MINUTES OF THE MEETING
of the
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
February 12, 1986

Present: Trustees Donald Bemis, Phyllis Law Googasian, Patricia Hartmann, Ken Morris, and Wallace Riley

Absent: Trustees David Handleman, Alex Mair and Howard Sims

The meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m. in Lounge II of the Oakland Center by Chairman Wallace Riley.

Approval of minutes of January 8, 1986

Mr. Riley asked for any additions or corrections to the proposed minutes of the Board meeting of January 8, 1986. There were no additions or corrections. Mr. Morris, seconded by Mr. Bemis, moved to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

Gifts and grants list of February 12, 1986

Mr. Robert Swanson, Vice President for Developmental Affairs, drew the Board's attention to the $39,859 received from loyal alumni, and to the $10,608 donated to the athletic program by various contributors. He also noted the gifts in support of Meadow Brook Hall from the Benson and Edith Ford Fund in the amount of $7,500, and from the Continental Water Company in the amount of $25,000. This gift was from Mrs. Charles S. Mott of Flint, Michigan. He stated that the total gifts for the month amounted to $159,976.

Mr. Keith Kleckner, Provost and Senior Vice President, drew the Board's attention to the National Institutes of Health's support of two faculty research projects totaling $188,544. Mr. Kleckner asked Dr. Venkat Reddy, Director of the Eye Research Institute, to make a statement regarding the project "Pharmacologic Approach to Intraocular Proliferation". Dr. Reddy stated that this grant has particular meaning because the Institute has brought two distinguished scholars to the University to perform this research. Oakland University was able to attract these researchers because of the "core grant" approved by the Board of Trustees a year ago which amounted to approximately $750,000. This action established the Institute as one of the important centers for eye research in the Country.

Mr. Riley stated that it was a "marvelous compliment" to the University to be able to attract such scholarly researchers. He also noted the 829 miscellaneous gifts of under $100 in support of the alumni fund. The University is not only receiving large donations, but is receiving support from a broad base of alumni.

Mr. Bemis asked for an explanation of the grant from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Mr. Kleckner responded that the grant is "seed money" for travel and other expenses for Professor Karl Gregory who will try to generate additional financial support for minority students.

Mrs. Hartmann moved, seconded by Mr. Morris, to accept the gifts and grants with gratitude. The motion was unanimously approved.

Approval of faculty personnel actions

Mr. Kleckner asked for approval of the faculty personnel actions set forth below:

Appointment

Nestor, Robert C., Clinical Instructor in Exercise Science, effective January 1, 1985, through August 14, 1986.

Walsh, Kathleen, Adjunct Instructor in Nursing, effective January 1, 1986, through December 31, 1986.

Zagorski, Zbigniew P., Adjunct Professor of Chemistry, effective January 1, 1986, through August 14, 1986.

Leave of Absence

Bryant, William C., Associate Professor of Spanish, sick leave from September 14, 1985, through March 13, 1986 (with full pay), and leave from March 14, 1986, through August 14, 1986 (with no pay); Mr. Bryant will apply for long-term disability, effective March 14, 1986. [Supersedes previous Board action of November 13, 1985, which placed Mr. Bryant on sick leave for the period September 14, 1985, through January 5, 1986 (with full pay), and September 11, 1985, which placed Mr. Bryant on sabbatical leave from January 6, 1986, through April 25, 1986 (with half pay).]

Cutts, John P., Professor of English, sick leave from September 5, 1985, through March 4, 1986 (with full pay), and leave from March 5, 1986, through December 31, 1986 (with no pay). [Supersedes previous Board action of January 8, 1986, which placed Mr. Cutts on sick leave from September 5, 1985, through March 4, 1986 (with full pay), and leave from March 5, 1986, through August 14, 1986 (with no pay). This is to accommodate the change in Mr. Cutts' retirement date from August 14, 1986, to December 31, 1986.]

Edgerton, Robert H., Professor of Engineering, leave from August 26, 1986, through April 25, 1987 (with no pay).

Hammerle, William G., Professor of Engineering, sick leave from January 2, 1986, through April 25, 1986 (with full pay).

