Minutes of the Meeting of the Oakland University Board of Trustees August 14, 1991

Present: Trustees Larry Chunovich, Andrea Fischer, Phyllis Googasian, David Handleman, L. Brooks Patterson, Stephan Sharf and James A. Sharp, Jr.

Absent: Chairman Howard F. Sims

Vice Chairman Phyllis Googasian called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. in the Gold Rooms of the Oakland Center.

Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of July 10, 1991

Trustee L. Brooks Patterson, seconded by Trustee Larry Chunovich, moved approval of the proposed Minutes of the Meeting of July 10, 1991. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Approval of the Minutes of the Closed Meeting of July 10, 1991

Trustee Patterson, seconded by Trustee Chunovich, moved approval of the proposed Minutes of the Closed Meeting of July 10, 1991. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Recommendation to accept Gifts and Grants to Oakland University for the period of June 1, 1991, through June 30, 1991; and Information Report on Gifts and Grants to the Oakland University Foundation for the same period

Mr. David Rodwell, Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs, reported that the gifts and grants to Oakland University for the period of June 1, 1991, through June 30, 1991, totaled $1,107,313.45. He also noted that the gifts and grants to the Oakland University Foundation totaled $119,742.20.

Trustee Andrea Fischer, seconded by Trustee James A. Sharp, Jr., moved approval of the gifts to Oakland University with gratitude. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Faculty Reemployment Actions including tenure and job security and non-tenure

Mr. Kleckner "enthusiastically" made the following recommendations for reemployment of faculty including tenure and job security:

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.

1. Assistant Professors recommended for early promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, effective August 15, 1991:

   Arts and Sciences

Gopalan Srinivasan	Physics	Reemploy and Promote

   Business Administration

Robert Kleiman	Finance	Reemploy and Promote

2. Assistant Professors recommended for early promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, effective August 15, 1992:

   Arts and Sciences

Linda Kay Benson	History	Reemploy and Promote

   Business Administration

Anandi P. Sahu	Economics	Reemploy and Promote

3. Assistant Professors eligible for reemployment and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, effective August 15, 1992:

   Arts and Sciences

Bonnie F. Abiko	Art History	Reemploy and Promote

Wallis May Andersen	Rhetoric	Reemploy and Promote
Feona M. Hansen-Smith	Biological Sciences	Reemploy and Promote
Susan E. Hawkins	English	Reemploy and Promote
Van E. Hillard	Rhetoric	Do Not Reemploy*
David L. Lau	Communication Arts	Reemploy and Promote
Bruce J. Mann	English	Reemploy and Promote
Taruvai N. Subramaniam	Mathematical Sciences	Do Not Reemploy*
Business Administration		
Kevin S. Nathan	Accounting	Reemploy and Promote
Education and Human Services		
Andrew S. Gunsberg	Human Development and Child Studies	Reemploy and Promote
Engineering and Computer Science		
Frank A. Cioch	Computer Science and Engineering	Reemploy and Promote
You-Liang Gu	Electrical and Systems Engineering	Reemploy and Promote
Ching Long Ko	Mechanical Engineering	Reemploy and Promote
Nursing		
Rita M. Gallagher		Reemploy and Promote

(Two Assistant Professors, Sadik Cokelez and Frank Schieber, originally scheduled for reemployment review are not presented for consideration in accordance with their written requests withdrawing their names from the review process. Their current appointments expire on August 14, 1992, and their employment at Oakland will terminate on that date.)

4. Associate Professors eligible for reemployment as Associate Professor with tenure, effective August 15, 1992:

Arts and Sciences

Rasul G. Chaudhry	Biological Sciences	Reemploy

Business Administration

John Henke	Marketing	Reemploy

*Termination effective August 14, 1992.

Mr. Kleckner then made the recommendations regarding non-tenure faculty promotions:

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.

1. Assistant Professors eligible for reemployment to second, two-year probationary terms as Assistant Professor, effective August 15, 1992:

Arts and Sciences

Brian A. Connery	English	Reemploy

Business Administration

Addington M. Coppin	Economics	Reemploy
Aleksandra E. Glowacka	Marketing	Reemploy

Education and Human Services

Dawn M. Pickard	Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership	Reemploy

Nursing

F. Darlene Schott-Baer		Reemploy

2. Assistant Professors eligible for reemployment to final, two-year probationary term as Assistant Professor, effective August 15, 1992:

Arts and Sciences

Kevin T. Grimm	English	Reemploy
John S. Klemanski	Political Science	Reemploy
Devadatta M. Kulkarni	Mathematical Sciences	Reemploy
Albert J. Meehan	Sociology	Reemploy

Business Administration

Mohammad S. Bazaz	Accounting	Reemploy
Sheila M. Jacobs	Management Information Systems	Reemploy
Sandra H. Pelfrey	Accounting	Reemploy

Education and Human Services

Joyce A. Eckart	Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership	Reemploy
Dyanne M. Tracy	Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership	Reemploy

Eye Research Institute

Michael K. Hartzer	Biomedical Sciences	Reemploy

Nursing

Anahid Kulwicki		Reemploy

(One Assistant Professor, Mary A. Johnson, originally scheduled for reemployment review is not presented for consideration in accordance with her written request withdrawing her name from the review process. Her current appointment expires on August 14, 1992, and her employment at Oakland will terminate on that date. One Assistant Professor, Julia J. Dorminey, originally scheduled for reemployment review is not presented for consideration by virtue of her resignation.)

