

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES
September 10, 1986

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

Chairman Wallace Riley called the meeting to order at 5:16 p.m. in Lounge II of the Oakland Center.

Approval of minutes of August 14, 1986

Chairman Riley asked for any additions or corrections to the proposed minutes for the meeting of August 14, 1986. There were no additions or corrections. Trustee Handleman, seconded by Trustee Mair, moved to approve the minutes as proposed. The motion was unanimously carried.

Approval of recommendation to accept gifts and grants to Oakland University

Mr. David Rodwell, Vice President for External Affairs, reported that this was an important but "not sensational" month for gifts and grants. The gifts totalled \$69,470.77.

Mr. Keith Kleckner, Senior Vice President for University Affairs and Provost, stated that this was a very substantial month for grants. He called attention to the American Heart Association grant for Dr. Bandana Chatterjee, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, who is working with a drug to be used in the control of certain heart conditions. Support was also received from the NIH, for Professor Denis Callewaert's continuing work on "killer cells" and their role in the control of cancer. NIH also provided support to the Eye Research Institute. In addition, a major grant was received from the U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command by the School of Engineering and Computer Science. The grants totalled \$711,651.00.

Trustee Sims, seconded by Trustee Mair, moved to accept the gifts and grants list. The motion was unanimously carried.

Acceptance of information report of gifts and grants to the Oakland University Foundation

Mr. Robert Swanson, Vice President for Developmental Affairs, reported on gifts made to the Foundation that were designated to specific schools and programs and were transferred to the

University. These designated gifts totalled \$24,704.64. Those gifts and grants that were undesignated and remain with the Oakland University Foundation totalled \$29,194.00. The total gifts for the period were \$53,898.64.

Chairman Riley noted that this was an information item and there was no need for a motion.

Approval of appointment of Dean for the School of Engineering and Computer Science

Mr. Kleckner reported that during the past year a search was conducted to identify a new dean to replace Mr. Thomas Butler, the former Dean for the School of Engineering and Computer Science. He stated that he was pleased to recommend the appointment of Dr. Robert Desmond who is currently at Rochester Institute of Technology where he serves as director of their Center for Imaging Science. Dr. Desmond would accept the University's invitation to join the faculty as dean and a tenured professor in the School of Engineering and Computer Science. Dr. Desmond has a distinguished record of accomplishment, particularly in working with business and industry. Mr. Kleckner added that Mr. Desmond would come to Oakland University with precisely the kind of experience the University needs at this point in the development of the School of Engineering and Computer Science.

Mr. Kleckner stated that, "We recommend with enthusiasm the endorsement of his employment," and he read the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approve the appointment of Dr. Robert M. Desmond as Professor of Engineering (with tenure), and as Dean of the School of Engineering and Computer Science, with the deanship appointment to commence January 1, 1987, for a period of five years.

Trustee Morris moved the recommendation which was seconded by Trustee Hartmann. Chairman Riley asked if Dr. Desmond was present. Mr. Kleckner stated that he would arrive in December or January. The motion was unanimously carried.

Approval of appointment of Department Chairs for the School of Human and Educational Services

Mr. Kleckner reported that over the last two years several academic units in the University have been reorganized by the

creation of departments since the units have grown too large for administration by a dean without assistance. The School of Engineering and Computer Science and the School of Business Administration are examples. Mr. Kleckner recommended that the same action be taken in the School of Human and Educational Services, which presently has over 40 faculty members plus part-time instructors. The recommendation is to establish five departments and appoint individual chairpersons to the standard three-year term in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Agreement:

The following persons are recommended for appointment as department chairs for the terms specified:

Robert W. Brown, Chairperson, Department of Counseling, August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1989.

Donald M. Miller, Chairperson, Department of Human Development and Child Studies, August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1989.

William F. Moorhouse, Chairperson, Department of Human Resource Development, August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1989.

M. Sharon Muir, Chairperson, Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership, August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1989.

George E. Coon, Chairperson, Department of Reading and Language Arts, August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1989.

Trustee Morris, seconded by Trustee Hartmann, moved the recommendation. The motion was unanimously carried.

Approval of faculty personnel actions list of September 10, 1986

Mr. Kleckner made the following recommendation:

Appointment

Cribbs, Michael D., Clinical Instructor in Exercise Science, effective August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1988

Gu, Ren-Jyh, Assistant Professor of Engineering, effective August 15, 1986

Grudzien, Thaddeus A., Assistant Professor of Biological Sciences, effective August 15, 1986

Latcha, Michael A., Assistant Professor of Engineering, effective August 15, 1986

Lauer, Thomas W., Assistant Professor of Management Information Systems, effective July 28, 1986

Mahmud, Syed, Assistant Professor of Engineering, effective August 15, 1986

Mili, Fatma, Assistant Professor of Engineering, effective August 15, 1986

Montenegro, Patricia G., Assistant Professor of Spanish, effective August 15, 1986 [Supersedes previous Board action of May 14, 1986 which appointed Ms. Montenegro as an Instructor in Spanish; this action is being taken because Ms. Montenegro has received her Doctor of Philosophy degree]

Rusek, Andrzej, Associate Professor of Engineering, effective August 15, 1986

Change of Status

Boddy, David E., from Professor of Engineering to Professor of Engineering and Acting Chair, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, effective August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1987

Miller, Donald M., from Professor of Education and Associate Dean of Education to Professor of Education, effective August 15, 1986

Morse, Donald E., from Professor of Rhetoric and English to Professor of English, effective August 15, 1986

Reddan, John R., from Professor of Biological Sciences to Professor of Biological Sciences and Adjunct Professor of Biomedical Sciences, effective August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1988

Sidaway, David D., from Special Instructor in Management to Special Instructor in Management and Acting Chair, Department of Accounting and Finance, effective August 15, 1986 through August 14, 1987

Unakar, Nalin J., from Professor of Biological Sciences and Chair, Department of Biological Sciences to Professor of Biological Sciences, Chair, Department of Biological Sciences, and Adjunct Professor of Biomedical Sciences, effective August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1988

Weng, Tung H., from Professor of Engineering to Professor of Engineering and Acting Chair, Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, effective August 15, 1986, through December 13, 1986

Leave of Absence

Doherty, Paul M., Associate Professor of Physics, from August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1987 (with no pay)

Resignation

Smith, Maureen H., Assistant Professor of Accounting, effective August 14, 1986

Trustee Morris, seconded by Trustee Hartmann, moved to accept the recommendation. The motion was unanimously carried.