Parameswaran, Ravi, Associate Professor of Management, sick leave from December 17, 1985, through February 28, 1986 (with full pay).

Weng, Tung H., Professor of Engineering and Acting Chairperson, Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, sabbatical leave from January 5, 1987, through April 25, 1987 (with full pay).

Retirement

Cutts, John P., Professor of English, effective December 31, 1986. [Supersedes previous Board action of January 8, 1986, which approved a retirement date of August 14, 1986.]

Mr. Bemis, seconded by Mrs. Hartmann, moved to approve the faculty personnel actions as presented. The motion was passed unanimously.

Approval of amendment to responsibilities of University Affairs Committee

Mr. John De Carlo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, stated that a presentation on the status of the University's equal opportunity program was made at the December 11, 1985, meeting of the Board of Trustees. In order to emphasize the importance of this program, the Board requested periodic reports on the status of the various phases of the program. In addition, it was determined that the review of these activities should be the responsibility of the Board of Trustees University Affairs Committee to assure continuous monitoring of the progress of the University in all areas, including personnel and student recruitment.

Mr. De Carlo presented the following resolution for Board consideration:

RESOLVED, That the duties of the Board of Trustees University Affairs Committee are amended as of the date of this action by adding paragraph 8 to the committee charge document as set forth below:

8. Review periodically the implementation and effectiveness of the Board of Trustees Equal Opportunity Policy. Review all matters concerning the Equal Opportunity Policy and related University programs, projects and recommendations referred to the Board of Trustees for action or information.

Mrs. Hartmann suggested that after this action an updated copy of the duties for the University Affairs Committee should be sent to the committee members. Mr. De Carlo stated that he would send revised copies of the duties of the two Board committees to all of the Trustees.

Mr. Morris, seconded by Mrs. Googasian, moved to approve the recommendation as presented. The motion was unanimously carried.

Security transactions report

Mr. Robert McGarry, Vice President for Finance and Administration, reported the sale of eight shares of Indiana Gas Company which realized net proceeds of $172.

Upon inquiry from the Chairman, Mr. De Carlo stated that the Board has requested that it be advised of all security transactions, and no formal action is required since the stock was previously accepted in the Gifts and Grants report.

Authorization of increase in Dodge Farmhouse renovation project

Mr. McGarry stated that the State had allocated $200,000 to remodel the Dodge Farmhouse. In June, 1985, the Board authorized the project and the solicitation of bids not to exceed $275,000. Bids have been received and $275,000 is not adequate to complete the project. The Board is being asked to amend its action of June 17, 1985, to authorize the project in the amount of $315,000. Mr. McGarry asked approval of the recommendation set forth below:

> It is recommended that the Board of Trustees amend its action of June 17, 1985, to authorize a total project cost for remodeling the Dodge Farmhouse at a level not to exceed $315,000.

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Bemis, to approve the recommendation as presented.

Mrs. Hartmann asked Mr. McGarry if he believed $315,000 to be sufficient for the project. He replied that there would be no future request for an increase.

Mr. Riley asked when the work would commence. Mr. McGarry answered that work would start as soon as the Board approves the funding increase and as soon as Mr. De Carlo obtains clearance and additional funding from the State.

Mr. Morris asked why the State's approval is required. Mr. DeCarlo replied that the State originally approved the project for $200,000, and the University is requesting additional funding from the State to cover the difference between $200,000 and $315,000.

Chairman Riley called for a vote and the motion was unanimously passed.

Appointment of auditor for review of 1985-86 fiscal year accounts

Mr. McGarry stated that each year it is the Board's policy to appoint an outside firm to audit the financial statements of the University. Last year the firm of Arthur Andersen & Company was engaged. It is recommended that the firm be appointed for the 1985-86 year at a fee of $35,000. Mr. McGarry asked approval of the recommendation set forth below:

> RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes Arthur Andersen & Company to conduct the audit of the University's financial statements for the year ending June 30, 1986, at a fee of $35,000.

Mr. Morris, Chairman of the Finance and Personnel Committee, stated that the Finance and Personnel Committee recommends that Arthur Andersen & Company audit the University's 1985-86 financial statements. He added that he has objections to the action, but will abstain from voting.