3. Special Instructors eligible for reemployment to a final, two-year probationary term as Special Instructor, effective August 15, 1992:

Education and Human Services

Carrie Owens-Petty	Human Development and Child Studies	Reemploy

Nursing

Virginia R. Hosbach		Reemploy

Trustee David Handleman, seconded by Trustee Chunovich, moved approval of the recommendations. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Department Chair Recommendations

Mr. Kleckner then made the following department chair recommendations:

RESOLVED, that the following persons are recommended for appointment to three-year terms--August 15, 1991 through August 14, 1994--as Department Chairs:

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS:

Department	Chair	Term
Chemistry	Paul Tomboulian	10th
Decision and Information Sciences	Albert L. Lederer	1st
English	Mark E. Workman	1st
History	Ronald C. Finucane	1st
Human Resources and Development	Robert G. Payne	1st
Mathematical Sciences	James H. McKay	1st
Mechanical Engineering	Joseph D. Hovanesian	3rd
Music, Theatre and Dance	Karl Boelter	1st
Philosophy	Richard W. Brooks	1st
Political Science	William A. Macauley	2nd
Rhetoric, Communications and Journalism	Jane Briggs-Bunting	2nd

RESOLVED, that the following Department Chair is recommended for a one-year extension of his current term, effective August 15, 1991:

Department	Name
Linguistics	Peter J. Binkert

RESOLVED, that the following individual is recommended to a one-year term--August 15, 1991, through August 14, 1992--as Acting Department Chair:

Department	Name
Computer Science and Engineering	Subramaniam Ganesan

Trustee L. Brooks Patterson asked how the department chairpersons were "screened" for the position. Mr. Kleckner responded that the constitution of the Schools and the College of Arts and Sciences provides for the process. The dean consults with all members of the department concerning the renewal or appointment of chairpersons and formulates a recommendation to the Provost.

Trustee Patterson, seconded by Trustee Handleman, then moved approval of the recommendations. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Faculty Personnel Actions

Mr. Kleckner made the following recommendations:

Bryant, Maria M., Assistant Professor of Chemistry, effective August 15, 1991 (filling a vacancy)

Finucane, Ronald C., Professor of History, effective August 15, 1991, (filling a vacancy) and Chairperson, Department of History, effective August 15, 1991, through August 14, 1994

Kaltenborn, Gertraud, Clinical Instructor in Physical Therapy, effective August 15, 1991, through August 14, 1994 (new appointment to an honorary position)

Khattree, Ravindra, Associate Professor of Mathematical Sciences, effective August 15, 1991 (filling a vacancy)

Parkash, Mohinder, Assistant Professor of Accounting, effective July 1, 1991 (filling a vacancy)

Pilchak, Therese, Adjunct Assistant Professor in Nursing, effective April 29, 1991, through August 14, 1994 (new appointment to an honorary position)

Silbergleit, Allen, Clinical Professor of Physical Therapy, effective August 15, 1990, through August 14, 1992 (renewal)

Utley, Rose A., Assistant Professor of Nursing, effective August 15, 1991 (filling a vacancy)

Resignation

Dorminey, Julia J., Assistant Professor of Education, effective August 14, 1991

Stanovich, Keith E., Professor of Psychology and Education, effective August 14, 1991

Mr. Kleckner expressed disappointment regarding the resignations. Trustee Handleman, seconded by Trustee Fischer, moved approval of

the recommendation. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Trustee Sharp requested information on the budget implications of the appointments. Mr. Kleckner stated that all of the appointments were filling vacancies which are covered within the existing budget. He noted that the appointments are also consistent with the Academic Affairs savings plan which includes the provision that some vacant positions will not be filled.

Trustee Sharp stated that in light of the recommended tuition increase, it is "high time we start reducing some numbers."

Proposed 1991-92 Tuition and Fee Schedule

Mr. John De Carlo, Interim President, made the following statement:

> We regret that the recommendation on tuition is being presented so late in the year, but given the changes at the University and the absence of budgetary and other appropriations data, the timing was unavoidable. We also regret any inconvenience we may have caused to our students. We have attempted to make the tuition and fee decision on an informed basis that would take into consideration all available cost and revenue factors. Regrettably this is not possible, since some information such as our appropriation level is not available at this time. Therefore, we must rely on projections.
>
> The Board has been briefed on the budgetary concerns facing the University and at best, the University will

receive a 4 percent increase from the state. I suppose most issues of this nature are relative. Under ordinary circumstances I would not consider a 4 percent increase to be very favorable. However, when we consider that some state agencies are being cut by 9 to 15 percent, a 4 percent increase as recommended by the Governor is outstanding, and I hope that the legislature will support that recommendation. My concern, which is shared by the other university presidents, is that the state fiscal problem will not permit us to retain this amount. The state is already withholding our first quarter payments and there is no evidence that the state's weakened economy will improve. The word from Lansing is "do not expect too much in the next two to three years." I hope they are wrong about three years out, but this year and next are readily predictable.

Given the level of anticipated income, we have made projections on our current budget and found that we would have a deficit at present expenditure levels of over $3 million. We cannot put the full burden of these costs on our students and, therefore, we have initiated very shortly after my appointment certain position, travel and equipment freezes, which is hardly a grand way to begin a new assignment. We are also in the process of reviewing program and organizational changes.

The state, unfortunately, has not adopted a policy on the proportion of the cost to be borne by the student and by the state. We are told to hold tuition down, which we try to do anyway, but we are not given the resources to provide the kind of education we would like for the number of students enrolled at this institution and at most of the other universities.

I have raised this policy issue in Lansing on several occasions, but it is easier to thrust the burden back to universities particularly given the state's shaky fiscal status.

I realize that some may contend that the proposed tuition and fee increase is too high given the rate of inflation, and the burden on our students. Key members of the legislature are currently drafting a proposed constitutional amendment to limit the universities' tuition granting authority to no more than the rate of inflation. If this passes, there will be serious changes in higher education.