Approval of degree candidates list of June 26, 1986

Mr. Kleckner stated that there were two degree candidate lists, as is customary, for students who finished course work at the completion of the Spring Semester. The first list consists of students receiving undergraduate degrees. The second list sets forth the students receiving graduate degrees.

Chairman Riley asked the University Affairs Committee to report on the recommendation. Trustee Hartmann stated that the Committee approved the candidates for degrees and moved that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation. The motion was seconded by Trustee Morris and was unanimously carried.

Extension of Meadow Brook Hall Food Service Contract

Mr. Robert McGarry reported that the University's contract with Oak Management, Inc., the present caterer at Meadow Brook Hall, expires September 30, 1986. He stated that the University was in the process of receiving bids and conducting site visits at facilities operated by some of the bidders. He noted that the Meadow Brook Hall administrators would be better served if the Oak Management contract were extended until the end of this

calendar year in order to provide the administration with more time for site visitation as well as to negotiate with each bidder the final terms of their offer. Mr. McGarry stated that he would present a five-year contract to the Board prior to January 1, 1987. He requested Board approval of the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That the Vice President for Finance and Administration be authorized to extend the contract with Oak Management, Inc. for service at Meadow Brook Hall to December 31, 1986, and be it further

RESOLVED, That a recommendation to enter into a catering contract for the period January 1, 1987, to December 31, 1991, will be brought to the Board of Trustees at a meeting prior to January 1, 1987.

Trustee Sims stated that he has no specific concern on this contract, but he stated that it would be reassuring to the Board to know that there was compliance with all University policies.

Chairman Riley inquired about the length of the term of the current contract with Oak Management. Mr. McGarry stated that it originally was a five-year contract that was renewed on a year-to-year basis. Oak Management came to the University in 1978. This request is the first time the administration has come to the Board with the catering contract.

Chairman Riley stated that a five-year contract appeared to be a long period of time. Mr. McGarry responded that it was very difficult in catering agreements to bid annually or even for three years. He felt "more comfortable with a five-year contract" with certain restrictions.

Trustee Hartmann asked if the contract was cancellable. Mr. McGarry responded that it would be cancellable with 60 days notice.

President Champagne stated that the University administration has received some of the bids and would like to make some site visits to the establishments being catered by the bidders. Also, to change caterers at a time when the Hall is beginning its busiest season would not be prudent. He added that Oak Management has agreed to an extension fully realizing that their contract may terminate in three months. If a contract is awarded to a new company, it would begin to serve in January or February, which is a slow program period at the Hall.

Chairman Riley inquired if the termination date for the proposed contract should be changed so as to avoid this problem in the

future. He added that the contract termination date should perhaps be in April. President Champagne stated that this recommendation could be considered when a new contract is presented to the Board. He emphasized that the University was only requesting an extension of the current agreement for three months.

Trustee Morris, seconded by Trustee Mair, moved to extend the contract for the three-month period. The motion was unanimously carried.

Trustee Sims stated that, "for clarity," the Board was only approving a portion of Mr. McGarry's recommendation which relates to the first "Resolve." Chairman Riley concurred. The proposal for a new contract must be brought to the Board of Trustees at a later date. President Champagne added that the second statement reads that a "recommendation to enter into a catering contract for the period January 1, 1987, to December 31, 1991, will be brought to the Board of Trustees at a meeting prior to January 1, 1987." If the time period is left open at this time, it will give the administration more flexibility with regard to the terms of the contract.

Chairman Riley reconfirmed that the Board had only adopted the first "Resolve" to extend the current contract for three months.

Alfred G. and Matilda R. Wilson Award Recipients

Mrs. Wilma Ray-Bledsoe, Vice President of Student Affairs, reported that the Alfred G. and Matilda R. Wilson Awards are presented annually to an Oakland University senior man and woman who have contributed to the Oakland University community as scholars, leaders and responsible citizens. First awarded in 1965, these honors were designed by Mrs. Matilda R. Wilson and Mr. Durwood Varner, Oakland's first chancellor, to recognize those students who not only have achieved academic excellence but who also have made significant contributions to campus life and demonstrated interest in the social problems of this community and society in general. The resolutions set forth below are submitted for consideration and approval in honor of Ms. Ann Giacomazza and Mr. Matthew Tomilo, recipients of the 1986 Matilda R. Wilson and Alfred G. Wilson Awards, respectively. Mrs. Bledsoe read the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Ms. Ann Giacomazza entered Oakland University in the Fall of 1982 as a residence hall student from Warren, Michigan, Warren Woods High School; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Giacomazza demonstrated academic excellence by maintaining a 3.7 grade point average in pursuit of a major in marketing; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Giacomazza's academic excellence has been recognized by her receipt of the 1985 Michigan Association of Governing Boards' Outstanding Student Award, the 1986 Wall Street Journal Award, Upper Class Achievement, University honors - Magna Cum Laude, academic honors - School of Business Administration; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Giacomazza has demonstrated leadership capabilities and commitment to the University by her participation in a variety of campus functions, including American Marketing Association, University Congress, WOUX, Health Conscious Society, Intramurals, NCAA II Basketball Statistician, CIPO Programmer, and Resident Assistant; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Giacomazza has served as a student representative of Oakland University to the public through her work as a Freshman Orientation Group Leader, Annual Blood Drive Volunteer, Director of Far Conservatory of Therapeutic and Performing Arts; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Giacomazza has been selected as the 1986 recipient of the Matilda R. Wilson Award given annually to a senior woman who has maintained high academic standards, who has demonstrated extraordinary leadership capabilities and involvement in the Oakland University community and who has expressed social concern; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees expresses its appreciation to Ms. Ann Giacomazza for her commitment to campus life at Oakland University; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees commends Ms. Ann Giacomazza for the quality of her scholarship and leadership.