Mr. Bemis stated that he has had no experience with the firm other than at Oakland University, but in his opinion the audit Arthur Andersen & Company conducted last year was thorough. He added that the firm agreed to go beyond what the administration requested by preparing the audit report in more than one format so that it would be acceptable to the different points of view that exist on the Board. Mr. Bemis moved that Arthur Andersen & Company be appointed the University's audit firm for the 1985-86 fiscal year. Mrs. Hartmann seconded the motion.

Mr. Morris stated that he has no question regarding the service provided Oakland University by Arthur Andersen & Company. His experience with the firm elsewhere justified his intent to abstain.

Mr. Bemis stated that five votes are needed for approval and there are only five Trustees present. If Trustee Morris abstains, the item is not approved. Therefore, he withdrew his motion to approve the recommendation, and moved to table the matter until the March Board meeting. Mrs. Hartmann seconded the motion which was voted on and approved by the Trustees. The appointment of the audit firm for the 1985-86 financial statements will be presented at the March Board meeting.

Proposed actions relating to refund from the City of Auburn Hills of advance sewer payments

Mr. De Carlo stated that on December 14, 1983, the University entered into an agreement with the City of Auburn Hills settling pending litigation regarding certain special sewer assessments levied by the City on University property. (This contract had the prior approval of the Board of Trustees.) As background information, the University challenged the special sewer assessment and in recognition of the need to settle the litigation, the parties entered into the contract conditioned on a consent judgment dismissing the case pending before the Michigan Tax Tribunal. The agreement established the fact that the City concurred in the University's position that State property was not subject to the City's Annual Sewer Contract Obligations Special Assessment, and that University property would not be placed on any future special assessment roll. There were further exclusions to such assessments based upon the University's continued use of the property for educational purposes. Pursuant to the authority granted under Section 14 of Public Act 188 of 1954, the University, in recognition of its use of the sewer system, agreed to assist the City in meeting some of its sewer obligation commitments by making certain payments in lieu of a special assessment. These payments were in the form of advance sewer connection payments and related charges.

The purpose of this agreement was to assist the City with its fiscal problems and to preserve to the University certain rights to use the sewer system in order to assure utility capacity for future buildings such as the Kresge Library addition. The University recognized at the time of this agreement that there also was pending litigation by private property owners challenging the method by which the City levied the special assessments. Therefore, the University included a provision in the December 14, 1983, contract which provides that in the event that the City did not prevail in the private lawsuit, and if the assessment was invalidated and the City does not elect to levy a new special assessment to correct the invalidity to meet its sewer contractual obligations, the University payments would be refunded.

The City did not prevail in the litigation with the private property owners. The University has conferred with Auburn Hills officials and they have determined to make refunds to the various land owners, including the University, within the near future. The University has made payments amounting to approximately $59,600. In order to meet its sewer obligation commitments the City may substantially increase the future charges for sewer connections and other services. The City may also limit the time for applying for sewer connection charges under the current rate to March 1, 1986. Therefore, the administration recommends that the Board of Trustees grant authority to the President of the University, or his specified designee, to negotiate an agreement with the City to receive either the entire payment or a partial refund with a portion of the past payment to be applied to sewer connection charges for the proposed addition to the Kresge Library. Since construction of the Library should commence in

1986, the payment of the sewer charges for this facility at a lower rate will result in a savings to the University. The refund over and above the charges to the Library will then be available for investment or other purposes.

The recommendation before the Board provides for a possible arrangement with the City that would permit Oakland to credit in advance the payments for the sewer connection charges for the Library addition at the current rate, which is approximately $1,000 per unit. Approximately 20,000 units are involved for the Library. The difference would be refunded because it is not known when Oakland's next sewer connection need will occur. If Oakland does not take advantage of this arrangement, the City, in all probability, will raise its unit charges to as high as $2,500. When sewer charges are requested at a later date, Oakland would pay $2,500 rather than $1,000 per unit.

It is recommended that Oakland exercise the provision of the contract whereby a refund will be made with the exception that an immediate advance payment can be made on the sewer charges for the Library at the lower rate.