There are some on campus who believe that the proposed rate is not high enough! I can only say that this recommendation is not based on any specific bias, but it is an effort to balance all of the issues in an attempt to resolve a critical, a very critical, budget problem, with some shared pain for all. There is no question in my mind that we must also make some changes at the University to become more efficient and to release more resources for our academic programs. I will have more to say in the future about this subject.

One comment about our review process. I met with the student representatives shortly after my appointment and again yesterday. I listened to their concerns about our existing tuition and fee structure and appointed a committee of informed and very able senior staff members to advise the cabinet on this subject. I also shared our tuition recommendations with the deans. In addition, this matter has been reviewed by the Board's Finance and Personnel Committee. We tried to be informed in our decision-making process.

We cannot remake a long established system in a few weeks, but we did incorporate some of the suggestions from those discussions and reviews, and we intend to pursue some additional recommendations in the future.

One final comment. Let us not be seduced into considering only percentages. We sometimes consider the percentage increase without taking into account the base figure or actual cost of an education at Oakland, which is really the critical number.

Mr. McGarry will now highlight one of the suggestions relating to the computer fee that we wish to implement later in the year and the proposed tuition and fee schedule.

Mr. Robert McGarry, Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer to the Board of Trustees, stated that the recommended tuition and fee schedule reflects an average increase of 7.72 percent for full-time on campus Michigan resident students. With the implementation of the previously approved student activities fee the increase would equal 7.88 percent. The overall increase ranks Oakland as eighth in the state. There is also an increase in the Computer Technology Fee along with some specific computer course fees. The recommendation includes an increase in these fees in the fall semester with the elimination of them in the winter semester. These fees will be replaced by certain fees based on the courses being taken by a student rather than the student's major area of study.

Mr. McGarry then reviewed some of the specific recommendations in the proposed Tuition and Fee Schedule for 1991-92 as follows:

1) a 5 percent surcharge on courses taken at extension sites,

2) a requirement that "guest" students be charged the upper division cost per credit hour,

3) a change in the credit hours indicating an upper division student classification from 58 to 56 in order to be in line with the state's classification process,

4) a graduate application fee increase from $25 to $30,

5) a reassessment of the readmission fee for undergraduate students who have been away from school for six years and graduate students who have been away for one year, and

6) a $100 penalty for late registration after the official statistics have been determined.

Mr. McGarry then made the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the proposed student Tuition and Fee Rates for 1991-92.

The 1991-92 Tuition and Fee Schedule is attached.

Mr. McGarry noted that the financial aid budget has been increased commensurate with the proposed tuition and fees increase.

Mr. De Carlo stated that if there are any questions from students with respect to the application of the tuition and fee provisions they should be addressed to Mr. Larry Bartalucci, Registrar, or Mr. Ronald Kevern, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs. He noted that the administration appreciated the students' understanding regarding the time frame in which the tuition and fees have been presented.

Trustee Chunovich stated that the Finance and Personnel Committee supports the recommendation of the tuition and fees increase. Trustee Chunovich, seconded by Trustee Handleman, moved approval of the recommendation.

Trustee Chunovich added that he does not feel that any of the Finance and Personnel Committee members are "pleased" with a tuition increase recommendation; however, there are few alternatives given the budget concerns faced by the University. He stated that the Committee would like to see tuition at a significantly lesser rate; however, the alternative was additional cuts above the existing cuts of $1.6 million currently proposed by the University administration.

Trustee Stephan Sharf stated that he was "extremely disappointed" that the increase is beyond the inflation rate in the country. He stated that since the University teaches efficiency, it should be able to apply efficiency in its budgetary planning. He noted that if tuition continues to increase at a higher level than inflation, many students will be priced out of an education in the future. He suggested that each faculty member and administrator should review his or her own area to determine where more efficiency can be implemented.

Trustee Chunovich stated that should the cost of living index increase in some years by 16 or 17 percent, the University would not expect that tuition would follow suit. He noted that indices should be referenced only relative to the market in question. "The cost of living index is a reference point for many decisions, but in and of itself it cannot be a sole determinant." He stated that for three consecutive years, Oakland has been the lowest in tuition and fee increases of all of the state universities. At present, it is in the "middle of the pack." The Trustees, the administration, the faculty and the University community have been extremely responsive over a long period of time. He noted that the problem of financing higher education has not been addressed. Oakland will continue to struggle with fiscal problems for years to come.

Trustee Handleman noted that it is the Trustees' responsibility to maintain the quality and the integrity of the University. He noted that the Board does not like to raise tuition. Unfortunately, in order for the University to maintain its quality, tuition and fees must be increased. He noted that this is "very painful" for the Trustees.

Trustee Sharp commended the administration for its work in this area. He concurred in Trustee Sharf's comments regarding efficiency. He added that the answer to budget problems cannot always be to raise tuition. If these increases continue, students will not be able to afford an education, the workplace will suffer and American technology will continue to lag behind that of other countries. To place more burden on the students is not in the best interest of the institution or the country. He noted that he would vote for the increase; however, he believes that other methods must be found to finance the institution. He suggested that the University should continue to focus on user fees and is pleased to see that they have been included in the recommendation. Trustee Sharp stated that the Interim President should pay a lot of attention to reorganizing the institution with an eye toward efficiency in all departments and to institute controls with regard to expenditures. He asked Interim President De Carlo to elaborate on the University's deficit.

Mr. De Carlo stated that there is a $3.8 million operating deficit in addition to a deficit of approximately $1.7 million in the auxiliary enterprises. The operating fund deficit is partially funded by the tuition increase ($2.2 million) and partially by the cuts and position freezes ($1.6 million). He noted that he has asked the cabinet to review each frozen administrative position to determine whether or not the position should be removed from the manning table in order to reorganize the institution immediately. He noted that a typical freeze process merely postpones the problem to the following year.