Mrs. Bledsoe then read the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Matthew Tomilo entered Oakland University in the Fall of 1982 as a residence hall student from Dearborn, Michigan, Divine Child High School; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Tomilo demonstrated academic excellence by maintaining a 3.4 grade point average in pursuit of a major in accounting; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Tomilo has demonstrated leadership capabilities and commitment to the University by his participation in a variety of campus functions, including Hill House Council President, Area Hall Council President, Resident Assistant, University Congress, Student Activity Fee Committee Chairperson, Accounting Club member, Student Representative to the Oakland University Faculty Senate, Student Representative to the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, Residence Halls House Policy Committee, Resident Halls Positive Committee, Project Unity Committee; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Tomilo has served as a student representative of Oakland University to the public through his work as a St. John Fisher Chapel Board member, Annual Blood Drive Volunteer, and Accounting tutor; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Tomilo has been selected as the 1986 recipient of the Alfred G. Wilson Award given annually to a senior man who has maintained high academic standards, who has demonstrated extraordinary leadership capabilities and involvement in the Oakland University community and who has expressed social concern; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees expresses its appreciation to Mr. Matthew Tomilo for his commitment to campus life at Oakland University; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees commends Mr. Matthew Tomilo for the quality of his scholarship and leadership.

Trustee Bemis, seconded by Trustee Morris, moved adoption of the two resolutions. The motion was unanimously carried.

Trustee Hartmann stated that if the students return to campus at the time of a Board meeting, the Trustees would enjoy meeting them.

Perfusion Technology Program

Mr. Kleckner reported that at its November, 1985, meeting the Board of Trustees passed a motion which authorized the School of Health Sciences to establish a Bachelor of Science degree in perfusion technology. The Board stipulated that implementation of the program would take place upon certification of the President, with the advice and consent of the Board, that all necessary approvals are secured. At that time, the University was seeking approval by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA). CAHEA has now granted provisional accreditation to the program. Mr. Kleckner stated that "provisional accreditation" is the term used by the agency for a new program that has not graduated any students. The agency gives provisional accreditation on the basis of the curriculum, the staff, and the apparent ability of the institution to carry out the program. The agency returns, after one class has been graduated, to review the program. If the University has met the commitments for accreditation, "provisional" status is removed. Mr. Kleckner stated that there was another approval process, which is a voluntary system, established by the Presidents Council of the State Colleges and Universities. Approval has been received from this process through the endorsement of the academic officers of all the other state institutions. There are no other comparable programs in Michigan.

Mr. Kleckner added that legislative recognition has also been received for the program.

Mr. Kleckner stated that historically perfusion technology programs were operated by private corporations or by a hospital. Many programs were technical training efforts which became hospital-based educational programs. There is a movement to university-based programs because of the need for scientific and technical background. In addition, liberal arts courses are also important in order to assist these individuals in their relationships with people.

PSICOR, Inc., expressed an interest in transferring its program to the University. Mr. Kleckner added that the administration now believes that all of the necessary elements are present, such as the agency approvals along with a feasible budget, for the

implementation of this program. The highlights are that PSICOR has agreed to pay the marginal increase in cost over available University funds for the operation of the program. He stated that among these costs are those of the faculty, who are specialists in perfusion technology. PSICOR also agrees to provide the necessary specialized equipment. The University could not afford to invest in such equipment for a program with such a limited number of students. PSICOR will also provide the required disposable laboratory supplies.

Mr. Kleckner stated that it was unfortunate that Mr. Michael Dunaway, President of PSICOR, could not be present because of hospitalization. Mr. Kleckner added that one of PSICOR's concerns throughout this entire set of discussions was the issue of academic quality. He stated that he did not recall any discussion with an outside agency that placed such an emphasis on program quality. It is usually the University that has to insist upon certain standards. He added that the relationship with PSICOR has been very "fruitful and productive."

Mr. Kleckner added that the University administration believes that this is a "wonderful opportunity to provide a program that is not being provided elsewhere in the state." The administration, therefore, recommends the implementation of the program at this time.

Mr. Kleckner then introduced, Mr. Joel Russell, Interim Dean of the School of Health Sciences.

Mr. Russell reported that the Board's action in November contemplated a site accreditation visit by CAHEA. This agency established the guidelines for the site visit and stated that the site visit would be concluded with an exit interview to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the program, but that the accrediting agency stated that the Committee would not inform the University of its recommendation until a later date. However, at the time of the actual exit interview, the Committee stated that there would be no delay because it was so favorably impressed with the program. Mr. Russell enumerated three strengths that were reported to him at that time.

1. The University/PSICOR relationship could develop into a model for other programs in the country. These programs are expensive to operate because the faculty have relatively high salaries compared to University faculty, and the equipment required for such programs

is costly and must be constantly updated. Other University programs have fiscal problems with maintenance and the updating of equipment in times of economic stress. In the Oakland case, there is another party (PSICOR) underwriting a part of the program so that the University is assured of appropriate equipment at all times.

2. The quality of the clinical experience is unique. Some university programs have had difficulty in establishing quality clinical instruction programs at off-campus sites. In this program, a PSICOR employee is present in all clinical sites. PSICOR will "constantly monitor" their employees to maintain the quality of the clinical education program. PSICOR has extensive programs for the education of its employees.

3. The type of experience provided to our students is broadened since PSICOR will rotate the students to three or four different locations. This will enrich and diversify clinical experience for students in a way not possible for other clinical programs. CAHEA representatives felt that Oakland University had a model program for the entire country.

Mr. Russell reported that the accrediting agency called attention to the strengths of the proposed Program Director, Mr. Harry Hoerr. His "knowledge, dedication, enthusiasm, and ability to motivate students" was noted. The University was pleased with the results of the site visit and grateful that the agency made its recommendation immediately, rather than at a later date, which is standard practice.

Mr. Kleckner stated that in Mr. Dunaway's absence, Mr. Hoerr was present to answer questions.

Chairman Riley stated that the report was very positive. He inquired if there were any reservations or risks.

Mr. Kleckner stated that it was conceivable that the program could prove to be too expensive or that it would not work due to the absence of qualified students. He added that it is possible that PSICOR may determine in the future that it cannot financially support the program. Mr. Kleckner noted that the University has a cancellation clause in the proposed contract with PSICOR that would permit termination of the program on a phased

basis to protect students in the program. The University administration is of the opinion that PSICOR's long-term interest minimizes this risk.