Mr. Riley asked what the total charge would be for the sewer connections for the Library addition. Mr. McGarry stated that the charge would be based on 22.9 units or $22,900 versus the $2,500 per unit charge which would be $57,000.

Mr. Riley asked if the cost would be $22,000 even if Oakland did not have $60,000 coming back but wished to pay before the price was increased. Mr. McGarry responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Riley asked for a clarification on how the advance payment is tied to the refund. Mr. De Carlo stated that Oakland attempted to assist the City in its sewer construction commitments by making advance sewer unit charge payments in settlement of the litigation challenging special sewer assessments on State property. Oakland University administrators and the Board realized that at some future date, sewer connections would be required for the Library and other buildings.

Mr. Bemis stated that to make up for the revenue loss due to the private lawsuit, the City charges have the potential of being raised after March 1, 1986. It is being suggested that Oakland credit or prepay the sewer connection charges for the Library at the current rate as opposed to the new higher rate that would be adopted in March.

Mrs. Googasian moved, seconded by Mr. Morris, to approve the recommendation as follows:

In recognition of the provisions of an agreement entered into between Oakland University and the City of Auburn Hills on December 14, 1983, regarding certain payments in lieu of special assessments, which payments are subject to a refund provision due to the fact that the City has not prevailed in certain litigation on the special assessment levy, the Board of Trustees hereby authorizes the President, or his specified designee, to negotiate with the City for either a total refund of the amount paid by Oakland, or to purchase certain sewer services for the proposed Kresge Library addition. The purchase of any future service must be made at the current lower rate for such service and result in a savings to the University. The Board of Trustees recognizes that the President may have to obligate the institution on this matter prior to the next regular meeting of the Trustees, since the City may propose a cutoff date of March 1, 1986, for purchasing services at the City's current rate. The President will report to the Board of Trustees regarding any action taken in this matter at the next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees.

The motion was unanimously passed.

Approval of change of Board meeting time

Mr. De Carlo stated that there has been some discussion by the Trustees about changing the time of the regular Board meetings from 7:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. because it appears to be a preferable time. Since the Open Meetings Act requires that the time of formal Board meetings must be posted, and since the dates and the time of the meetings were already established by Board action, the Board must now amend that action. Mr. De Carlo asked approval of the recommendation set forth below:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees changes the adopted time of 7:00 p.m. for its regularly scheduled formal meetings to 5:00 p.m. for each month of the fiscal year, commencing with the meeting of March 12, 1986.

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mrs. Googasian, to approve the recommendation as presented. The motion was unanimously carried.

President's report

President Joseph E. Champagne reported that Governor James J. Blanchard's 1986-87 budget recommendation for an increase of approximately 5.5 percent for all colleges and universities will result in about $1.5 million for Oakland University. It is not known at this point in time whether the recommendation will be increased by the Legislature. It is possible that an increase of slightly more than 5.5 percent could occur. It is too early to predict the final appropriations amount, but he would keep the Board advised.

President Champagne also reported that the University's "unannounced" Capital Campaign has commitments and the receipt of funds in the amount of approximately $4.6 million. Trustee Hartmann inquired if the specific gifts and the donors would be reported.

President Champagne stated that some of the gifts are in the form of a pledge and some are to the Oakland University Foundation. Only the gifts to the University are being reported at this time.

Upon completion of the President's report, Chairman Riley inquired if there were any comments from the Trustees.

Mrs. Googasian reported that each year the Michigan Association of Governing Boards sponsors an all day workshop at the Kellogg Center in East Lansing for the purpose of addressing topics which are of interest to Trustees. This year's conference is Wednesday, April 9, from 9:00 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. In the evening a special convocations ceremony occurs at which two faculty members and two students from each public university are recognized for their outstanding contributions to their institution. Unfortunately, that night conflicts with the Board meeting. She encouraged the Trustees, however, to attend the conference during the day. She added that past conferences were very valuable and that the meetings consisted of a series of presentations and roundtable discussions conducted by experts.

