

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
of the  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
January 16, 1985

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m. in Lounge II of the Oakland Center by Chairman Alex Mair.

Present: Trustees Donald Bemis, Phyllis Law Googasian, David Handleman, Alex Mair, Ken Morris, and Wallace Riley

Absent: Trustees Patricia Hartmann and Howard Sims

Chairman Alex Mair announced that each Board member had been appointed to the following committees based on Board member preferences:

Audit and Finance Committee

Donald L. Bemis  
David Handleman  
Ken Morris  
Wallace D. Riley

Personnel Policy Committee

Phyllis Law Googasian  
Patricia B. Hartmann  
Wallace D. Riley

University and Development Committee

Phyllis Law Googasian  
David Handleman  
Patricia B. Hartmann  
Howard F. Sims

Chairman Mair announced the following appointments to the Michigan Association of Governing Boards:

Delegate---Phyllis Law Googasian  
Alternate--Howard F. Sims

Mr. Morris, seconded by Mr. Bemis, moved to concur with the committee recommendations as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of minutes of December 12, 1984

Mr. Bemis moved to approve the minutes of December 12, 1984. Mr. Morris seconded the motion which was voted on and passed by all of the Trustees present.

Presentation of Outstanding Medical Laboratory Science Student plaque

Mr. John De Carlo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, stated that this agenda item would be deferred until the arrival of the award donor's representative.

Acceptance of gifts and grants lists of December 19, 1984 and January 16, 1985

Mr. Robert Swanson, Vice President for Developmental Affairs, drew the Board's attention to page four of the December 19, 1984 report which listed a total of \$140,711 in contributions to Meadow Brook Hall. Mr. Swanson also pointed out the \$122,021 contribution from the Matilda Wilson Fund to pay the cost of a new heating plant for Meadow Brook Hall.

Mr. Keith Kleckner, Senior Vice President and Provost, called the Board's attention to the \$60,000 and the \$108,000 grants from the U. S. Army Tank Automotive Command for the School of Engineering and Computer Science. He also pointed out the \$31,000 grant from Ford Motor Company to the Department of Mathematics.

Mr. Bemis, seconded by Mr. Morris, moved to accept the gifts and grants as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

Presentation of Outstanding Medical Laboratory Science Student plaque

Mr. Kleckner stated that Advance Medical and Research Center, Inc., of Pontiac, Michigan, has worked closely with Oakland University's faculty on various health sciences programs. Some time ago, Mr. Robert Moloney, President of Advance Medical and Research Center, Inc., suggested that he would like to sponsor an award for an outstanding medical laboratory science student.

Mr. Kleckner then called upon Mr. Joel Russell, Interim Director of the Center for Health Sciences, who explained that the award for an outstanding medical laboratory science student is made annually to a student whose performance was outstanding during his/her junior year in the program. A large plaque will be displayed in Hannah Hall and will be engraved with the name of each year's winner. The student recipient receives a personal plaque and an award of \$250. Mr. Russell announced this year's winner, Ms. Lisa Gunnlaugsson, who possesses a 3.87 grade point average. Ms. Gunnlaugsson's record is especially remarkable because she had no extensive exposure to science in high school.

Mr. Russell introduced Mr. Bradley Jones, Vice President of Advance Medical and Research Center, Inc. Mr. Jones displayed

the large plaque that will be hung in Hannah Hall. He stated that he is proud to be working closely with Oakland University and is looking forward to many more years of cooperative efforts.

Mr. Mair expressed the Board's thanks to Mr. Jones, Mr. Moloney and the personnel of Advance Medical and Research Center, Inc.

#### Approval of faculty personnel actions

Mr. Kleckner requested approval of the following actions:

##### Appointment

Marcotty, Michael, Adjunct Professor of Engineering,  
effective January 2, 1985, through December 31, 1986

##### Leave of Absence

Brown, Maurice R., Professor of English, sick leave,  
effective November 21, 1984, through April 20, 1985  
(with full pay)

Hamilton, Barbara, Special Instructor in Rhetoric, leave  
effective January 2, 1985, through April 20, 1985  
(with no pay)

Mr. Handleman, seconded by Mr. Morris, moved approval of the faculty personnel actions as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### Approval of faculty reemployment actions (non tenure)

Mr. Kleckner requested approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approves the following personnel action which has been formulated by the Provost with the advice of the Dean and faculty colleague review body in accordance with the specified tenure review process:

Assistant Professor eligible for reemployment to a final two-year probationary term as Assistant Professor, effective August 15, 1985.

##### Arts and Sciences

Tadeusz Malinski

Chemistry

Reemploy

Mr. Bemis, seconded by Mr. Handleman, moved approval of the recommendation as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

Approval of faculty promotion actions

Mr. Kleckner requested approval of the recommendation set forth below:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approves the following personnel actions which have been formulated by the Provost with the advice of the Deans and faculty colleague review bodies in accordance with the specified tenure review process:

Special Instructors with job security considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, with tenure, effective August 15, 1985:

Arts and Sciences

John N. Dovaras	Music	Promote
Wilma R. Garcia	Rhetoric	Promote

Associate Professors with tenure considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, effective August 15, 1985:

Arts and Sciences

Denis M. Callewaert	Chemistry	Promote
Egbert W. Henry	Biological Sciences	Promote
Lyle E. Nordstrom	Music	Promote

Engineering and Computer Science

David E. Boddy	Retain in Rank
Janusz W. Laski	Promote

Mr. Bemis moved to approve the recommendations as presented. Mr. Morris seconded the motion which was voted on and passed by all of the Trustees present.

Consideration of retirement plan alternatives to TIAA/CREF

Mr. Robert McGarry, Vice President for Finance and Administration, stated that this agenda item was being presented to the Board merely for consideration and would be brought back to the Board at its next meeting if action were not taken. He said that Oakland's faculty is currently operating under a contract which permits the introduction of alternative retirement plans to the existing TIAA/CREF plan, which is currently the only plan available to faculty and staff. A joint committee of faculty and administration representatives deliberated for nearly a year to determine the best optional plans to offer which will give employees more investment options now and at the time of retirement. The recommendation of the committee, which has been accepted by the AAUP, is that the University make available the 403(b)7 (tax deferred annuity) plans from the Fidelity Mutual Fund group and the Equitable Insurance Company.



The criteria for selecting Fidelity and Equitable as vendors included good past performance, low cost to the employee, flexibility of investment options, number of investment options, and service.

The conditions under which Oakland will make these options available are:

1. The program is to be implemented in the first half of 1985.
2. Employees are free to allocate their retirement funds among any of the vendors. The distribution must be in 25% increments of each employee's allocation to facilitate administrative processing, and change to this allocation may be made only once each calendar year.
3. Within each vendor's options, employees are free to select any of the investment options and to change those options as frequently as permitted by the respective vendors.
4. No withdrawals of base pension money will be permitted as long as the individual is employed by Oakland. When an employee leaves Oakland, he or she is free to withdraw funds according to restrictions imposed by the vendor and/or IRS regulations. This item is a significant policy change for the University, and not offered under the TIAA/CREF option.