Trustee Morris stated that because of the personnel actions and funding issues, this matter was discussed at some length by the Finance and Personnel Committee and that a number of concerns were raised. The first concern was that this is a new approach in the relationship between the University and corporations. It raises the question of whether any company could come to the institution and request that some "specialized" area be taught in order to provide a source of employees for the company. Trustee Morris inquired about the effect on "normal faculty/University relationships". He also wondered how many additional companies would be willing to develop their own systems if they could have the University sponsor such programs. He inquired if it was appropriate for a state-funded university to underwrite such programs for private industry. He added that he had many trepidations about this program, most of which were expressed at the Finance and Personnel Committee meeting.

Trustee Hartmann stated that the University Affairs Committee reviewed the programmatic aspects and the Committee felt that this was a very special opportunity for the University to benefit the health science program. She added that it may have some "pitfalls," but the program was unique and could be used as a model for additional programs that would be beneficial to the University.

Trustee Morris stated that one of the questions to be considered is: "Where do you draw the line on University/corporation relationships?"

Trustee Handleman stated that the Finance and Personnel Committee members thought that there was a philosophic question concerning "how much influence government and business will have in the operation of a university."

Trustee Bemis stated that he had a series of questions which he hoped could be answered. His first question was, "When would the program start?" Mr. Kleckner answered that the program would start upon approval of the Board of Trustees. Trustee Bemis asked, "Has the program already started?" Mr. Kleckner stated, "No." Trustee Bemis then asked Mr. Kleckner for a definition of special instructors. Mr. Kleckner responded that special instructors have faculty appointments, but the full range of

faculty involvement in such areas as research and public service are not expected. Mr. Kleckner added that the University has appointed special instructors in other health science areas as "clinical faculty."

(Trustee Handleman left the meeting at this time.)

Mr. Kleckner clarified that special instructors are full-time faculty whose entire employment responsibility is to the University, but who do not have the typical broad spectrum of faculty responsibilities. They are limited by the employment agreement at the time of hire.

Trustee Bemis continued his questions by asking, "What would be the normal progression of a special instructor?" Mr. Kleckner answered that there are two routes. Some will remain special instructors permanently and may obtain job security through the provisions of the Faculty Agreement after five years of service. The other employment route would be if the individual moved to a position with a full range of faculty responsibilities, including research and service activities. In the new position, the individual would be titled associate professor with tenure. He added that the University has experienced this change of responsibilities with certain faculty members. The Board approved, within the last year, one such promotion from special instructor to associate professor. It is not common, but it is possible.

Trustee Bemis stated that he had a copy of the complete contract and assumed that the other Board members had copies or a synopsis. Mr. Kleckner stated that the Board members have a copy of the complete contract. Trustee Bemis asked if the University would own the equipment referred to in the agreement or would it be owned by PSICOR with the University having access. Mr. Kleckner stated that he believed the title under the terms of the contract rests with PSICOR, but PSICOR has agreed to maintain the equipment. Mr. Russell stated that PSICOR would maintain and update the equipment. He added that should PSICOR at some point decide to terminate this relationship, it has agreed to sell the equipment to the University at market value.

Trustee Bemis made reference to the Board's authorization of the site visit by the accrediting agency last November. He inquired if the review covered the clinical or technical aspects of the program or the entire program. Mr. Kleckner stated that the agency looked at the whole curriculum, including the general education, basic science, and math courses, because a baccalaureate program is involved. Mr. Kleckner added that there has

been considerable discussion in the University Senate regarding the adherence of this program to all of the University's general education requirements and the appropriateness of this program in a university setting. This program would have the same requirements as those set forth for all students.

Trustee Bemis asked how many perfusion technology programs were university-based programs, and how many were comparable to PSICOR's program. Mr. Russell responded that there were 14 university programs and 10 hospital programs. There are 24 accredited programs, one in Toronto and the other 23 in the United States.

Trustee Bemis asked, "What University policies are not being adhered to with the adoption of this program?" Mr. Kleckner responded that he does not believe that there are any such policies. He added that there had been some discussion at the Board committee level concerning the faculty appointments to this program and whether or not they come under the Faculty Hiring Procedures approved by the Board effective July 1, 1986. He added that these persons were identified as potential faculty before July 1. Trustee Bemis sought clarification by asking whether Mr. Kleckner meant the individuals were "potentially identified as employees of Oakland University." Mr. Kleckner answered affirmatively. He also stated that they had not been employed by the University, but the identification and selection process was completed by that time. Trustee Bemis stated that he is not in a position to make a judgment on the individuals being discussed. He stated that his concern was that the University retain total control of the academic standards of the curriculum, including admissions and faculty hiring. He then asked, "Why wouldn't we go through the same faculty hiring procedure as far as the examination of the candidates is concerned, in particular with respect to the identification of minority candidates for these jobs?" Mr. Kleckner responded that in his opinion this is a different situation. He then referred to the early discussions between PSICOR and Oakland University regarding the University ultimately assuming responsibility for this program and upgrading it to a baccalaureate program. At that time, there were professionals already associated with the program, although the program did not have a full science base or a general education base. We entered into discussions knowing that if the University took over the program we would be working with existing PSICOR staff. There were discussions at that time about whether we felt that they were qualified to be involved with our program. This

is an unusual situation. Elements of this program are already in existence. This University is not creating a totally new program. We are not considering, at this time, the takeover of any other existing programs.

Trustee Bemis stated that it should be clearly noted that the administration is requesting an exception to the Faculty Hiring Procedure policy which was just adopted. Mr. Kleckner stated that should there be a vacancy or should the program be expanded at some point there is no question that the hiring process to fill that vacancy would be in accord with the existing University procedure. Trustee Bemis commented that at the time of adoption he thought the policy was "tough" in its requirements, but he noted that the policy was adopted based on the recommendation of the University administration.

President Champagne interjected that when the policy was adopted there were many questions. There was a provision in the last part of the resolution that any amendment to the Faculty Hiring Procedure would be reported to the Board of Trustees at the next regularly scheduled meeting. We recognized, at that time, that there would be occasions when the policy may not apply to a given circumstance. Rather than delay the implementation of a matter, the administration would report to the Board. The administration would also report to the Board in January, 1987, on the status of the procedure. While this is an exception to the policy, the President stated that in his judgment it is an exception within the authority granted to the administration.