Report on recruitment activities by Mr. Jerry Rose, Director of Admissions and Scholarships

Chairman Riley called upon Ms. Wilma Ray-Bledsoe, Vice President for Student Affairs. Ms. Ray-Bledsoe stated that some time ago the Board expressed an interest in Oakland's recruitment efforts, and Mr. Jerry Rose, Director of Admissions and Scholarships, was present to address this subject.

Mr. Jerry Rose's presentation in its entirety is on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees. The following is a synopsis of his comments:

> Mr. Rose expressed appreciation for the opportunity to report to the Board of Trustees on recruiting activities which he considered to be extremely successful when one views our increase in enrollment. He noted that his office does not take full credit for this accomplishment and that it requires a team effort. He introduced the

following individuals who supported his activities and who were present to answer questions: Ms. Norian Johnson, Assistant Director of Admissions, responsible for transfer, adult and graduate recruitment; Ms. Anne Sandoval, Admissions Advisor, responsible for coordinating freshman recruitment and high school relations. He then introduced the newest member of the staff, Ms. Carretta Cooke, Admissions Advisor for freshman recruitment, who is primarily responsible for minority recruitment in Wayne County.

He then noted that the recruitment program at Oakland is extensive due to its diversified student population. There is a large body of transfer students and a large number of adult students at the institution. He noted that the freshman component that entered each year was very important to provide a well-balanced institution, and that this mix of the student body was what he referred to as "enrollment management". He noted that recruitment is only one factor, and that equally important was the need to retain and assist students after they arrived on campus. To provide this support the services of the Departments of Financial Aid and Residence Halls, academic advising, and academic programs are required. Retention is an important factor.

Mr. Rose then stated that he had submitted to the Board information setting forth the specific recruitment plans of his office. He noted that there was a great deal of competition for qualified students throughout the State and the Midwest. Competition is not only from institutions within the State, but from neighboring states and the "Sunbelt". He observed that the relatively high tuition rate at Michigan's colleges and universities is well known throughout the Country and some out-of-state institutions publicize and take advantage of this fact. Out-of-state institutions are now more prevalent in their recruitment appearances in area high schools. He gave some specific examples regarding tuition rates, such as the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which charges $3400 per year. These institutions have financial appeal to Michigan students. He noted that his office and all the universities find themselves in what could be considered a "marketing activity" where one has to put together a variety of resources and financial aid packages to attract students.

He then noted that the majority of Oakland University students come from Oakland, Macomb and Wayne Counties. He stated that the national average cost for state colleges and universities to recruit one student who enrolls at a state institution is $155 per student. That amount is based on staff salaries, the cost of promotional publications, travel and other costs. At Oakland the cost per student is $137. In his opinion the average cost in Michigan, due to a variety of reasons, including the drop in enrollment at some state institutions, is close to $180. Private schools average $455 per student. One university in Texas is spending approximately $1100 for each student that it recruits.

He then noted that the material provided to the Board had an analysis of racial and ethnic backgrounds of the students. He added that 82 percent of the Oakland University students responded to the request for information in this area, and that the answer was voluntary. He stated that his office was aware of the specific market areas that would be most productive for the University and efforts will be made in these areas. He noted that one of the primary student "feeder" areas for Oakland University is Macomb County and that there is a high transfer enrollment from Macomb Community College. When you review the ratio of students from this area to minorities, you note, however, that the potential for significant recruitment for such students at Macomb Community College is quite low. In 1985 there were 29,491 students enrolled at Macomb Community College with only 594 black students, or only two percent of the enrollment. In view of the fact that one of our primary "feeder" schools has such a low enrollment, we must recruit in other areas in order to find minority students.

In working with Wayne Community College and Highland Park Community College, which have high minority enrollments, we encounter student transportation problems which are difficult to resolve.

Mr. Rose commented on the fact that Oakland University was very fortunate to have the cooperation of the Utica Community Schools since they provide a large number of our freshman students. In this connection he stated that there were school districts in close proximity to the University which did not provide a large number of students to Oakland University. Bloomfield Hills, Troy and Rochester were examples that he cited where families and students express an interest in "going away to college". In spite of this fact, approximately 19 percent of the potential student body from Oakland County attends Oakland University. Our institution has a larger percentage of enrollment from Oakland County and Macomb County than the University of Michigan, which is one of our major competitors.