Mr. McGarry stated that several members of the joint committee were present at the meeting if the Board had any questions.

President Champagne said that this item was being presented to the Board for study because the recommended action has long term effects; however, if there are no objections, immediate adoption of the recommendation would allow the changeover process to begin. The proposed plan has been discussed by the Board Audit and Finance Committee, and it is in agreement with the proposal. President Champagne stated that he recommends the policy, but understands that the Board may wish to study it further.

Chairman Mair asked President Champagne if there were any known problems about the proposed policy that the Board should question. President Champagne stated that there were no problems to his knowledge, but it has been the practice of the administration to submit certain items to the Board with the understanding that there would be an opportunity to study and discuss the recommended action prior to adoption. President Champagne noted that when the original recommendation was made it included administrators as well as faculty. He chose to offer the new plan to only one group at this time so that experience could be gained

with the companies involved. If the program goes well, the plan will be extended to other employee groups.

Mrs. Googasian, seconded by Mr. Bemis, moved to adopt the recommended policy as presented below:

RESOLVED, That Oakland University expand the retirement fund options available to its eligible AAUP-represented faculty employees to include the 403(b)7 (tax deferred annuity) plans of the Fidelity Mutual Fund Group and the Equitable Insurance Company

The motion was unanimously approved.

### Consideration of Conflict of Interest Policy

The following policy was presented to the Board for consideration:

#### POLICY AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING CONFLICT OF INTEREST APPOINTMENT AND ASSIGNMENT OF RELATED EMPLOYEES

##### I. General Statement of Policy

In accordance with general university policies, the criteria for employment, promotion and remuneration at Oakland University shall be based on legally appropriate qualifications, performance, contractual agreements, policies, and procedures.

In order to insure the fair application of these criteria, it is important to avoid actual or potential conflicts of interest caused by the relationship of one employee to another. It is the policy of Oakland University that the relationship of one employee to another employee or to an applicant for employment shall not constitute an advantage with respect to employment or working conditions at the university.

Conflicts of interest may arise when a personal relationship places an employee in a position where employment responsibilities cannot be exercised without affecting private interests, thereby possibly denying the public of impartial performance of duties. In order to remove this potential barrier to equitable decision making, this policy is established regarding the employment and assignment of related employees.

##### II. Scope of Policy

This policy pertains to all employees (full-time, part-time, permanent, temporary and student) and to all applicants for employment.

### III. Definitions

- A. The term "personal relationship", sometimes called "nepotism", pertains to employment, promotion, or other benefit based on family relationships or, in some instances, comparable personal relationships, rather than on qualifications, experience, and merit under the policies of the university.
- B. The term "relative" is defined for this policy as being any person related by blood, adoption, or marriage to the degree set forth below:
  - Blood or Adoption: parent, child, brother, sister, grandparent, grandchild, or half-brother or half-sister.
  - Marriage: spouse, father-in-law or mother-in-law, brother-in-law or sister-in-law, step-child, or son-in-law or daughter-in-law.

This definition is not to be construed as all-inclusive. In an individual case, other family or close personal relationships, including those relationships comparable to marital status, could result in decisions not based on qualifications, performance, and merit. Such relationships are covered by this policy.

### IV. General Provisions

- A. University personnel may not initiate, participate in, or influence any employment decision involving an individual where there is a personal relationship as defined in Section III (B). Employment decisions include decisions on initial employment, retention, promotion, salary, leave-of-absence, discipline, discharge, or any other matter relating to the employment relationship.
- B. A university employee must give notice to his or her administrative supervisor in any instance where job duties involve employment decisions about a relative or someone with whom there is a close personal relationship as defined in this policy. The supervisor shall report such notice to the division head.
- C. No individual shall be hired or otherwise placed (1) under the administrative supervision of a relative, or (2) in a position where the supervisor of that position is part of a reporting line containing a relative of said individual.
- D. For the purpose of this policy, faculty chairpersons and faculty coordinators are considered administrative supervisors of faculty members in their department or area.

- E. Student employment is covered by this policy, and the provisions set forth above are applicable with the exception that a student is not peremptorily prohibited from working for a related supervisor in those cases where the student employment: 1) is part of a financial aid plan, and 2) is directly related to the student's specific academic pursuits. The following are examples of this exception: an undergraduate music major is employed to maintain the musical scores library, a graduate chemistry student is employed to assist in the supervision of an undergraduate chemistry laboratory. In these instances, special arrangements or accommodations must be made by the hiring department and the divisional vice president to insure that all employment-related non-ministerial decisions are reviewed by a supervisor who is not a relative.

V. Changes in Employment or Relational Status Which Cause Conflict with this Policy

In the event that a change occurs in an employee's status by promotion, transfer, change in job description or change in relational status (through marriage, for example) which results in a supervisory relationship in violation of this policy, the following action shall occur:

- A. The supervisor and the person supervised shall provide immediate written notice of the relationship to the Vice President of their organizational unit and refrain from any employment decisions of direct or indirect benefit to either party involved in the relationship. Notice should be provided of any relationship described in Section III B prior to any change in status.
- B. The appropriate university officials, including the Director of Employee Relations, shall review the circumstances to determine if an equitable adjustment in assignment or transfer can be arranged. In no instance will the supervisor participate in employment decisions concerning an employee where there is a relationship as described in Section III B.
- C. If an appropriate accommodation cannot be made (for example, due to the unavailability of a position for which either party is qualified, or an inability to develop an appropriate supervisory reporting relationship with another party), one of the parties must cease active employment with the university. The parties themselves shall have the right to determine which party will remain as a university employee, but if the parties are unable to agree, then the university shall make that determination.

VI. Applicability of Provisions to Relationships  
Existing at Time of Policy Implementation

Existing supervisory relationships on the date of policy implementation are covered by the policy. Subject to the approval of the President, however, an existing supervisory relationship otherwise violative of this policy may be continued until the completion of the supervisor's appointed term. During this period, the actions of the supervisor regarding the related employee shall be reviewed by the vice president, or a designee reporting directly to the vice president, of the division in which the parties are employed.

VII. Records

All correspondence and approvals relating to any employee or applicant, and related supervisor, shall be placed in their personnel files with copies to the appropriate administrative departments.

President Champagne stated that the policy is being introduced to place it in the public record and to encourage comments from interested individuals. He strongly recommended that the Board defer adoption of the proposed policy tonight. President Champagne asked Mr. De Carlo to comment on the need to update the University's nepotism policy.

Mr. De Carlo stated that when Oakland University became autonomous, the Board of Trustees took "blanket" action to adopt all procedures and policies in effect while Oakland was affiliated with Michigan State University, including its "nepotism" policy. Oakland University has grown and changed, and it is believed that it should have its own updated procedures and policies.