Trustee Sharp stated that he applauded the work of the Finance and Personnel Committee and noted that he anticipates that there will be more creative approaches to any existing financial problems next year. Trustee Sharp recommended a zero based budget at that time.

Mr. De Carlo stated that he respected the concerns of the Trustees, and he noted that "the administration and the Board are going to try to solve these problems in a compassionate and expeditious manner." The cabinet and the deans have already been asked to consider a three percent departmental budget cut. He stated that "the problem is here and now and will not go away unless definitive and permanent action is taken."

Trustee Sharp stated that the "burden of picking up the shortfall" must be spread throughout the University community. Trustee Sharf concurred in Trustee Sharp's comments.

Mr. De Carlo stated that the problem is serious at every Michigan university, and he added that the financial situation in Michigan is not as critical as it is in other states. He stated that the University faculty and staff have the intelligence and the will to solve this problem.

Trustee Patterson stated that he intended to vote for the increase. He stated that he understands that there has been a conscientious effort by the Finance and Personnel Committee to keep the tuition increase at the barest minimum for the students, and he stated that he "applauded and respected the effort." He noted that he does not have much experience with this issue and will go along with the Trustees who have been involved with tuition and financial constraints for a longer period of time. However, he noted what he considered to be inequity in the splitting of the $3.8 million deficit. He pointed out that the amount of tuition revenue exceeds the amount of budget cuts made by the University. He stated that the "burden" should be split 50/50, and he will not vote for an increase next year if this is not done. In addition, he expressed his concern with user fees which he believes are "out of control." He stated that user fees should be reduced. He noted that he does not think the students are being treated fairly when they are required to pay toward a shortfall of $3.8 million to which they did not contribute.

Trustee Chunovich stated that the budget reflects two primary sources of revenue, appropriations from the state and tuition. He reviewed the state's proposed contribution and the proposed tuition increase and noted that on the overall budget there is an increase of 4.6 percent in spending which is closer to the inflationary rate. He noted that the media's portrayal of an increase in educational expenditures of eight percent is simply not true. He added that the revenue source is increasing by only 4.19 percent coupled with a $1.6 million budget cut.

Trustee Sharf suggested that an innovative way in cutting expenditures would be to pool library resources with other universities. Trustee Fischer responded that a reduction in the Library budget is included in the $1.6 million budget cut. She also noted that the Library problem is national and based on accreditation standards and requirements.

Vice Chairman Googasian stated that she has "great distaste for any tuition increase" and would hope to see a budget in future years without a tuition increase.

Trustee Sharp stated that everyone should feel that they have some obligation to present ideas toward efficiency and budget reduction. He clarified that his support of the user fee issue is due to the fact that he is pleased that the user fees are applied to those taking particular courses with higher costs rather than imposing a fee on students as a result of their major.

The motion was then voted on and unanimously carried.

Mr. De Carlo stated that the Board's comments will be taken very seriously, and the administration will do the best it can to rectify the situation in the future.

<u>Approval of agreement with David H. Rodwell for limited post resignation consulting contract</u>

Mr. McGarry stated that Mr. David Rodwell will be resigning from the University as of December 31, 1991. He has requested that he be allowed to remain in the University's group medical plan at his expense for four months until his entitlement to the University's plan for retirees. Because of the expected continuing relationship with Mr. Rodwell, the administration requests that the Board make an exception to its policy in order to allow him to remain in the medical group until he reaches age 65.

Mr. McGarry then made the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees authorizes the Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute an agreement with Mr. David H. Rodwell for post-resignation consulting activities from January 1, 1992, through April 30, 1992, in exchange for an extension of COBRA benefit rights to twenty-two months.

Trustee Patterson, seconded by Trustee Sharp, moved approval of the recommendation. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Mr. De Carlo stated that he had indicated earlier that there is a critical need to review Oakland's organizational structure given its acute fiscal problems. He then made the following comments:

> I indicated earlier that there is a critical need to review our organizational structure given our acute fiscal problems. The departure of any employee provides us with an opportunity to review not only the responsibilities of that individual but other areas as well. This review is not a reflection on the performance of the individuals involved, but rather is an opportunity to review the performance and structure of the institution.
>
> With Mr. Rodwell's departure another question will be raised in the minds of the members of the University community and that question relates to the selection process for his successor. Let me state now that it is my intention to seek some immediate additional input to my already ongoing analysis of the Division of Development and Alumni Affairs and the Division of University Extension and Public Service. It is my intent to reorganize these divisions with some possible realignment of functions to other divisions. After consultation and deliberation it is my intent to effectuate financial savings and to provide a stronger, more streamlined if you will, organizational structure of one division with one vice president.
>
> There will be a legitimate and thorough search process. Incorporated in this effort will be a strong emphasis

or concentration on the academic mission of the institution.

The initial details of this plan will be presented to the Board committees at the September meeting, with further details at subsequent meetings.

Let me address one somewhat related matter. Four weeks ago I instructed the Provost to carry out the established search process for the Dean of the School of Nursing. I believe that it is important to have updated information on this issue and I wish to call on Mr. Kleckner for his status report.

Mr. Kleckner stated that the search committee for a dean for the School of Nursing has been appointed, the first meeting has been arranged and an advertisement will be placed in The Chronicle of Higher Education. The Committee is being chaired by Professor Anne Tripp of the Department of History and is comprised of Professor George Coon of the Department of Education, Professors Frances Jackson, Patricia Ketcham, Gary Moore and Diane Wilson of the School of Nursing and a recent alumna of the School. In response to Trustee Fischer's questions, Mr. Kleckner stated that the time frame will have finalists on campus by the end of the fall semester. He stated that a recommendation for dean could probably be presented at the March, 1992, meeting of the Board.