Mr. Rose then stated that he provided the Board with some supplementary information which contained a profile of the University's freshman class prepared by the American College Testing Program. The profile is based on a sample of 718 students taking the test as high school juniors and seniors entering the University in the fall of 1985. He observed that Oakland University students are above the national average as well as the State average for freshman students. He concluded that this represents the strong academic interest of our entering student body. He noted that Oakland University enrolled 25 percent of the students that are at state colleges and universities from Macomb County which compares to 25.9 percent for Wayne State University. Michigan State has only 15 percent of the Macomb County student body, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor has 6.5 percent, and Central Michigan University has 7.5 percent. In Oakland County, Oakland University has 19 percent of the available student body attending public institutions, with Wayne State receiving 11.5 percent of the Oakland County students. He noted that 24 percent of the students in Oakland County attend Michigan State University and 15.4 percent attend the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

He noted that we recruit throughout the State and even outside the State to provide diversity in our enrollment. He then stated that he would be pleased to answer any questions of concern to the Trustees.

Mrs. Hartmann stated that the report did not mention the institutions attended by students from Wayne County. She added that Oakland, as close as it is to Wayne County, does not receive many of its students. Mr. Rose replied that the lack of transportation is the most important reason. Four percent of Central Michigan University's enrollment is from western Wayne County. Eastern Michigan University also draws well from Wayne County.

Ms. Ray-Bledsoe stated that lack of residence hall capacity at Oakland University also plays a part in the problem.

Mr. Rose stated that the three counties north of the University--Genesee, Lapeer, and St. Clair--show an increase each year in the number of students who choose Oakland University.

Mr. Riley asked about the retention rate of students. Mr. Rose replied that 90 percent of the freshmen enter with the intent of being full-time students. Usually they stay on that pattern for two to three years. The retention of freshmen is very different from that of transfer students who "come in and out". It is almost impossible to predict a retention rate for transfer students. Less than 50 percent of entering freshmen graduate, but they come back later as adult students.

Mrs. Googasian asked if much of the emphasis on recruitment begins in August and September of the high school students' senior year. Mr. Rose replied that emphasis is attempted earlier, but it is difficult to get cooperation from the high schools to talk with juniors. It is a "buyer's market" so students are less concerned with making college decisions earlier than their senior year. During the Summer a large direct mail campaign is conducted to contact students between their junior and senior years. To be effective in the minority recruitment market, it is important to start at the junior high school level.

Mrs. Googasian stated that many students choose a school based on what they hear from other people and friends. It appears important to reach students at the ninth grade level when they are selecting college preparatory classes. Mr. Rose agreed that the senior year is late to make a first approach.

Mrs. Googasian suggested that a brochure be mailed directly to students to introduce them to Oakland University. Mr. Rose stated that Ms. Sandoval has been working on a project in this area.

Mr. Riley stated that Mr. Rose indicated that the enrollment process is one of sales and marketing. He asked if Oakland's sales approach is "sensitive to the level of tuition". Mr. Rose replied that Oakland's primary competitors have high enough tuition that they give Oakland a "slight cushion". Scholarships are currently being used and are becoming a more important factor in overcoming the cost of tuition.

Mr. Rose added that with the array of programs Oakland offers and Oakland's admission standards, the University has held a position of academic excellence in the marketplace for twenty years. The only problem may be the declining high school graduate pool. Our position of academic excellence and the events that are happening around the University, such as the development of the technology park, enhance our theme of excellence.

Mr. Riley stated that Oakland is only $18 less than the national average, and $43 less than the Michigan average in recruitment costs. Suppose more money was spent on promotion. Would more students be realized? Mr. Rose responded that it costs proportionately more to go into outlying areas to recruit. There is not that direct relationship of more dollars into marketing equals more sales.

Mr. Morris asked about the relationship of increased tuition to our recruitment efforts. Mr. Rose replied that at some level there is a breakpoint where you cannot successfully recruit. Oakland is not at that point where a minimum increase in tuition would suddenly put us into a negative position. We hope that we have the financial aid resources to respond to any problems with our current tuition rate.

