Voelck inquired about the decision to decline the purchase of PAIS, a basic resource in the field. Mr. Trumbore responded that as an abstract service, and not a full-text resource, it did not seem essential to include in the program's library budget. Ms. Voelck pointed out that strong undergraduate programs normally have that resource, and that PAIS indexes material that is not available yet in digital format. She urged Messrs. Trumbore and Klemanski to reconsider that decision.

The second item of new business concerned a procedural motion from the Steering Committee to staff Senate Standing committees -- moved by Ms. Stein, seconded by Mr. Lepkowski, and approved without comment.

MOVED that the persons listed below be appointed to the committee designated:

Academic Conduct Committee--

Nancy Brown (SEHS) -- Winter 2007 through 2008

Sumit Dinda (SHS) -- Winter 2007 through 2008

Moving to the Good and Welfare, Mr. Russell announced that the Michigan State AAUP will hold a legislative reception on February 13 at 5:00 p.m. He invited all OU faculty to attend. Mr. Moudgil echoed the invitation and pointed out that a good turnout will send a positive message in Lansing. Mr. Downing then posed a question to the Senate Steering Committee,

urging them to consider an issue that was raised by the Graduate Council, that is, how to define a ?new program? -- as opposed to spin-offs, modifications of existing programs, and so forth. Mr. Moudgil supported the suggestion.

At 3:55 the meeting concluded with Ms. Lee?s motion to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Tamara Machmut-Jhashi
Secretary to the University Senate

(posted 2/15/07)

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