Trustee Sharp asked how much the search would cost. Mr. Kleckner responded that advertising and travel would be the only costs, and he estimated expenditures to be approximately $5,000. Trustee Sharp stated that a few months ago the Board questioned the cost of an item, and after it was told there were no budget implications, the item ended up costing over $90,000. Mr. Kleckner stated that the records are maintained for each search which he would be pleased to supply to the Board. He added that the funds will come from the Academic Affairs budget.

Mr. De Carlo requested that the search process be handled expeditiously.

Trustee Fischer requested that Mr. De Carlo present his recommendations regarding the proposed reorganization at the September committee meetings. She asked if there were any other interim positions that would require searches. Mr. De Carlo responded that the only one he was aware of was the Director of Alumni Relations.

Designation of Theatre in honor of Mr. and Mrs. David Handleman

Mr. De Carlo made the following statement:

> The Board is already aware of David Handleman's great contributions of counsel, wisdom and time regarding the problems of the University. What is not generally known is that Marion and David Handleman have also made significant personal and financial contributions to Oakland University and other cultural activities in this state. What we are proposing this afternoon is only a token of our esteem and cannot equal the service, time and support given to us by Marion and David.

Mr. Rodwell then made the following recommendation:

> RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Oakland University hereby honors Marion and David Handleman for their exceptional generosity through many gifts to Oakland University over more than 20 years by naming the major theatre space in Wilson Hall, now the site of Meadow Brook Theatre performances, as the Marion and David Handleman Auditorium. In the event the location of those performances should change to another facility, the Board of Trustees strongly recommends that full consideration be given to naming the new location in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Handleman.

Trustee Fischer, seconded by Trustee Patterson, moved approval of the recommendation. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried. There was a round of applause for Trustee Handleman.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Presidential Search Process

Vice Chairman Googasian noted at this time that Chairman Howard F. Sims had a conflict between the Board meeting and another Board on which he serves and was unable to attend Oakland's meeting.

Vice Chairman Googasian stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Presidential Search Process was charged by Chairman Sims with the responsibility to obtain information on the options that were available for the Presidential Search Process and to report its findings to the Board Chairman. She noted that with Chairman Sims' concurrence, the Committee has brought forth a recommendation for the Board's review and approval.

Vice Chairman Googasian reviewed the following elements which the Committee determined were "absolutely essential" to the search process:

1) broad community consultation and input concerning an institutional needs assessment as such an assessment would apply to a presidential search;

2) input concerning presidential selection criteria from various constituencies;

3) involvement of Board members and persons from various constituent groups in search and screening activities;

4) effective recruitment to provide the best possible candidate pool, including women and minorities; and

5) maintenance of candidate confidentiality to the extent legally permitted in order to obtain and retain the best possible candidate pool.

Vice Chairman Googasian stated that with these elements in mind, the Committee considered both an internal search process and the use of an external search consultant to augment the internal presidential search.

Trustee Chunovich then moved that the University should engage in the use of an external search consultant, which was seconded by Trustee Handleman. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Trustee Chunovich stated that the depth of the exploration of the Committee was considerable and emphasized the need for the inclusionary aspect of the community.

Chairman Googasian stated that the Committee members had discussions with seven consulting firms. She noted that it is anticipated that the consultant will meet with members of the Board, the Committee and with members of the community during the remainder of August and September in order to develop a recommendation to the Chairman of the Board and the full Board on the process and the search criteria.

Vice Chairman Googasian then made the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees authorizes the University administration and the General Counsel's office to negotiate an appropriate consulting agreement with the Presidential Search Consultation Service of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (PSCS) for comprehensive search assistance at a fee not to exceed $25,000, plus direct consultant expenses that shall not exceed $5,000; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Board authorizes the Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute the agreement on behalf of the University; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the contract for employment shall comply with University contracting policies and procedures.

Trustee Sharp, seconded by Trustee Handleman, moved approval of the recommendation. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Vice Chairman Googasian stated that approval of this recommendation is only the first step in the process. She noted with appreciation that many University community members have offered suggestions on some aspects of the search. She noted that when Mr. Charles Neff of PSCS is on campus he will be meeting with those members of the University community who have suggestions regarding selection criteria, composition of the search committee, timetables, etc.

Trustee Sharf congratulated the Committee for its "fine work" and the recommendation it has developed.

Vice Chairman Googasian announced that copies of the report are available in the Office of the General Counsel.

Recommendation to file a Brief as Amicus Curiae

Mr. De Carlo stated that the Board of Regents at the University of Michigan has been named as a defendant in a lawsuit filed in the Washtenaw County Circuit Court. The plaintiff, a University of Michigan student, is seeking a declaratory judgment that he is a bona fide resident of the state of Michigan. He noted that the issue concerns the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court versus that of the Court of Claims, and he added that Oakland has been asked to join in the amicus brief to support the University of Michigan's position that this issue should be tried before the Court of Claims.

Mr. De Carlo then made the following recommendation:

> RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the submission by the University of a motion for leave to file brief *amicus curiae* and an *amicus curiae* brief in support of the University of Michigan's position concerning the exclusive jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in the case of *Robert S. Silverman v Board of Regents of the University of Michigan*.

Trustee Fischer, seconded by Trustee Patterson, moved approval of the recommendation. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Affirmative Action Report

Ms. Catherine Rush, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity, stated that she is pleased to report significant progress in meeting faculty hiring goals set by the University's Affirmative Action Plan. The numbers of Black and minority faculty hired in 1990-91 is equal to the total number hired over the previous three years. In addition, 48 percent of tenure track hires were women. She stated that the 24 Black faculty and visiting faculty members reported through 1990 represent a net increase of only nine over the last ten years. She added that it is discouraging that the number of women employed over that period has not significantly improved and the number of Hispanic faculty has not increased. Ms. Rush reported affirmative action progress in other areas, such as the continued success in hiring women and Black staff for administrative and clerical positions. Over the last ten years, the number of women and Black administrators and clerical staff at Oakland has more than doubled.