Mr. Morris asked if anything had transpired to create the need for the Board to update the nepotism policy. President Champagne replied in the negative, but stated that the administration believed it desirable to update and clarify Oakland's policy in this area.

Chairman Mair asked for questions and comments.

Professor Robert Eberwein made the following statement in regard to the proposed nepotism policy:

Since Professor Jane Eberwein and I are on the last page of the nepotism policy, I felt it appropriate for both of us to make some statements which we hope the Board will find useful in its consideration of the matter. I

have a few points and Professor Eberwein has a few points to make also. My first point is not meant to be belligerent but to ask a question. I was appointed by Board action to the position of Chair of the English Department on June 18. To my knowledge, within four months, discussion and drafting was going on of the policy akin to what is before you this evening. Why did the Board approve me in the first place if it was clear that the situation was going to change or that severe questions would arise about the situation?

The second point I want to make is this: I absolutely agree with the spirit and impulse for a nepotism policy. I think it is absurd to imagine that any institution, particularly one of this size, can operate without such a policy. I think it is completely appropriate and desirable for us to have such a policy. I am perfectly happy within that framework to remove myself from any kind of determination involving Professor Eberwein in the specifics as stated in the document before you. The only relevant item, as I see it, happens to be her salary. I am sure some sort of accommodation can be worked out. I do believe, quite honestly, since I have been Chair and she has been in the department, that there has been no abuse of the existing relationship. To my knowledge, no one has ever come to anyone in the University and said, "Something is wrong here." Certainly no one has come to us and we have heard nothing, and I think we have fairly sensitive antennae up. We have heard no grumblings or rumors in the fifteen years we have been here.

This is your English teacher talking now--The document on page one says words to the effect that there is an inherent conflict of interest when family members make employment judgments about other family members. On page two the word "inherent" is shifted to the word "potential", which strikes me as a more realistic word to describe the situation. It seems to me that there is always a potential for abuse and I do not believe there has been any abuse. Again, to talk about the language, I do not feel that the public has been denied impartial performance of duties because of the existing relationship.

Chairman Mair thanked Professor Eberwein for his comments.

Professor Jane Eberwein made the following statement in regard to the proposed nepotism policy:



I have some concerns about the document before you that I would like to share with you. I just suggest that you might want to think about these things more carefully.

It concerns me that this policy is being brought forward here tonight without having been circulated beforehand within the faculty and staff of this University. In fact, there has been no prior consultation with the persons most affected--people who find themselves implicitly named in this document. My husband and I first heard about this proposal last Thursday and first saw a copy of it today. This is offensive to us. It concerns me also that this is being moved through this body in the interval between Affirmative Action Officers. This is distinctly an issue within the purview of such an officer. Partly because an Affirmative Action Officer, I would presume, would bring to this issue some context of information about what is done on this issue in other institutions with regard to faculty kinds of appointments such as chairmanship. At the University of Michigan, Western Michigan University and Indiana University we know more flexible arrangements exist than the one presented to you. These things work successfully at other places. You do not have before you the document that represents the only kind of policy appropriate for an institution of higher education.

I also am concerned that the policy embodies what I consider a fundamental confusion between the existence of close relatives in direct employment connection and the existence of abuse. If you look in the dictionary at "nepotism", you will see that it is defined as a case of abuse. It means that there has been misuse of the opportunities provided in such a relationship. It seems to me when I was searching for an analogy today, the closest thing I could think of was if we, as a group, wanted to stamp out bigamy in Michigan, we could do it by abolishing marriage because you could not possibly have the crime without the good thing. In this case, a great deal of happiness would be interfered with.

I would also like to mention that Chairs at this University hold faculty status rather than administrative positions, which varies from some other universities. Faculty operate on an odd life cycle that is probably not understood in the corporate world. In the corporate world, when somebody rises to a headship position, the next likely stage is one up from there, and one up from there if the person continues to succeed. From a faculty point of view, we have departments that work



together on a collegial basis. We periodically draw from among us, the scholars and teachers that we are, some poor soul who serves as Chairman for a while and then returns into the normal ranks of the department. We are not setting up some sort of permanent arrangement. We are simply seeking out from among ourselves somebody who can temporarily provide leadership, and yet this policy ignores that cycle. Within my own department we have three former Chairs living quite contentedly as teacher/scholars at the moment. So we would like to maintain that cycle without providing impediments to our ability to seek out leaders at any given time. We do not have large numbers in our department and, certainly, not in any others. When you put a barrier to seeking out leadership within a small group, you create problems for the University in terms of keeping programs going smoothly. We actually regard chairmanship as a burdensome office. The one case now that is presented involving the current implications of this policy being ours in the English Department that would be affected really does not give you a very good example of all the things that this policy is written to do. Both of us are now full professors. There is no higher title within the capacity of this University to grant. There is nothing the Department could do to promote either of us. There is nothing it could do to demote either of us, so the Chairman is not going to have any effect on my rank in the Department. The only thing that he could have an effect on is my salary. I would point out that that is largely determined by the faculty agreement. The Chairman has a small measure of contribution to make to that. He can easily defer that decision in my case, just as he does in his own case, to the Dean. Arrangements are made at other institutions.

I would reiterate what has been mentioned that the current arrangement has engendered no complaints whatsoever from members of our Department. They are apparently happy with what is going on. The Executive Committee of our Department has been just made aware that this matter is coming before you and would like to indicate their objection to a policy being imposed that limits the faculty members of the Department and their opportunities to select leadership at any given time suitable to their needs.

I would also point out that you have been told that the policy now existing is a rather severe one adopted in 1970. I suppose, on the books, that is the case. But, in fact, it is not the case. In fact we have been

getting along with a very flexible sort of system of appointments. None of these people holding chairmanships are unknown to our academic administrators. We have planned our careers in close consultation with the former Dean and our current Dean, our former Provost and our current Provost. We are doing nothing we have not been encouraged to do and are, therefore, surprised to find this issue before you tonight.

Chairman Mair thanked Professor Eberwein for her comments and asked if anyone else wished to comment.

President Champagne stated that the reason for presenting the proposed policy in this manner was to elicit public response. Any interested group or individual may express themselves on the issue. The University recognizes that the proposed policy has specific ramifications for the English Department. From the equal opportunity standpoint, the policy has been reviewed by the Office of Equal Opportunity and by counsel. President Champagne stated his desire that the Board hear the comments of interested individuals and then decide whether to move forward to amend or approve the existing policy.

Mr. Morris asked if this were the first public notice made of the proposed policy. President Champagne replied that it was.

Mr. Morris said that the need for notice is justification for deferring action on the issue to give interested parties the opportunity to bring their views to the attention of the Board. Mr. Morris stated his belief that the issue must be handled in a very careful manner, and that further information would be most helpful.