Mr. Morris stated that the breakpoint obviously would be different with different economic groups. Mr. Rose replied that he does not have access to such figures. The Financial Aid Office or one of the Student Service offices could provide a more accurate answer. To make a blanket statement that raising tuition would not disadvantage certain student markets would not be accurate. We believe we have in place a financial aid program that will respond to our problems. He noted that 65 percent of the students at Oakland are working part-time jobs. This indicates that we have a large group of students who are not able to pay without working. This percentage is not unusual for the State average.

Mr. Kleckner stated that a figure that might be useful is that for the past eight years, Oakland's share in the State of all students attending public institutions of higher education has steadily increased. Most of those years tuition was increased. Oakland's share seemed to increase whether tuition was raised or not.

Mr. Bemis stated that one of the concerns of this Board has been the recruitment of minority students and he wished to pursue this subject. The number of minority students who applied in 1984-85 was not what we would have liked, but it is fairly strong compared to the total population in the markets that we are serving. Mr. Rose stated that the heavy competition for minority students who are academically qualified is a major factor in the number of students available to Oakland University.

Mr. Bemis asked what the goals are for next year for minority recruitment. A new person has been hired, are we going to see some increase next fall in that area? Ms. Cooke responded that one can always anticipate an increase. In her experience in working with minority students, the "attitude of not thinking about college is strong". For every single academically-able minority student, there are between four and five scholarship offers for those students--both in state and out of state. When you are talking about that particular student group, you are not only talking about the academic excellence that Oakland has to offer, but the money that Oakland has to offer. When you are considering the disadvantaged minority student coming through the academic support program, oftentimes you are dealing with a lot of personal discouragement, because even though they are admitted to Oakland University, they feel they can attend a community college for a year or two, not work as hard, and then attend

Oakland. Many of those students are going to end up as transfer students.

Mr. Bemis stated that even with the transfer students, we are still experiencing only about a 50 percent admission of those that make an application. Ms. Ray-Bledsoe stated that we aspire to have larger numbers. We have not established a precise goal. We are convinced that we need to engage in more non-traditional methods of recruitment, and that we cannot rely exclusively on routine recruitment mechanisms to give us access to such students. As an example, about three Sundays ago there was a reception on campus for the parents of 200 seventh graders from the Pontiac School District who had been identified as high achievers. We had in excess of 150 people attend on a very snowy "Super Bowl Sunday". She stated that she was tremendously encouraged by the turnout. With respect to the goal for next year, we have scheduled on February 19 a meeting in Detroit with the Education Directors of all the Baptist churches in the City of Detroit. We are hoping that this kind of effort will be more productive than relying on the traditional school recruitment mechanism.

Mr. Bemis asked about the number of minority students in last year's freshman class from Wayne County. Mr. Rose replied 94. Mr. Bemis stated that perhaps our efforts should be concentrated with minority students in high schools where Oakland University is well established. It is difficult to go into Wayne County because the students do not have a "tradition" of attending Oakland. He suggested the "cultivation of markets" where we receive our largest enrollment. Ms. Ray-Bledsoe replied that the problem with that approach is that residential segregation precludes a large pool of students from which to draw. The minority enrollment is listed school by school in the material provided to the Board. The numbers are "miniscule" from our primary source of students. Mr. Bemis stated that Mt. Clemens has the largest number of minority students in Macomb County and should be tapped.

Mr. Morris stated that what has impressed him is that there is a major university in Detroit, Wayne State University, and because of transportation problems, minority students attend that institution. Another point that has to be made is the need for a constant effort to advise the public about Oakland University. It is his impression that the percentage of minority students attending Oakland University in the 1960's was higher than the 70's and 80's, because at one point we used to identify more with Detroit through programs such as the Meadow Brook Theatre. The Theatre played for a week each month during the Theatre season at the Detroit Institute of Arts. We went to Detroit and to Wayne County at that time and we invited all the high schools to the Theatre. The residents of Wayne County were "acquainted with the name of Oakland University and the fact that we existed". We do not undertake such efforts anymore. Mr. Morris stated that he was curious about our enrollment figures at that time and whether such programs generated more interest in Oakland. He stated that, in his opinion, to be a viable university in the future, we should not serve only the suburban communities. Oakland University should serve a broad constituency and we should do everything possible to encourage broad area attendance. Whatever "salesmanship" is required should be undertaken. Any time there is an activity in Wayne County, Macomb County, or the Pontiac area that relates to education, we should participate and we should let the public know of our interest. The more we make our presence known and reach out, the more likely we shall have minorities coming to Oakland.