Ms. Rush noted that significant challenges face the University in the upcoming year, among them are the search for a new president, the budget crisis and the need to continue to be more successful in the hiring, promotion and retention of women and minority faculty and staff. She noted that Oakland is likely to show limited progress in its affirmative action efforts in a year of hiring freezes.

Ms. Rush stated that she appreciated the Board's support in the area of affirmative action. She then requested that the reporting months on the affirmative action report be moved to October and April due to the time when most hiring information is available.

Trustee Chunovich asked for a copy of the Affirmative Action Plan. Ms. Rush said that she would forward a copy to him.

Vice Chairman Googasian thanked Ms. Rush for her report and noted that the Board approved of the change in reporting months.

Recommendation for approval of Degree Candidates for June 21, 1991

Mr. Kleckner made the following recommendation:

> RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the Degree Candidate's List dated June 21, 1991.

Trustee Patterson, seconded by Trustee Handleman, moved approval of the recommendation. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Other items

Mr. De Carlo stated that he wished to share with the Board two communications forwarded to him by Mr. Kleckner. He read a letter from the Kellogg Foundation commending Dean Gerald Pine of the School of Education and Human Services on a report he had submitted to the Foundation. The Foundation also requested Dean Pine's permission to use the report as a model report. Mr. De Carlo noted that this letter speaks very well of Dean Pine and his staff. He also read a letter from a recent student who complimented the University on the "high level of academic excellence exemplified by the faculty and staff of Oakland University" specifically naming the School of Health Sciences and Professor Richard Rozek of the Department of Health and Safety.

Trustee Chunovich stated that the Finance and Personnel Committee has prepared a resolution regarding compensation for Interim President John De Carlo, and he proceeded to read the recommendation as follows:

WHEREAS, Mr. John De Carlo was appointed Interim President for the University on June 5, 1991, and has assumed the full responsibility of the office; and

WHEREAS, the Finance and Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees has reviewed the matter of compensation for the position of the Interim President; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that Mr. John De Carlo should be paid at the same salary rate as President Joseph E. Champagne in the amount of $120,000 annually and that he should also receive the comparable TIAA benefits recommended by the Finance and Personnel Committee; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that in the absence of the provision of a residence which is normally provided to all state university presidents, and in view of the critical time constraints that Mr. De Carlo will be facing, Mr. De Carlo will be reimbursed for certain expenses in an amount to be determined by the Finance and Personnel Committee; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that Mr. De Carlo will also be entitled to the vacation provisions provided to President Champagne and given the fact that he will not be able to take such vacation time for an extended period, he shall also be entitled to a threemonth leave at some future date; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that these benefits should be made retroactive to June 5, 1991; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the above salary compensation and reimbursement benefits shall be provided only during Mr. De Carlo's term in office as Interim President; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the details of this compensation package as recommended by the Finance and Personnel Committee shall be set forth in an agreement between the University and Mr. De Carlo to be executed on behalf of the University by the Chairman of the Board.

Trustee Handleman, seconded by Trustee Sharp, moved approval of the recommendation. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Authorization for a Closed Session

Mr. De Carlo stated that approval of a closed meeting is sought to discuss the negotiation of a collective bargaining agreement. Section 8(c) of the Open Meetings Act provides that a public body may meet in a closed session for this purpose.

Trustee Handleman, seconded by Trustee Sharp, moved approval of a closed meeting roll call vote. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Mr. De Carlo then called the roll in order to determine Board approval for a closed meeting.

-	Larry Chunovich	yes
-	Andrea L. Fischer	yes
-	Phyllis Law Googasian	yes
-	David Handleman	yes
-	L. Brooks Patterson	yes
-	Stephan Sharf	yes
-	James A. Sharp, Jr.	yes

The closed session was approved. Trustee Patterson, seconded by Trustee Handleman, moved adjournment of the open meeting at 4:50 p.m. The motion was voted on and unanimously carried.

Submitted,

Catherine Gianakura

Catherine Gianakura, for
John De Carlo
Interim President and Secretary
Board of Trustees

Approved,

Phyllis Law Googasian

Phyllis Law Googasian
Vice Chairman
Board of Trustees

Written and prepared by
Catherine Gianakura

EXHIBIT I

Oakland University
1991-92 Tuition and Fee Schedule
Effective Fall Semester 1991

		Current 1990-91 Rate		Changes	Fall 1991-92 Rate
1.	Tuition per semester credit hour: (a)				
	a. Michigan residents:				
	Undergraduate: Lower	$ 65.25		$ 5.50	$ 70.75
	Undergraduate: Upper (b)	74.75		6.25	81.00
	Graduate	122.00		13.00	135.00
	b. Non-residents:				
	Undergraduate: Lower	192.50		20.50	213.00
	Undergraduate: Upper (b)	210.00		23.00	233.00
	Graduate	270.00		29.00	299.00
	c. Competency credit exam fee:				
	Undergraduate: Lower	27.00		3.00	30.00
	Undergraduate: Upper	27.00		3.00	30.00
	Graduate	27.00		3.00	30.00
	All Non-residents	27.00		3.00	30.00
	d. Off-Campus Differential: (c)				
	Undergraduate: Lower	-		4.00	4.00
	Undergraduate: Upper	-		4.00	4.00
	Graduate	-		7.00	7.00
2.	Required fees per semester:				
	a. Undergraduates taking 10 credits or more:				
	General Service Fee	$ 83.00		-	$ 83.00
	Student Activities	11.50	(d)	-	11.50
	Total	$ 94.50		-	$ 94.50
	b. Undergraduates taking less than 10 credits:				
	General Service Fee	$ 83.00		-	$ 83.00
	Student Activities	9.85	(d)	-	9.85
	Total	$ 92.85		-	$ 92.85
	c. Graduates taking 8 credits or more:				
	General Service Fee	$ 83.00		-	$ 83.00
	Student Activities	5.00	(d)	-	5.00
	Total	$ 88.00		-	$ 88.00
	d. Graduates taking less than 8 credits:				
	General Service Fee	$ 83.00		-	$ 83.00
	Student Activities	4.00	(d)	-	4.00
	Total	$ 87.00		-	$ 87.00