President Champagne stated that the need for a nepotism policy may be especially relevant to higher education because there are many spouse teaching teams.

Mr. Kleckner stated that, as chief academic officer, he would like to put into the record that there indeed has never been any suggestion of any abuse of the existing relationship in the English Department.

Mr. Kleckner said that Mr. Brian Copenhaver, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, has responsibility to regulate such issues as promotions and salary changes. He stated that his preference would be for the policy to recognize that changes in status such as marriage can present obstacles to actions that need to be accomplished at the University. It should also be recognized that the University has the capability of finding the mechanics to solve potential conflicts in particular cases as suggested by Professor Jane Eberwein.

Mr. Bemis suggested that the matter should be referred back to President Champagne for further consideration.

President Champagne stated that the proposed policy has been under review for quite some time by all of the officers and administrators of the University, and it is the consensus of these groups that the suggested policy is a starting point on this sensitive issue. Further input is welcome.

Chairman Mair stated that the proposed policy is now a matter of public record and that the policy will be further reviewed and considered before Board action is taken.

#### Consideration of policy on sale and service of alcoholic beverages

President Champagne stated that at the last Board meeting a proposed policy regarding the sale and service of alcoholic beverages was brought forward for discussion. Several concerns emerged. Trustee Bemis questioned Section VI which would allow the President to revoke the policy in emergency situations. The word "revoke" has been changed to "suspend".

Trustee Riley had requested that an opinion on the proposed policy should be obtained from the Liquor Control Commission. The policy has been submitted to the Commission and a Commission representative has informed Mr. De Carlo that it has no objection to the policy.

Student body representatives requested clarification concerning provisions relating to off-campus events. The first sentence of Section V of the policy has been changed to read:

The service or sale of alcoholic beverages at off-campus official University-sponsored programs is prohibited unless such event is conducted in accordance with the law, or at licensed facilities.

If an event is clearly an official University event, it must follow the provisions of the policy. If the event is an official function for which the University is responsible, this policy will apply off campus as well as on campus. University liability must be clearly understood. There must be a legal basis for identifying an event as an official University event.

President Champagne asked Mr. Robert McClory, former President of the University Congress, and Mr. Michael Carbone, current President of the University Congress, if either of them had any comment.

Mr. McClory stated that he believes the University has made a comprehensive attempt to come to grips with the issue at hand. It is the general opinion of the student body to encourage adoption of the policy. He added that if the student body were allotted two licenses as stipulated in the policy, three licenses would be remaining. Some students feel that the student body should have more than two licenses per year. If the remaining three licenses are unused, the student body will most likely apply for them.

Mr. De Carlo pointed out that if the policy is adopted, it is necessary to amend ordinance 12, Section 2.02, which lists the campus locations where it is permissible to use or possess alcoholic beverages. Mr. De Carlo also suggested for clarification purposes the striking of the reference to Meadow Brook Hall from Section III of the policy previously submitted.

Mr. Riley asked if the Liquor Control Commission had given a definite opinion of Oakland's proposed policy. Mr. De Carlo answered that he had spoken by telephone twice with a representative of the Enforcement Division of the Commission who stated that he had reviewed the proposed policy and had no objections or suggested changes.

Mr. Riley asked about the procedure for obtaining the bonds required under Paragraph III, Section D.

Mr. De Carlo stated that Mr. Kleckner, Mrs. Ray-Bledsoe and Mr. McGarry would be responsible for certain approvals and the creation of procedures. The University will establish specific procedural steps that must be followed to ensure compliance with the policy and with the law. These requirements will be part of the application for a license. If an event is University authorized, Oakland must be concerned that its liability is covered by insurance. If an event is not University-authorized, Oakland must be sure it is held harmless.

Mr. Riley stated that the entity named on the license will always be the defendant. Mr. De Carlo agreed.

Chairman Mair asked for a motion on the proposed policy and ordinance as set forth below:

#### SERVICE AND SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON CAMPUS

##### I. Service of alcoholic beverages at Meadow Brook Hall.

- A. The Michigan Liquor Control Commission has granted a Class C conference center liquor license to Oakland University in the name of the Board of Trustees for use at Meadow Brook Hall. This li-

cense permits the service and sale of alcoholic beverages at regularly scheduled activities at the Hall.

- B. All alcoholic beverages served at Meadow Brook Hall must be purchased from the Hall, which in turn is required by law to acquire such beverages from licensed agencies.
- C. Organizations or individuals desiring to serve or sell alcoholic beverages on campus are encouraged to schedule their activities at Meadow Brook Hall.
- D. Activities at Meadow Brook Hall where alcoholic beverages will be served or sold must be scheduled in advance with the appropriate office at Meadow Brook Hall.

II. Service of alcoholic beverages at campus locations other than Meadow Brook Hall.

- A. The University recognizes the occasional need to permit the limited service or sale of alcoholic beverages in conjunction with programs, in accordance with the law, at locations other than Meadow Brook Hall. State law permits the issuance of a special (24 hour) license by the Liquor Control Commission for the consumption of alcoholic beverages on State property when the license is approved by the governing body of the State property involved. The rules and regulations of the Michigan Liquor Control Act provide that five special (24 hour) liquor licenses may be issued to a nonprofit, religious, fraternal, civic or patriotic organization during a calendar year. The Board of Trustees, therefore, authorizes limited service and sale of alcoholic beverages in accordance with the law, under the following conditions:

- 1. During each calendar year two University-wide student events may be authorized for the service or sale of alcoholic beverages on campus. Persons desiring to either serve or sell alcoholic beverages on campus for these student events must receive the approval of the Vice President for Student Affairs and the President of the University, and comply with the requirements of this policy. The licenses will be requested in the name of the University.

2. During each calendar year, three additional events may be authorized to serve or sell alcoholic beverages on campus. These events should be of a general nature and must have the prior approval of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the President of the University, and comply with the requirements of this policy. The licenses will be requested in the name of the University.
3. The University may approve during each calendar year up to five events for the service or sale of alcoholic beverages to employee organizations which may qualify under the law and the regulations of the Liquor Control Commission as organizations entitled to receive special (24 hour) licenses. The total number of events approved shall not exceed five in any calendar year. The distribution of the licenses will be determined by the University with the date of receipt being a factor in the decision. The Vice President for Finance and Administration will be responsible for administering this provision. An effort will be made to assure an equitable distribution of the approvals to various employee organizations. The University will not be the sponsor for such events since these are considered to be independent organizations which may qualify as separate legal entities for such special (24 hour) licenses. The organizations must conform to all University rules and regulations and provide required insurance indemnifying the University. These events should be general University activities and must have the prior approval of the Vice President for Finance and Administration and the President of the University.
4. The Oakland University Foundation, as a separate legal entity, may be entitled under the law to five special (24 hour) licenses during a calendar year. The Foundation may request University approval for up to five events during the calendar year. The requests must have the approval of the President of the University. The Foundation must conform to University rules and regulations and provide required insurance indemnifying the University.
5. The Meadow Brook Performing Arts Company, as a separate legal entity, may be entitled to five



special (24 hour) licenses under the law. The Company may request University authorization to serve or sell alcoholic beverages at five events during the year. The Meadow Brook Performing Arts Company must receive the approval of the President before applying for any license. The Company must conform to University rules and regulations and provide required insurance indemnifying the University.