Trustee Bemis stated that he is not questioning the authority of the administration; he is just observing the issue as an exception is being made in this case. Trustee Bemis added that the Finance and Personnel Committee had an extensive discussion on this subject, and one of the points that was raised was that the Board possibly should have an in-depth review of the PSICOR-business-University relationship before the University becomes too involved. He added that it appeared that the University Affairs Committee had some of the same concerns. He stated that he "was not anti-perfusion technology." He does not want anyone to misunderstand the issue. It appears to him that this action is a "major shift in direction for the University" and careful thought has to be given to the matter so that a precedent will not be established by the perfusion technology case.

Trustee Hartmann stated that the program should be studied very carefully as it develops.

Trustee Morris concurred with this statement and added that perhaps the program should be delayed for a year while discussions are held with other universities. He stated that it was his impression that some faculty members also had some reservations about the concept. He expressed concern and stated that the University should proceed "cautiously."

Trustee Bemis stated that his concern was also with the contractual commitments made to special instructor employees. Trustee Bemis inquired if there were any programs nationally that are similar. Mr. Russell responded that a group of surgeons in Minneapolis are trying to establish a program. They have not been accredited to this date. It was very clear in the accreditation process that "this is an Oakland University program, not a joint or a PSICOR program." We have PSICOR support, but it is "wholly a University program."

Trustee Hartmann asked if this program were much different from having a robotics lab with support from the automotive industry. Mr. Kleckner added that it was different, because in the robotics case the University is able to directly offer "extra experiences" to the students because the basic program is being provided by Oakland through funding to the institution. In the case of perfusion technology, the basic program would not be possible without the resources of staff, equipment, and clinical sites provided by PSICOR.

Trustee Sims stated that he hoped the discussion and the responses at the meeting would clarify the program. He stated that he was more confused with the discussion today than he had been previously. He stated that it was his understanding that one reason why the University would entertain such an agreement would be that it is a logical extension of the activities in which the University is presently engaged. In other words, if a private company did not offer the program, it might well be developed as an extension to the health science program. There is, in fact, some basis to question why a perfusionist needs a baccalaureate degree rather than a two-year certification from a training program. Trustee Sims' original understanding was that the only reason the University would engage in the program is that it was programmatically logical and there was a basis for a bachelor's degree in this area. He wondered if it was a coincidence that PSICOR had contacted Oakland. Mr. Kleckner responded by saying that the program was logical for our health science effort. He noted that the University would like to

engage in certain programs but cannot because the financial resources are not available. In the health science area, a number of specialized programs are moving from a hospital base to a university base in order to provide students with broader-based scientific training. Graduates of these programs must be prepared in physiology, pharmacology, and to make quick decisions. They must have an extensive educational background in problem solving in addition to the mechanical and scientific training. A problem with these programs for a university like Oakland is their high cost. It is very difficult to consider adding programs, such as respiratory therapy, which are logical extensions of the health sciences and would provide additional outlets for students who cannot get into physical therapy, because of cost.

Trustee Sims asked if Mr. Kleckner could "hypothesize that the University might have thought of this program and approached PSICOR." Mr. Kleckner said it was possible "under the right conditions."

Trustee Sims stated that the issue that several of the members of the Board have raised is whether this is an appropriate relationship for this University. His concern is that the program be appropriate for the University specifically, and not for the convenience of, or service to, a private company.

Trustee Hartmann questioned Mr. Kleckner as to whether she was correct in understanding that there have been other programs that have been rejected, even though funds were available, because they were not appropriate for the University. Mr. Kleckner said, "Yes." Trustee Hartmann stated that this issue was much more "palatable" to her when she had learned that other programs had been turned down.

Trustee Morris asked about the educational training of perfusionists up to this point and if they had a degree of any kind. Mr. Hoerr, a PSICOR employee, responded that perfusion technology started in the early 1960's. Originally doctors engaged in the work, but "they got tired of the process and started to pick people off the street to take over this particular function with on-the-job training." As the field became more sophisticated and perfusionists became more responsible, the necessity for a wider background for a person who is not just a machinist became apparent. This fact was first noted by Ohio State University when it began its baccalaureate program in the early 1970's. From that point, there has been a steady progression away from the hospital based programs toward baccalaureate programs. Currently there are about 2,500 to 3,000

perfusionists in the country. It is not a large profession, but there is currently a great need which should last for ten years and beyond. Perfusionists must have the "ability to assess life and death situations and act independently" even though under the control of a surgeon, since they are more familiar with the heart/lung machine than the doctor. The accrediting bodies are now stressing the baccalaureate program.

Trustee Sims asked how many of the 2,500 perfusionists would possess baccalaureate degrees. Mr. Hoerr stated that he did not know.

Trustee Sims asked if there would be an effort to decertify the non-baccalaureate perfusionists. Mr. Hoerr answered "no" as there is too great a need for their services. The non-baccalaureate programs are being phased out and the baccalaureate programs are supplying the majority of the new entries into the field.

Trustee Sims asked if a substantial number of that 2,500 are performing capably without baccalaureate degrees. Mr. Hoerr responded that it is on the complex cases, when a disaster occurs, that it becomes apparent that the people who have the degree background are more competent.

Trustee Bemis read from the proposed contract that "the University would take total control over the academic standard of the curriculum, admissions, and regular and clinical faculty hiring." He noted that page 5, paragraph 3, of the contract states, "The University shall hire by separate employment agreement a Program Director and a Clinical Coordinator who are acceptable to PSICOR" Trustee Bemis then asked if PSICOR or the University had control of the program. Trustee Bemis felt that "it was unique to turn veto power over to an outside agency." Mr. Kleckner responded that the University could refuse to hire an individual. In two critical perfusionist positions, the University could propose someone and PSICOR could determine the person is not technically capable. Mr. Kleckner agreed that the condition was different. Trustee Bemis asked if Mr. Kleckner found the provision "repugnant or unusual." Mr. Kleckner stated that he found it unusual but not repugnant because the concern of PSICOR relates to Oakland University's ability to identify and hire qualified staff.