Mr. Bemis stated that he had some more concerns on the subject and wished to meet with Ms. Ray-Bledsoe or Mr. Rose at another time to discuss the matter further.

Chairman Riley stated that this was an important subject and that time would not permit a full discussion. He suggested that this matter be rescheduled for Board or Committee review.

Purchase of property in Rochester Hills, Michigan

Mr. Riley stated that at the January 8, 1986, meeting, the Board approved the assignment of Sunset Terrace to Meadow Brook Hall for use as a conference center annex. As a part of that action, the Chairman of the Board was authorized to make alternate and appropriate housing arrangements for the President, subject to final approval of the Board of Trustees. Immediately afterward, an attempt was made to locate some suitable housing arrangements that would meet a number of requirements such as: 1)provide quarters for the President and his family, 2)facilitate entertaining, and 3)be located on or adjacent to University property. A suitable home has been located at 2509 Munster, Rochester Hills, which is contiguous to University property.

Most of the Board members have examined the property and an offer to purchase has been made to the owners. One of the benefits that has resulted from the request to use Sunset Terrace for Meadow Brook Hall functions is that the facility will generate revenue to offset its operating costs. The result will be that instead of a cost of approximately $60,000 to house the President, the cost will be about a third of that amount. Not only are some of Meadow Brook Hall's problems being solved, but institutional costs are being reduced.

Mr. Bemis stated that, based on early bookings, it had been indicated to the Board that it will take less than five years to pay off the house from the cost savings. The financial outlook is much more optimistic than previously believed.

Mr. Riley asked approval of the following recommendation:

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees has voted to convert Sunset Terrace into a conference, meeting, and reception annex to Meadow Brook Hall to alleviate the Hall's space shortages; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees has traditionally required the President, as a condition of employment, to reside in a residence provided and maintained by the University for the convenience of the University in carrying out the multiple requisites of the position of President, both during and after normal working hours; and

WHEREAS, It is not reasonable to expect the President to provide his own residence for the requisite ceremonial, entertainment, and administrative functions frequently taking place in the President's residence; and

WHEREAS, It is essential that the residence be functionally a part of the University's campus; and

WHEREAS, Comparable facilities for this purpose are not presently available at other University facilities; and

WHEREAS, The Board empowered the Chairman to arrange for such appropriate housing; and

WHEREAS, the property and home at 2509 Munster, Rochester Hills, in Meadow Brook Valley, adjacent to the east campus, meets the requirements for adequate functioning of the President in his many official roles; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees accepts this resolution and authorizes the purchase of the home and property at 2509 Munster, Rochester Hills, in accordance with the purchase agreement entered into on January 18, 1986, in the name of the Board of Trustees and on behalf of the University under the authorization granted to the Chairman, for a purchase price of $195,000 from non-general fund sources; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Vice President for Finance and Administration is authorized to sign all necessary purchase documents in the name of the Board of Trustees, subject to the prior review of the General Counsel; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the President of the University, as a condition of employment shall be required to reside in the presidential residence located at 2509 Munster, Rochester Hills, Michigan.

Morris concurred and moved, seconded by Mrs. Hartmann, to :ove the recommendation as presented. The motion was ıimously passed.

<u>ər items</u>

Riley asked if there were any other items to be brought ore the Board by the public. There being none, Mrs. Hartmann ed, seconded by Mr. Morris, to adjourn the meeting. The ting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Approved,

ın De Carlo, Secretary
ırd of Trustees

Wallace D. Riley, Chairman
Board of Trustees