- B. In order to comply with the law and maintain the integrity of the institution, it has been determined that special (24 hour) licenses should be limited to the groups set forth above. The University shall not be responsible for any action on the part of the Liquor Control Commission regarding the denial of any application for a license. No non-University organization or campus group may request approval to sell or serve alcoholic beverages on campus other than at Meadow Brook Hall.

### III. Procedures regarding special (24 hour) licenses.

- A. After an organization receives approval to serve or sell alcoholic beverages, a special (24 hour) liquor license must be obtained from the Michigan Liquor Control Commission.
- B. The service and sale of alcoholic beverages may be held only in those locations authorized in Ordinance No. 2.02 of Chapter 2. The locations authorized for special (24 hour) licenses are as follows: Meadow Brook Festival grounds; Sunset Terrace; Meadow Brook Club House; Oakland Center rooms as approved by the administration; Meadow Brook Art Gallery and Theatre in Wilson Hall; and the lower level of the Barn Theatre.
- C. The rules and regulations of the Michigan Liquor Control Commission provide that application for the special liquor license must be made to the Commission not less than 10 days and no more than 30 days prior to the date for which the license is requested. The University does not take responsibility for the application of any license other than the five special (24 hour) licenses issued in the name of the University as set forth in Section II A (1) (2) and (3) above.



- D. Persons or organizations making application for special (24 hour) liquor licenses are responsible for obtaining all necessary approvals, posting all required bonds, and paying all required license fees associated with the issuance of special (24 hour) liquor licenses.
- E. All alcoholic beverages served or sold on campus pursuant to the issuance of a special (24 hour) liquor license must be purchased in accordance with the law.
- F. Each organization receiving approval of a special (24 hour) license must comply with State law and all University rules and regulations.

#### IV. Private residences on campus.

The prohibitions set forth above on the service of alcoholic beverages shall not prohibit the lawful possession and use of such beverages in the private areas of university housing facilities including rooms, suites, apartments, and private homes. This provision does not permit the sale of alcoholic beverages in these areas.

#### V. Service or sale of alcoholic beverages off-campus.

The service or sale of alcoholic beverages at off-campus official University-sponsored programs is prohibited unless such event is conducted in accordance with the law, or at licensed facilities. The approval of the President or his designee, established in writing, is required prior to conducting such an event. If unlicensed premises are utilized, then a special (24 hour) license is required in accordance with the provisions of this policy. The license for the off-campus event will be offset against an eligible organization's quota for a licensed on-campus or off-campus event.

#### VI. Duration of policy.

- A. This policy is revocable at any time at the discretion of the Board of Trustees. The Board authorizes the President to suspend the operation of this policy if the President determines that it is necessary in order to protect the institution from liability. Those events approved prior to the revocation or suspension action, and not made specifically subject to the revocation or suspen-

sion provisions, may be conducted in accordance with this policy and the law. During the period of revocation or suspension, no additional licenses will be authorized. All suspensions will be reported to the Board along with the rationale for the action at the next regularly scheduled meeting following the suspension.

- B. The Board or the President has the authority to revoke any previously authorized licensed event prior to its occurrence, even if a license is granted by the Liquor Control Commission, if in the opinion of the Board or the President the event will not be conducted in accordance with the rules and regulations of the University, or the law, or if such event could create potential liability to the institution.
- C. All authorizations will be issued subject to the conditions set forth in paragraphs A and B in order to place the parties on notice of the reservation of these rights by the institution. The authorization will include a condition that provides that the University will not be held responsible for any costs incurred under these provisions when the Board or the President is acting in the interest of the institution.
- D. Semiannual reports will be made to the Board of Trustees regarding the activities authorized under this policy. The Board will review this policy annually to determine whether there is need for any amendment.

The following is an amendment to Chapter 2 of the Oakland University Ordinances:

#### Chapter 2 Campus Regulations

- 2.02 Alcoholic Beverages. No person shall use or possess any alcoholic beverage on the campus except in permitted areas as established in this section. The lawful possession and the lawful and moderate use of alcoholic beverages shall be permitted in the private areas of University housing facilities including rooms, suites, apartments, and private homes and during scheduled and official University activities or University-approved events at the following locations: Meadow Brook Festival grounds; Sunset Terrace; Meadow Brook Club House; Meadow Brook Hall; the Oakland Center in areas with

prior approval of the President or a Presidential designee; Meadow Brook Art Gallery and Theatre in Wilson Hall; and the lower level of the Barn Theater. The use of alcoholic beverages shall not be deemed to be moderate if it causes material impairment of the senses, judgment, or physical abilities of the user, or if it is used in association with a disturbance of the peace or other disorderly conduct.

Mr. Bemis moved to approve both the policy and the ordinance amendment. Mr. Morris seconded the motion which was voted on and passed by all of the Trustees present.

President Champagne stated that he wished to assure the student body that the Board and the administration will be open to evaluation of the success of this new policy. Comments will be welcomed from the University Congress at any time.

### President's Report

President Champagne stated that he wished to allocate his time to the report of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education. (What follows is a paraphrase of President Champagne's remarks. The first person presentation is retained, however, for ease of reading.)

Approximately a year ago Governor James Blanchard, in trying to deal with the problems of higher education, appointed the Commission on the Future of Higher Education to make recommendations. Every university and college in the State of Michigan commends the Governor for appointing the Commission to raise these issues. My comments are not intended to criticize Governor Blanchard in any way, but are merely Oakland University's reaction to the Commission's recommendations. Since the Commission report was published December 13, 1984, Oakland has taken the public position of disagreement with certain provisions of the report. The Commission was dissolved upon publication of its report; therefore, no possibility of appeal to the Commission exists. However, an attempt can be made to point out areas that should be reconsidered by the Governor before any specific action is taken. A significant number of community contacts have been made. Mr. De Carlo and I have visited with many members of the Legislature and the Governor's staff regarding the Commission's report. It is encouraging to note that there is an understanding in Lansing that Oakland University is a more comprehensive institution than was portrayed in the report. My purpose tonight is to present an overall analysis of the report and to give to the Board members a written analysis of the report. The analysis follows the order of the Commission's report and begins by stating that the report is generally a very positive statement of

the needs in Michigan relative to higher education; however, certain items in the document are not accurate relative to Oakland University.