Trustee Bemis stated that his responsibility is not to PSICOR but to Oakland University, and that is his concern. He expressed surprise that this issue was not raised by the faculty as the

program was reviewed. In his opinion, it is a major issue for a public institution to turn over veto power regarding employment and faculty status to an outside agency.

Trustee Bemis contended that the company and not the University would essentially have control over who is going to direct the program. He reiterated his concern that this was a unique position for a public university. He added that he had raised some of these objections when the contract was first discussed last November.

Chairman Riley asked if there was any money appropriated by the Legislature for this program. Mr. Kleckner stated that the University has not sought any additional appropriation.

Trustee Bemis observed that a portion of the general appropriation will be used to house and operate the program.

Trustee Mair stated that he felt that the program provided an opportunity for increased knowledge in the cardio-vascular area which could increase our life span. This factor and the need to increase the learning level of perfusionists were the reasons he and the University Affairs Committee supported the contract.

Trustee Sims stated that at this point there was not enough agreement among the Board members to move ahead with this item. He stated that he was reluctant to put this issue to a vote this evening. He asked Chairman Riley if the item could be tabled and referred to a committee to provide an opportunity to answer some of the legitimate concerns of Board members.

Chairman Riley asked what timing Trustee Sims would suggest. Trustee Sims responded that the questions do not require a great amount of time, but convincing answers are needed. He added that the approval of a new program was an important act and he would not like to see a divided Board on the matter. He then stated that there were some legitimate concerns as to whether this program was really educational or if Oakland was engaging in the "training business." He asked if perfusion technology would be an on-going specialty of some permanence, like engineering, or should the University be training and educating someone who might specialize as a perfusionist but have a broader degree. He restated his concern that there were Board members who were not convinced of the merit of the program, and he felt they should have the time that they need to obtain the answers they sought.

Trustee Bemis stated that he was supportive of the perfusion technology program as a baccalaureate program at this University. He would have no problem voting positively on that issue alone with the data provided. The problem comes with the confusion of the rights of the two separate entities--Oakland and PSICOR. The interests of Michigan and the Board's obligation to the University must be met. He added that the Board could negotiate a contract to fulfill these requirements, but he has some philosophical problems with the University entering into the kind of agreement presented with any corporation.

Trustee Hartmann stated that she wanted to proceed to approve the implementation of the program. President Champagne responded that last November the program was approved and implementation was delayed pending the necessary approvals which are before the Board at this time.

Chairman Riley asked how the contract was obtained and with whom it was negotiated. Mr. Kleckner answered that negotiations took place with PSICOR. Chairman Riley proposed to the Board members that what they were saying was that they approved of the program but not some of the terms in the PSICOR contract.

Trustee Bemis agreed. He stated that he has a problem with relinquishing some of the fundamental authority of the University to a private contractor.

Trustee Hartmann asked Mr. John De Carlo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Vice President of Governmental Affairs and General Counsel, whether there was a way to vote on the establishment of the program without acting on the contract. Mr. De Carlo responded that the issues, at this time, were "intertwined."

Mr. De Carlo addressed Mr. Kleckner and stated that perhaps the most desirable action would be to determine if the University could take over the entire program with a grant from PSICOR to cover all costs. This would result in full control by the University and resolve some of the questions. PSICOR would not be involved in the hiring action. He asked, "Would that be a possibility?" Mr. Kleckner responded that he did not know, but the issue could be discussed with PSICOR. PSICOR has some further interest in this agreement since it is not only providing equipment, but will also maintain it. Mr. De Carlo asked if PSICOR could, under the agreement, terminate the contract which would place the maintenance burden on the University. Mr. Kleckner stated that the administration would have to determine

if it wished to keep the program, and find a way to underwrite the expenses that were underwritten by PSICOR. That option is available to the University.

Trustee Sims asked what would happen to the students who were enrolled in the program should it be dropped. Mr. Kleckner responded that the students in the program would finish, no new students would be enrolled, and the program would be phased out.

Trustee Morris read item "c" on page 3 of the contract, namely, "Students shall be under the supervision and control of PSICOR and its instructor employees during classroom, laboratory and clinical courses for which PSICOR is responsible." He stated that the University is, in effect, saying that it turns the program over to PSICOR.

Trustee Law Googasian stated that she believes that the intent of that paragraph is to place responsibility on PSICOR for the courses it is teaching. It very clearly specifies that the University is responsible for all the other classes.

Mr. Kleckner stated that the regular day-to-day clinical supervision would be done by on-site PSICOR employees, similar to the hospital staff in the physical therapy program.

Chairman Riley asked Mr. Russell if it were correct to state that the first part of the agreement concerned activities during the 1985-86 year and the second part concerned activities starting after Board approval of the contract. Mr. Russell answered that the second part takes effect whenever the Board approves the implementation of the program.

Chairman Riley asked if there was a motion on the matter.

Trustee Morris stated that he desired an in-depth review of the contract.

President Champagne asked if the Trustees could review the contract indicating the areas that need revision so that the administration could negotiate the matter with PSICOR. Trustee Morris stated that he felt that there should be a session for a collective review of the contract. He stated that he had some hesitancy about signing the contract.

Chairman Riley repeated Trustee Morris' concerns stating that he would like to refer the matter to a committee to review the contract prior to further discussions with PSICOR.

President Champagne suggested that Chairman Riley appoint an ad hoc committee that would express to the administration some of the Board's concerns. The administration would then attempt to renegotiate a contract to the satisfaction of the Board. The Board would be approving the establishment of the program subject to an acceptable contract.

Trustee Hartmann moved to adopt the President's recommendation, and Trustee Morris seconded the motion.

Chairman Riley asked the President about timing. President Champagne responded that he could not determine how long it would take to resolve the matter. The administration would be responsible for bringing the issue back to the Board.

President Champagne stated that PSICOR may not be amenable to the changes and may seek a resolution elsewhere.