Oakland University
1991-92 Tuition and Fee Schedule
Effective Fall Semester 1991

		Current 1990-91 Rate	Changes	Fall 1991-92 Rate
3.	Computer Technology Fee: (e) For Upper Division and Graduate Students in Engineering, Computer Science, Business Administration, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, and Biology:			
	a. Undergraduate - Upper:			
	9 credits or more	$ 80.00	$ 20.00	$ 100.00
	8 credits or less	50.00	10.00	60.00
	b. Graduate:			
	7 credits or more	80.00	20.00	100.00
	6 credits or less	50.00	10.00	60.00
4.	Special course fees per course:			
	ED 455	$ 35.00	-	$ 35.00
	ED 597	50.00	-	50.00
	Applied Music:			
	Individual Instruction			
	2 Credits	85.00	-	85.00
	4 Credits	170.00	-	170.00
	Group Instruction	25.00	-	25.00
	Computer Lab Fee (e)	25.00	$ 5.00	30.00
	Course Fee (f)	-	30.00	30.00
5.	Other Fees:			
	Application Fee: Undergraduate	$ 25.00	-	$ 25.00
	Application Fee: Graduate	25.00	$ 5.00	30.00
	Readmission Fee: Undergraduate	-	25.00	25.00
	Readmission Fee: Graduate	-	30.00	30.00
	Graduation Service Fee	30.00	-	30.00
	Late Registration	35.00	-	35.00 (g)
	Late Addition-of-Course (per course added)	10.00	-	10.00
	Orientation Fees:			
	Freshmen	60.00	-	60.00
	Transfer Students	35.00	-	35.00
	Reissue of Diploma	30.00	-	30.00
	Unofficial Transcript Fee	3.00	-	3.00
	Transcript Fee	5.00	-	5.00
	Same Day Transcript Fee	10.00	-	10.00

Oakland University
1990-91 Tuition and Fee Schedule
Effective Fall Semester 1991

	Current 1990-91 Rate	Changes	Fall 1991-92 Rate	Percent Increase
6. Summary comparison of tuition and required fees cost (exclusive of special course fees):				
a. Undergraduate Michigan resident student taking a 31 credit hour load for two semesters:				
1) Lower Division:				
Tuition	$2,022.75	$170.50	$2,193.25	
Required Fees	189.00	-	189.00	
Total	$2,211.75	$170.50	$2,382.25	7.71%
2) Upper Division:				
Tuition	$2,317.25	$193.75	$2,511.00	
Required Fees	189.00	-	189.00	
Total	$2,506.25	$193.75	$2,700.00	7.73%
Average Resident Undergraduate	$2,359.00	$182.13	$2,541.13	7.72%
b. Graduate Michigan resident student taking a 24 credit hour load for two semesters:				
Tuition	$2,928.00	$312.00	$3,240.00	
Required Fees	176.00	-	176.00	
Total	$3,104.00	$312.00	$3,416.00	10.05%
c. Non-resident undergraduate student taking a 31 credit hour load for two semesters:				
1) Lower Division:				
Tuition	$5,967.50	$635.50	$6,603.00	
Required Fees	189.00	-	189.00	
Total	$6,156.50	$635.50	$6,792.00	10.32%
2) Upper Division:				
Tuition	$6,510.00	$713.00	$7,223.00	
Required Fees	189.00	-	189.00	
Total	$6,699.00	$713.00	$7,412.00	10.64%
d. Non-resident graduate student taking a 24 credit hour load for two semesters:				
Tuition	$6,480.00	$696.00	$7,176.00	
Required Fees	176.00	-	176.00	
Total	$6,656.00	$696.00	$7,352.00	10.46%

Oakland University
1990-91 Tuition and Fee Schedule
Effective Fall Semester 1991

NOTES

(a) Tuition rates are per credit hour and do not vary between fall and winter semesters and spring and summer sessions.

(b) Current practice is to assess upper division rates upon completion of 58 credit hours. Effective winter term, 1991, upper division rates will be assessed upon completion of 55 credit hours.

(c) The off-campus differential will be assessed in addition to the regular applicable tuition rates. For fall term the differential will be assessed by separate off-campus tuition rates which include the differential. For winter term the differential will be assessed as a course fee in addition to applicable on-campus tuition rates.

(d) Increased February 3, 1991, became effective spring semester 1991:
 2a from $9.75
 2b from $7.25
 2c from $2.50
 2d from $2.00

(e) The computer technology fee and computer lab fee will be in effect for fall term only. Effective winter term, course fees will be assessed in lieu of the computer technology fee - see footnote (f).

(f) Effective winter term, 1992, course fees will be assessed for all courses in business, engineering, computer science, mathematics, chemistry, physics, biology, nursing, and health sciences. The $30 course fee is for a standard 4 credit hour course. Courses greater than or less than 4 hours will be assessed at $7.50 per credit hour.

(g) Effective fall term, 1991, this fee will increase to $100 if the late registration occurs after the official count date for the term.