The report calls for greater equal opportunity, improvement of K-12 education, raising of admissions standards, establishment of a general education core of basic courses as part of the curriculum of all universities, strengthening of faculty, a greater expenditure of funds to upgrade equipment, development of enrollment formulas for funding purposes (an item Oakland University strongly supports), improved cooperation between business and universities (to which Oakland is extremely committed), funding of deferred maintenance, and the creation of a research excellence fund to stimulate greater research and scholarship on college and university campuses. These are all extremely positive things. Unfortunately, Oakland University must take exception to certain items upon which my report tonight will focus.

My first concern is Recommendation X, which calls for a classification of all State institutions of higher education according to the defined role and mission suggested by the Commission. There are 15 four year colleges and universities in the State of Michigan. Certain ones have assumed certain roles, but at the present time there is no classification system in the State. There are several national classification schemes, the most famous of which is the Carnegie system which defines the relative role and scope of institutions based upon the comprehensiveness of their programs. Institutions such as the University of Michigan, Michigan State University and Wayne State University come out on the high side because they are large comprehensive universities. All of the remaining public institutions in the State are also categorized as comprehensive colleges and universities but not as high as what we have traditionally called the "Big 3". This classification system, which already exists, is a clear system that faculty all over the nation understand. It is one that is fair and allows institutions in this state to be compared to institutions in all of the other 49 states. It seems unnecessary to inject a new classification system that is not consistent with the systems which currently exist. The five categories recommended by the Commission are the community colleges, the technical colleges, the regional colleges, the general state universities and the nationally-recognized research institutions.

In this particular recommendation, the Commission also recommends that the State tie funding to the particular role and mission classification. When a university's funding is tied to an inaccurate classification, the question of an injured institutional ego more importantly becomes a question of institutional survival. Oakland is already underfunded by \$400 per student per

year compared to the average of the other eleven comparable institutions. If you were to superimpose on that fact a lesser role for the University and, in fact, not call it a university but relegate it to the role of a college (whose principal programs would be undergraduate with a very select few graduate programs), Oakland's funding situation would be even further disadvantaged.

The classification scheme whereby Oakland was placed in the category of a regional college ignores the reality of what Oakland University is in the educational system of the State. Oakland is a comprehensive research institution. It has over 100 programs of different majors and areas: approximately 70 at the undergraduate level, 30 at the graduate and master's levels, and three doctoral programs. Oakland is, by every nationally measurable standard, a comprehensive research institution.

The quality, scope, and breadth of Oakland's research is as good as the quality of the research which is done at some of the institutions classified in the Commission's scheme as nationally recognized research institutions. Research at Oakland University has been pinpointed and focused at specific areas. What other institution is doing the kind of vision research that Oakland is doing in its Institute of Biological Science, which has been funded over the years at over \$8 million from the federal government? One need only look at the work that is going on in Oakland's School of Engineering and in the science areas, or to see Professor Arun Roy going to Sweden to present his paper before the Nobel Symposium to understand something about the quality of Oakland's research. What other institution is doing the kind of killer cell cancer research that is going on at Oakland?

The breadth of our research is not going to compare to an institution that is doing \$100 million worth of research, but the quality and depth of the targeted research we are doing is every bit as basic and scholarly as the research going on at other institutions. To say that this institution is not a research institution simply cannot be supported by any measure of comparison. If you just take dollar volume, we are the fifth largest research institution in the State--higher than the four general state universities which are classified and given a more pre-eminent role in research by the Commission. This past year we received about \$4.5 million for sponsored activities, bringing in an indirect cost recovery of about \$700,000.

In the area of economic development, I don't know of any university in this State that is doing more with economic development than this institution which has demonstrated its ability in the past few years through the Oakland Technology Park. If the role as a regional college were accepted for



Oakland University, it could possibly take us out of the area of "technology transfer", which is specifically defined in the document as the purview of the nationally recognized universities and the general State colleges. According to the report, regional colleges should provide only "economic development assistance". What the Commission means by that statement is unclear, but I suspect it means courses designed to help people set up businesses as opposed to actually getting into the process of technology transfer, which is the whole underlying principle of the Oakland Technology Park.

Another area that concerns me is the manner of implementing formula funding. The Commission has recommended formula funding and deserves high praise for that position. However, the Commission failed to go far enough, in my judgment. The Commission recommends that the Department of Management and Budget should develop formulas to relate funding to enrollment and should phase in that process. I agree with this recommendation, but what should have been addressed is the initial correction of the inequities that exist between those institutions that are currently underfunded because their growth in the past four years has not been funded, and the schools who are currently being funded for thousands of students that no longer exist. We are not advocating that those schools that have lost enrollment should lose that funding, but it seems to me that those schools that have grown should at the least be funded for that growth. The amount of this catch-up funding for the State is not overwhelming; about \$21 million would bring the entire State back up to parity, in our estimate. What that would mean to Oakland University, because of our enormous growth, would be an addition of about \$4 million to our base annual appropriation. Many problems we face at this institution, such as the lack of academic advisors, the lack of adequate information systems, and our archaic registration system could be corrected if our base appropriation were adjusted consistent with the size of the existing student body. In addition, our faculty has the highest teaching load in the State. We would like to reduce that load to a level that approximates national norms and at least to the norms of the other institutions in this State. The question of the enrollment funding inequities should have been addressed. To me, that is as important as deferred maintenance, obsolete instructional equipment, and the research excellence fund.

Another item to which the Commission spoke concerned the guidelines for the funding of new buildings. I do not quarrel with the basic criteria that were set up for the determination of whether or not new buildings are needed, but I think the Commission's analysis did not recognize the existing needs of our campuses. I think we need to attempt to convince the Legislature and the Governor that there are still building needs on our col-

lege campuses. Because there has been a state-wide decline in enrollment does not mean that we do not need new buildings. Some of the buildings simply cannot be "retrofitted" to meet the new curricula that are emerging, and others are simply inadequate in terms of size. Our campus is a good example. The average number of square feet available for general purposes on all college campuses across the State is 214 square feet per student. Oakland's is 111 square feet. We account for 4.8% of the enrollment in this State yet we account for 2.5% of the square footage. Certainly, we think that the request for expanding the Kresge Library, which was built to accommodate 4,800 students--we now have 12,000 students--was a legitimate request. We wish that these types of building needs would have been considered in the capital improvement area, or in a long term master plan for facilities development.

The issue of economic development is one that permeates the entire Commission document. We are very pleased that the Commission recognizes that economic development and higher education go hand in hand. They are integrated concepts in our information society. However, the Commission has confused the issues of economic development and technology development. There is a fundamental difference. The Commission, in specifying that economic development should be the purview of a select few institutions, was talking more about the field of technology development. Not all of our institutions are going to be involved with the development of new technology, but Oakland University is involved with that process now. So is the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Wayne State University and Michigan Technological University. The research institutions alone are involved in the development of new and emerging technologies, but all 15 schools should be involved in economic development. Economic development is a broad concept. It is working with employers and training their employees. It is working with the automobile companies, for example, in current employee assistance and tuition reimbursement plans. It is working with school districts to improve the quality of life in a given area. All institutions should be involved in economic development across the entire state. It cannot be localized or regionalized.