Trustee Bemis asked Mr. Hoerr if, in light of the discussion, he felt a contract could be negotiated between Oakland University and PSICOR. Mr. Hoerr stated that he thought it could be done but it may not be easy. The issue relates to Mr. Dunaway's concerns about education and the commitment of corporate resources. He added that this is not "making money for the company." Mr. Dunaway committed funds to this educational program because of his interest in the training of perfusionists. He has been very concerned about the professional quality of the trainers. He added that he, himself, has been involved in this program from the very beginning and knows of Mr. Dunaway's wishes to create a program that will produce the highest quality of trained staff. In so doing, he is very concerned that the PSICOR staff control the clinical program.

Trustee Bemis responded that he was certain that he spoke for the Trustees when he stated that the Board had the same objective for the program. Trustee Bemis added that the Board has a public trust which is distinctly different from a private corporation or a private university. There are legal restrictions on a public institution. The Board has to approach this matter with great caution, because as soon as the Board abdicates its responsibility there are serious problems. He clarified that it is not that the Board does not trust PSICOR, but this is a major step for the University. Unfortunately, the PSICOR contract is the first program to broach this subject. Trustee Bemis expressed hope that for the benefit of the students an acceptable contract will be developed.

Chairman Riley recognized Ms. Osa Jackson, Associate Professor of Physical Therapy. Ms. Jackson stated that the proposed concept is identical to the current model being used in physical therapy. The physical therapy students go to clinical studies at hospitals where the faculty delegates certain functions and then supervises their implementation by occasional site visits. This is not a new model for Oakland University.

Trustee Bemis stated that he wishes to make sure that the same safeguards existing in the physical therapy program are built into the perfusion technology program.

President Champagne restated that the present situation is one where the Board is concerned about the possible loss of University control as a result of the PSICOR contract. The Board is indicating that the program is satisfactory, but the implementation document is not.

President Champagne stated that he thinks the Board ad hoc committee should meet with the administration and after contract negotiations return a document to the Board for review. The motion on the floor is that the Chairman will appoint a committee to assist the administration in the development of an appropriate contract to implement this program. The Board would ultimately approve the contract. If such a contract cannot be implemented, then the University can make a decision on whether to fund or terminate the program.

President Champagne added that the administration may find that there is no acceptable way to work out a contract that is agreeable to both the University and the corporation.

Chairman Riley restated the motion that the Chairman is authorized to appoint a special committee of the Board to review the contract and make whatever changes or adjustments are necessary so that it may be presented to the Board for determination on the implementation of the program.

Mr. Kleckner stated that he thought this matter should be resolved as quickly as possible, because these issues have been discussed with PSICOR for a long time and the academic implementation of the program will soon become very difficult.

President Champagne restated the motion for the benefit of the Board.

The motion is consistent with the Board's prior approval of this program. Implementation of the program will be subject to an acceptable contract document. The Chairman of the Board will appoint a special committee of the Board to work with the administration in negotiating such a contract. The resulting contract document will be submitted to the Board for its approval.

Trustee Bemis, seconded by Trustee Morris, moved for approval. Chairman Riley asked for a vote. Trustee Bemis called for a roll call vote. Trustees Bemis, Law Googasian, Morris, Sims, and Riley voted in favor of the motion. Trustees Hartmann and Mair voted "no." The motion was approved.

Trustee Hartman stated that she was ready to vote on the approval of the contract this evening. Trustee Mair agreed with Trustee Hartmann.

Trustee Bemis suggested that if a satisfactory contract is negotiated, a special Board meeting could be called so as not to hinder student progress. He presented it as a motion which was seconded by Trustee Googasian. The motion was unanimously carried.

(Trustee Hartmann left the meeting at 7:10 p.m.)

Approval of honorary degree at September 14, 1986 Commencement

President Champagne stated that the University will conduct the Commencement Program on September 14, 1986. In connection with the program, it is recommended that the Board approve the granting of the degree of Doctor of Laws, Honoris Causa to Michigan Supreme Court Justice G. Mennen Williams. The institution grants very few honorary degrees reserving them for individuals of national distinction who also have a relationship with the University. Justice Williams will be retiring in January, 1987, after a distinguished career as a jurist, Governor of the State of Michigan, and United States Ambassador. In addition, Justice Williams has had a long-standing relationship with the University having made a significant contribution consisting of a portion of his African Art collection. He is also a distinguished member of the President's Club.

The President added that the administration discussed this matter with Chief Justice Williams and he has indicated that he would be honored to receive an honorary degree from Oakland.

He then read the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes the awarding of the degree of Doctor of Laws, Honoris Causa to the Honorable G. Mennen Williams at the September 14, 1986 Commencement Program.

Trustee Morris, seconded by Trustee Sims, moved to approve the awarding of the degree. The motion was unanimously carried.

Status of the University Master Plan

Trustee Sims read the following statement in the absence of Trustee Hartmann who serves as the Chair of the University Affairs Committee:

On September 4, 1986, the University Affairs Committee had a general discussion regarding the status of the University Master Plan which was adopted by the Board of Trustees on December 4, 1971. The Committee heard a presentation by Mr. William McGibbon of J. J. & R. Co. regarding the elements of updating a Master Plan.

There is a definite need to update the Oakland University Master Plan given the date of the original plan and the developments which have occurred on campus since that date. In addition, new buildings such as the science building are proposed, and the creation of the Oakland Technology Park with the proposed road system in the area mandates an updating.

Therefore, authorization is being requested from the full Board to permit the University Affairs Committee to interview planning consulting firms. The University Affairs Committee would then make a recommendation to the full Board regarding the retention of a firm to update the Master Plan and, if necessary, conduct traffic surveys and other studies. The following recommendation is submitted for your consideration:

RESOLVED, That the University Affairs Committee is authorized to conduct interviews in order to submit to the full Board a recommendation on the retention of a firm to update the University Master Plan and provide any necessary additional studies in connection with such plan, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the full Board will determine whether to retain such consultant.

Trustee Morris, seconded by Trustee Sims, moved the recommendation. The motion was unanimously carried.