8/12/91

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
Survey of Projected Tuition and Required Fees
For Full-Time-Resident Undergraduate Students
Comparison of Fall 1991 to Fall 1990 **
(Ranked by Tuition Cost)

	Rank	Tution and Required Fees Fall 1991 Amount	Fall 1990 Amount	Increase Total	Percent
UM-Ann Arbor - Lower (1)	1	$3,840.21	$3,502.24	$337.97	9.65%
- Upper		4,248.10	3,874.24	373.86	9.65%
MSU - Lower	2	3,609.54	3,370.25	239.29	7.10%
- Upper		3,933.25	3,672.50	260.75	7.10%
Michigan Tech (2)	3	2,920.50	2,541.00	379.50	14.93%
Wayne - Lower	4	2,640.40	2,479.25	161.15	6.50%
- Upper		3,077.85	2,890.00	187.85	6.50%
UM-Dearborn - Lower	5	2,761.16	2,559.00	202.16	7.90%
- Upper		2,812.34	2,559.00	253.34	9.90% (New)
Western - Lower (3)	6	2,553.67	2,334.25	219.42	9.40%
- Upper		2,782.59	2,543.50	239.09	9.40%
Ferris	7	2,564.79	2,397.00	167.79	7.00%
Oakland - Lower	8	2,382.25	2,208.25	174.00	7.88% (6)
- Upper		2,700.00	2,502.75	197.25	7.88% (6)
Lake Superior (4)	9	2,518.00	2,040.00	478.00	23.43%
UM-Flint (5)	10	2,459.50	2,240.00	219.50	9.80%
Saginaw Valley	11	2,425.75	2,270.75	155.00	6.83%
Central	12	2,337.09	2,128.50	208.59	9.80%
Eastern - Lower *	13	2,223.00	2,068.00	155.00	7.50%
- Upper		2,347.00	2,168.75	178.25	8.22%
Northern	14	2,249.00	2,053.90	195.10	9.50%
Grand Valley	15	2,236.35	2,092.00	144.35	6.90%

* Fall rates are approved by Board of Trustees
** From Presidents Council 1990-91 Report on Tuition and Fees

(1) UM-Ann Arbor includes a new $50 per semester fee for Infrastructure Maintenance.
(2) Michigan Tech includes a 4.9% tuition increase plus $75 per quarter surcharge ($225/yr.) to be refunded if state appropriation fourth quarter holdback is returned.
(3) Western includes a tuition increase of 6.9% plus a $25 per semester increase in the registration fee and an $8 per semester increase in the Student Activity Fee.
(4) Lake Superior increase represents 7.5% for Spring Term and an incremental 15% for fall term.
(5) UM-Flint includes tuition increase of 6.4% plus new registration fee of $40 per semester.
(6) Includes $3.50 Student Activities Fee increase effective Spring '91 (0.17%, 0.15%). The total fee is $23.00 per year.

8/12/91

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
Survey of Projected Tuition and Required Fees
For Full-Time-Resident Undergraduate Students
Comparison of Fall 1991 to Fall 1990 **
(Ranked by Percentage Increase)

		Tution and Required Fees		Increase		
		Fall 1991	Fall 1990			
	Rank	Amount	Amount	Total	Percent	
Lake Superior (1)	1	$2,518.00	$2,040.00	$478.00	23.43%	
Michigan Tech (2)	2	2,920.50	2,541.00	379.50	14.93%	
Central	3	2,337.09	2,128.50	208.59	9.80%	
UM-Flint (3)	3	2,459.50	2,240.00	219.50	9.80%	
UM-Ann Arbor - Lower (4)	5	3,840.21	3,502.24	337.97	9.65%	
- Upper		4,248.10	3,874.24	373.86	9.65%	
Northern	6	2,249.00	2,053.90	195.10	9.50%	
Western - Lower (5)	7	2,553.67	2,334.25	219.42	9.40%	
- Upper		2,782.59	2,543.50	239.09	9.40%	
UM-Dearborn - Lower	8	2,761.16	2,559.00	202.16	7.90%	
- Upper		2,812.34	2,559.00	253.34	9.90%	(New)
Oakland - Lower	9	2,382.25	2,208.25	174.00	7.88%	(6)
- Upper		2,700.00	2,502.75	197.25	7.88%	(6)
Eastern - Lower	10	2,223.00	2,068.00	155.00	7.50%	
- Upper		2,347.00	2,168.75	178.25	8.22%	
MSU - Lower	11	3,609.54	3,370.25	239.29	7.10%	
- Upper		3,933.25	3,672.50	260.75	7.10%	
Ferris	12	2,564.79	2,397.00	167.79	7.00%	
Grand Valley	13	2,236.35	2,092.00	144.35	6.90%	
Saginaw Valley	14	2,425.75	2,270.75	155.00	6.83%	
Wayne - Lower	15	2,640.40	2,479.25	161.15	6.50%	
- Upper		3,077.85	2,890.00	187.85	6.50%	

* Fall rates are approved by Board of Trustees

** From Presidents Council 1990-91 Report on Tuition and Fees

(1) Lake Superior increase represents 7.5% for Spring Term and an incremental 15% for fall term.

(2) Michigan Tech includes a 4.9% tuition increase plus $75 per quarter surcharge ($225/yr.) to be refunded if state appropriation fourth quarter holdback is returned.

(3) UM-Flint includes tuition increase of 6.4% plus new registration fee of $40 per semester.

(4) UM-Ann Arbor includes a new $50 per semester for Infrastructure Maintenance.

(5) Western includes a tuition increase of 6.9% plus a $25 per semester increase in the registration fee and an $8 per semester increase in the Student Activity Fee.

(6) Includes $3.50 Student Activities Fee increase effective Spring '91 (0.17%, 0.15%) The total fee is $23.00 per year.