Another area that concerns me is that of restrictive access. The report states that there should be greater access to higher education, and indeed in many respects a system of greater access is mandated. But when you actually look at the specifics of the recommendations of the document, I am convinced that we are going to deny access to the people of the State of Michigan. For example, let me quote a statement from the Commission's background document which sheds light concerning the finally-adopted document. I am reading a statement of proposed State policy from page 518 of the background papers:



The State of Michigan has no necessary obligation to provide geographical access for instructional programs above the baccalaureate level.

What this statement says is that the only obligation the State has is to provide program accessibility for baccalaureate level programs. I categorically do not agree with that statement. In our society the master's degree should be very accessible to teachers, for example, who need to progress in their careers, and to engineers who need to upgrade themselves to master's levels or who need continuing professional upgrading. The "half-life" of an engineer now is three to five years. Engineers continually need the professional upgrading that comes through graduate programs. Similar statements apply to the Master's in Business Administration program. We need to provide master's level programs to our business executives and professional people across the State, and to our health practitioners. The master's degree is emerging more and more as the common and required degree for licensing, advancement and certification. The assertion that the State of Michigan has no obligation to provide geographical access for post-baccalaureate programs is something I just do not understand.

In addition, the Commission also printed a policy statement that states: "The master's degree for teacher education should be assigned to the four general State universities." This would mean that all of our teachers who wish to get master's degrees would do so at the four general State universities, which are spread across the entire State. The question I ask is: "What about placebound students?" What about the student who works 40 hours a week and must go to school at night to get an advanced degree? We should not adopt a policy which limits access to the kinds of programs that are going to allow people to move into the 21st century prepared for the 21st century. While the report favors accessibility in principle, specific recommendations of the report work against that principle.

The idea of the research excellence fund also is a very good concept. I am very concerned, however, about the method of allocating money to the institutions of higher education. Unless you are in the pre-eminent research classification, you are not going to have much opportunity to receive that research money. It is my contention that if you are already a pre-eminent research institution, you have the wherewithal to obtain resources from industry, the federal government and elsewhere. That does not mean that these institutions should not be given some more help, but if in fact we are going to encourage all of our institutions to serve the economy of this State and its economic growth needs, then some good, basic seed money should be made available. This support can oftentimes mean the difference between qualifying for federal matching grants and not. A number

of our institutions are not able to get into matching grant programs because they do not have that basic money. The research excellence fund should address this issue.

A section of the report relates to institutional and program closures. Fortunately, Oakland University would not be involved in the institutional closure aspect because none of the criteria apply to us. But, even though that does not apply to us, the criteria that are established for institutional merger or closure need to be examined. The basic concept is that if an institution's enrollment drops by more than one-third of its peak year of enrollment, that institution should be considered for closure or for consolidation with another institution. Wayne State's enrollment has declined 28%, and Western Michigan's enrollment has declined 27%. There are some community colleges that have declined in excess of 33%. I have the feeling that the percentages were never applied to the actual enrollment patterns of institutions. I think that the principle ought to be there, but we should not make those numbers too rigid. Some institutions may grow smaller but yet be absolutely essential to the State--even if they grow a lot smaller. You have to look at the regional effects of the mergers of certain institutions. If you took literally the recommendations as they are put forth, you would start to examine closure of the PhD program in computer science and mathematics because they produce in the institutions less than ten PhD's a year. There are certain programs, even if they produce only one or two PhD's, that are vital to our future. The number of students being graduated from a program does not necessarily indicate the need for the program, because in certain areas you may only want to produce a very limited number of graduates. That is true of the PhD programs at this University. These are select, highly focused PhD programs which were never intended to become large. They are there to support senior level faculty who are able to use the graduate students in these programs to further their research and scholarship, which generates additional research grants, which brings indirect cost recovery, which then pays for these programs. Oakland still has PhD programs, even though it is funded \$400 per year per student less than the average of the eleven comparable institutions. To say that these programs are costly ignores the cost data associated with these programs. It is my contention that some of these programs produce money for the State.

There is a concept in the report that there is an excess of higher education capacity in southeastern Michigan. I do not understand that viewpoint. There are 4.6 million people in southeastern Michigan if you consider the multi-county area which is the government's defined statistical consolidated area. This area would include Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Lapeer, St. Clair and Washtenaw counties. There are many states which have far fewer residents, with far more public institutions. We have five public four year institutions in southeastern Michigan serving

4.6 million people. (One of these is the University of Michigan which serves an international constituency, so it should probably not be included.) Alabama, for example, with only 3.5 million people has 17 public four year institutions plus approximately 45 private institutions. You can look at some of the smaller states with a geographic mix more closely approximating the southeastern Michigan area and you will see far more institutions. The problem that really exists is not excess capacity but rather an enrollment decline in one or two institutions. That is the issue that needs to be addressed, and we need to implement some corrective action to help those one or two institutions regain their stability. We should not move something out of Oakland University or out of the University of Michigan at Dearborn, which are both growth institutions, because one or two institutions have had some decline. What we need to do is to analyze why that decline has happened at those institutions and find a way to prevent that decline and to make those institutions more accessible. It is wrong to penalize success institutions and cause them to go through a great deal of institutional trauma because they have been successful.

These are some of the concerns I have with the report. Despite these negative comments, the overall report is good. The general principles of the document are sound. The specifics of application are what I think this institution needs to call to public attention to ensure that debate is generated within the Legislature and in other arenas. I, as President, and I would hope you as Oakland's Board, have a fundamental obligation to make sure that the Legislature, the Governor and other people, who will carry forward the recommendations of the Commission, know our concerns.

Chairman Mair stated that President Champagne's analysis was excellent and asked the President what vehicle was available to address the issues set forth in the report.

President Champagne stated that he had prepared an analysis of the Commission's report showing positive and negative points. He said that making his analysis available to Legislators and the Governor and testifying before Senator William Sederburg's Committee are important means for making its concerns known to the appropriate people. President Champagne added that certain aspects of the Commission report are inaccurate as a matter of fact in reference to Oakland University. He asked for the Board's approval to continue in his efforts to point out the inaccuracies of the report. He added that he believes the Board should write a letter to Governor Blanchard stating that Oakland is supportive of an investigation of higher education, but is not comfortable with certain aspects of the Commission's report.

Chairman Mair asked if there were any Board action required to allow the President to proceed.

President Champagne replied that he needed to know the sense of the Board's opinions concerning his continued aggressive approach on behalf of Oakland.