President's Report

President Champagne requested that Mr. Kleckner provide an enrollment update. Mr. Kleckner stated that the University is still registering students at off-campus locations. He added that it is estimated that the head count will be at an all-time high but only slightly above last year's enrollment. The University has tried in a number of ways to keep enrollment at about the same level as last year because of limited staff and faculty resources. The University is estimating about 12,750 students as opposed to 12,586 last year. There are somewhat fewer freshmen than last year and fewer transfer students because of a new policy which increased academic requirements for transfer admission. There is a great increase in the number of returning students. He added that seniors are the largest undergraduate constituency followed by juniors, sophomores, and then freshmen. Once these students graduate, the University will see some decline in enrollment. He added that the administration is trying to control the admission of new students so that a proper balance can be maintained. The administration has also limited the number of new graduate students, particularly in the School of Human and Educational Services.

Trustee Sims asked Mr. Kleckner if this change in student profile presents any significant problem with respect to course offering or faculty. Mr. Kleckner stated that no critical problems are foreseen other than those relating to the increase in the number of students. Significant strides have been made in the distribution of faculty. He added that in some sense the University is a "victim of its own success" as the retention of these students is higher. Mr. Kleckner was asked by Trustee Mair if he had any knowledge on how the other universities in Michigan were doing. Mr. Kleckner stated that he did not know at this time since some schools have not started.

Comments from Members of the Audience

Chairman Riley stated that he had received cards from members of the audience requesting to speak. He noted that all wished to speak on the appointment of a dean for the School of Health Sciences. Chairman Riley then called on Ms. Osa Jackson.

Ms. Osa Jackson, Associate Professor of Physical Therapy, stated that she was speaking on behalf of the physical therapy faculty to express concern about the possibility of reopening the search process for the Dean of the School of Health Sciences. She stated that Professor Joel Russell has worked for quite some time as interim dean and has assisted in advancing the physical therapy program from 49th to seventh, nationally. She stated that it was her hope that the Board would review the search committee's recommendation regarding Professor Russell, and she hoped for "a constructive outcome."

Chairman Riley called on Ms. Lynne Williams.

Ms. Lynne Williams, Associate Professor of Medical Laboratory Science, stated that she was the first faculty member in the health science area, having joined the institution in 1968. She served on the search committee, and after a nationwide review, it made its recommendations regarding Mr. Russell. If a decision were made contrary to that recommendation, without discussion with the faculty, this would be destructive to institutional relations.

Trustee Sims stated that the two speakers had raised a question regarding a subject which was not on the Board agenda and he was not familiar with the issue. He asked what the basis was for the presentations. President Champagne stated that the University has been engaged in a search process for about a year for the position of Dean of the School of Health Sciences. This search was begun after the Board established the School changing it from "Center" to "School" status. The search committee presented three names to the Provost. Those names have been reviewed by both the Provost and the President, and no name has been put forth to the Board pending further analysis of the qualifications of the three individuals recommended. He stated that he appreciated the faculty's concern and expressed the hope that the matter would be resolved.

Trustee Bemis asked if he understood correctly that there were three names under consideration, and that a decision has not been made on the matter. President Champagne responded that Trustee Bemis was correct.

Chairman Riley then called on Mr. Philip Singer.

Mr. Philip Singer, Professor of Health Behavioral Science and Anthropology, stated that he would speak for himself and Mr. Carl Vann, Professor of Health Behavioral Science and Political

Science. He stated that he was a senior faculty member in the School of Health Sciences, and he was "disturbed that the Board had not accepted the recommendation of the search committee for a Dean of the School of Health Sciences." The committee expended an extensive amount of time and institutional funds to review the matter. After many months, the committee selected Interim Dean Joel Russell as its choice. He stated that a reopening of the search would be "destructive to the school." He then requested that the Board engage in "an open dialogue with the School to resolve" this issue.

Chairman Riley called on Mr. John Stevenson.

Mr. John Stevenson, Assistant Professor of Exercise Science, stated that he was impressed by Mr. Russell's leadership and he was pleased with the search committee's recommendation. The exercise science area has grown under Mr. Russell's leadership, and he asked that the President and the Board confer with the faculty on the matter.

Chairman Riley called on Mr. Richard Rozek.

Mr. Richard Rozek, Assistant Professor of Industrial Health and Science, stated that he has been involved in health sciences for the past five years, and that, in his opinion, Mr. Russell was the best candidate for the position of dean. He requested that before any action is taken to reject the recommendation of the search committee there be some dialogue between the Board and the faculty.

Chairman Riley called on Mr. Clifford Snitgen.

Mr. Clifford Snitgen, Manager of Clinical Research Laboratory, stated that he was representing himself and Mr. Arthur Griggs, Assistant to the Dean of the School of Health Sciences. He stated that Mr. Russell had exhibited outstanding leadership qualities during the past three years as interim dean and deserved consideration for the permanent position. He added that further delay in filling the position will be detrimental to the School and to the University.

Upon completion of the presentations, President Champagne summarized the process by stating that the search committee submitted three names to the Provost and the President. The search committee preferred Mr. Joel Russell, and he had the committee's highest recommendation. There has been no action to bring forward to the full Board a recommendation on any of the three candidates.

Professor Singer then expressed his concern about a new search being implemented before the names were brought before the Board. He asked that the names be submitted to the Board.

President Champagne stated that the request was reasonable, but he noted that a reopening of a search does not deny the current candidates from further consideration. What the action indicates is that the candidates presented may not necessarily possess all of the attributes that may be found by extending the search process. No name has been put forward, at this time, because the administration may wish to see some additional names.

Professor Singer stated that he feels that a reasonable search has been made, three names have been presented, and one of those names is the overwhelming choice of the search committee and the faculty. Before the University pursues an expensive search, the Board should consult with the faculty. If the search is reopened, it will be destructive to the School of Health Sciences and to Oakland University.

Chairman Riley stated that no decision would be made at this meeting, since the matter is new to the Board members. He suggested that a motion would be in order to refer this question to the Finance and Personnel Committee.

Trustee Bemis stated that there is nothing before the Board, and it should not take any action until it hears from the President at the appropriate time. He suggested that the faculty discuss their concern with the President rather than the Board at this time.

President Champagne stated that for the public record he will present the three names to the Finance and Personnel Committee for discussion.

Chairman Riley stated that no motion was needed and asked if there were any other business to come before the Board. There being no further business, Trustee Sims, seconded by Trustee Morris, moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

Approved,

John De Carlo, Secretary
Board of Trustees

Wallace D. Riley, Chairman
Board of Trustees