Mr. Morris stated that he agreed with everything that President Champagne had said. He said he believed that the report did not touch at all on some of the problems of geography as they relate to this area and as they affect where people are able to go to school. Many of the programs negotiated into employee contracts provide the opportunity for many people to attend a University like Oakland. Mr. Morris stated that President Champagne must be prepared to deal with funding questions when he appears before the Legislature. He asked President Champagne to be cognizant of the decreasing State resources issue under discussion in the State and under which Oakland has been operating since 1979 since he will be asked where the money will come from to do the things he proposes.

Mr. Morris stated his belief that corporations should be taxed, and that a considerable part of the problem of funding of education is the question of tax abatements. He said that currently no legislator will recommend increasing taxes to raise money for education.

President Champagne stated that he agreed with Mr. Morris. He said he merely wished to be sure Oakland received its fair share of the available monies. He added that in addition to Oakland being underfunded \$400 per student per year, the national funding average is \$3,600 per student per year and Michigan's funding average is only \$2,900. This is one reason Michigan's tuition is higher than that charged in other states. He added that Oakland must continue to point out that its costs are being controlled at all times, but there is a limit to what can be done. The State must decide whether or not it wants a quality educational system.

Mr. Morris agreed, stating that it is crucial to educate the community who wish to send their children to college and that the recommendations of the Commission will limit the educational opportunities of the people of southeast Michigan. It is imperative to make known the likely impact on the future of Oakland University if the Commission's recommendations are implemented.

Mr. Riley moved approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees hereby authorizes President Joseph E. Champagne to continue to advocate the University's position publicly and before

governmental bodies regarding certain recommendations in the report of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

Mr. Morris seconded the motion. Chairman Mair stated that President Champagne's analysis is also indicative of his personal feeling that the Commission's report is basically positive. The intent of the President's analysis is to improve appropriations for Oakland and to demonstrate the elements of the report that are not acceptable to Oakland. Mr. Mair said that the motion on the floor is to instruct President Champagne to demonstrate those facts, and he called for a vote. The motion was voted on and passed by all of the Trustees present.

Mr. Riley asked if President Champagne intended to present his analysis before the Senate committee. President Champagne replied that he did, and that it will be made available to Oakland's entire faculty and staff.

Mr. Riley stated his belief that, as a matter of strategy, priorities should be set and included in President Champagne's presentation to the Senate committee. President Champagne agreed and said that his testimony before the Sederburg committee will involve the role and mission of Oakland and formula funding.

Mr. Bemis asked for clarification that five Senate Committee hearings would take place, and asked if Oakland would be represented at all of them. President Champagne replied that Oakland will testify at the hearing regarding role and mission and perhaps the one regarding economic development.

Mr. Bemis asked if Oakland had a position on each area that will be considered in the hearings. President Champagne said that Oakland did have a position on all of the areas, but did not plan to testify at the hearings concerning areas of agreement.

Mr. Bemis stated his belief that Oakland should testify at all of the hearings. President Champagne expressed his general agreement and stated that he tried in his analysis to address all areas of the report.

Mr. De Carlo stated that Mr. Kleckner and he are scheduled to attend the next hearing, and President Champagne will be going to the second and the last hearings. The first hearing was on financial aid recommendations to which Oakland had no opposing position. It was decided, instead, to speak privately to various legislators regarding the financial aid aspect of the report. The next hearing will cover faculty training and other related areas. When Oakland's position on these subjects was presented to individual legislators, the response has been supportive.



Mr. Bemis stated that decisions set forth in the Commission's report are based on data received and asked whether Oakland had done as much as it could have to provide complete data to the Commission.

President Champagne replied that Oakland did everything it was allowed to do. He was permitted to testify for fifteen minutes and had one Commission member visit the campus for two and one-half hours. Oakland did respond fully to all of the Commission's requests for information. He added that Oakland's principal surprise was being designated as a regional school in the report.

Mr. Morris suggested that a written statement addressing Oakland's concern on the regional school designation issue be prepared and submitted to the Legislature.

President Champagne stated that he is providing the Legislature with a written copy of his analysis report which covers this subject. He added that he understood that the Board's sense of the situation was that he should continue his efforts on Oakland's behalf in Lansing in regard to the Commission's report.

President Champagne stated that the Board is legally and constitutionally responsible for the future of Oakland University. Governor Blanchard should be given the opportunity to hear what Oakland's Board of Trustees thinks about the Commission's report, and that a written communication from the Board would add weight to President Champagne's efforts. The statement should convey that Oakland does not believe its classification is correct. The Board should invite the Governor to visit and inspect Oakland's campus.

Chairman Mair stated that President Champagne should create such a letter for the Board's review, and asked for further comments.

Mr. Handleman and Mr. Morris both expressed their agreement to Chairman Mair's suggestion.

President Champagne added that the letter should be prepared and sent in the very near future because of impending budget decisions. He added that he had a telephone discussion with the Governor for a half-hour last week on the issue of Oakland's classification as a regional college. President Champagne said that Governor Blanchard is supportive of what Oakland is attempting to accomplish, and that the proposed letter will reinforce our position.

Mr. Bemis reminded the Board and President Champagne that the Commission's report is advisory in nature, and that the proposed recommendations will not necessarily be implemented.

President Champagne said that he believed Chairman Mair should be given the authority to sign the letter from the Board of Trustees to the Governor. Mrs. Googasion agreed, adding that the members of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education worked very hard to produce their report and it is a good document in which the Commission believes. She added that Oakland is part of a fifteen unit system of colleges and universities, and should make an effort not to appear self-serving to the Governor or to the Legislature. Oakland should remember how it fits into the whole picture, and should perhaps find its own methods of reducing operating costs.

Chairman Mair stated that he agreed with these comments. The letter should acknowledge that the report was outstanding, in part, but contained some elements not agreed to by Oakland.

President Champagne agreed that, although the Commission's work should be praised, Oakland must impress upon the Legislature and the Governor that certain elements of the report are unacceptable. This action can be taken in a sensitive manner so as not to offend anyone, including the other institutions which the report classified as regional schools.

President Champagne added that on January 17, 1985, The Detroit News will publish an analysis of the report of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Both he and Mr. Kleckner had made known the strength of Oakland's feeling regarding its classification.

Mr. Riley moved that the following recommendation be approved:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees hereby authorizes President Joseph E. Champagne to prepare a letter to Governor James Blanchard, on behalf of the Board, stating its concern regarding the classification of Oakland University in the report of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes Chairman Alex Mair to sign the letter

The motion was seconded by Mr. Morris, voted on, and passed by all of the Trustees present.

Mr. Riley said he believed the letter should be from the Board of Trustees as a body. President Champagne stated that he would be pleased to draft the letter.



Chairman Mair asked for further comments or for additional business to consider. There being none, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Mair at 9:30 p.m.

Approved,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John De Carlo, Secretary  
Board of Trustees

\_\_\_\_\_  
Alex Mair, Chairman  
Board of Trustees

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date