Minutes of the Meeting
of the
Oakland University
Board of Trustees
October 15, 1980

The meeting was called to order by Interim President George T. Matthews at 7:35 p.m. in Lounge II of the Oakland Center.

Present: Chairman Richard H. Headlee, Trustees David Handleman, Marvin L. Katke, David B. Lewis, Alex C. Mair and Ken Morris

Absent: Trustees Patricia B. Hartmann and Arthur W. Saltzman

Information Items

Mr. Matthews made the following report on campus activities:

President's Club Lecture Series - The first speaker of the President's Club Lecture Series on October 15, 1980 was Dr. Karl H. Pribram, head of the Neuropsychology Laboratories of Stanford University, and Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology. Dr. Pribram spoke to over 400 people and met with classes.

Eye Conference - The Institute of Biological Sciences is host to an international conference on biochemistry of the eye. Fifty scientists and ophthalmologists from the United States, West Germany and Sweden are on campus for this program. The conference has been held at Oakland University for eight consecutive years.

Alumni Telethon - Volunteers are contacting more than 10,000 alumni in the annual telethon campaign. Opening night $7,500 in pledges was received. The second night of solicitations raised this amount to $14,000. The goal of $24,000 is expect to be reached.

Enrollment - Final statistics show 12,006 students enrolled in the fall semester which is a "landmark" for Oakland University.

Mr. Matthews noted that there was a large audience present The subject of interest was the upcoming tax proposals and would be discussed after all the items on the formal agenda were reviewed and acted upon.

Approval of Minutes of September 17, 1980

Mr. Matthews requested approval of the minutes of the special and regular meetings of the Oakland University Board of Trustees held on September 17, 1980. Mr. Mair offered a motion for approval of the minutes which was seconded by Mr. Katke. The motion was voted on and approved by all of the Trustees present.

Acceptance of Gifts and Grants

Mr. Matthews requested the Board's acceptance of gifts and grants totaling $699,293.08. (A copy of the complete list of gifts and grants is on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees and the Office of the Vice President for Business Affairs.)

Mr. Lewis moved that the gifts and grants be accepted with gratitude. Mr. Handleman seconded the motion which was voted on and approved by all of the Trustees present.

Approval of Expenditure of Funds from Oakland University Foundation

Mr. Matthews stated that on October 2, 1980 the Executive Trustees of the Oakland University Foundation approved an award of $150,500 to Oakland University in support of some of its programs which are enumerated in the following resolution:

> WHEREAS, the programs identified to receive support from the Oakland University Foundation are important to Oakland University; and
>
> WHEREAS, the Oakland University Foundation desires to provide funds totaling $150,500 in support of the following programs:

O. U. Foundation Scholarships	$ 13,750	
President's Club Lecture Series	7,000	
Kresge Library - To Match the Student Self-Assessed Fee	8,000	(Est.)
Lowry Early Childhood Center	3,750	
Computer Equipment and Support	118,000	
Total	$150,500	

Now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees accepts with gratitude the gift of $150,500 from the Oakland University Foundation and gives its approval of the expenditure of the funds for the programs specified.

Mr. Matthews requested that Mr. Robert W. Swanson, Vice President for Business Affairs, comment on this resolution.

Mr. Swanson stated that this was a two-part resolution since it first provided for the acceptance of the gift by the Board of Trustees and second, granted authorization to the university administration for specific expenditures.

Mr. Lewis moved that the gift be accepted with gratitude and that the expenditures be authorized. Mr. Morris seconded the motion.

Mr. Matthews noted that the largest expenditure of $118,000 would be for the additional DPS-2 computer units. Mr. Matthews estimated that the DPS-2 would increase the current system's capacity by about 30 percent.

Mr. Matthews expressed his gratitude to the Foundation for its gift.

The motion to approve the resolution was voted on and approved by all of the Trustees present.

Approval of Personnel Actions

Mr. Matthews presented the following faculty personnel actions for the Board's approval:

Appointments

Kerfoot, Edward J., Adjunct Associate Professor of Chemistry, effective August 15, 1980 through August 14, 1982

Schwartz, Roberta C., Assistant Professor of Communication Arts, effective August 15, 1981

Shichi, Hitoshi, Professor of Biomedical Sciences with tenure and Acting Assistant Director of the Institute of Biological Sciences, effective August 15, 1980*

*Contingent upon satisfactory completion of a physical examination.

Appointments (Continued)

Spinelli, Theresa M., Instructor in Management, effective August 15, 1980

White, William E., part-time (three-quarter) Professor of Communication Arts and Journalism with tenure, effective August 15, 1980, through August 14, 1981

Change of Status

Rosenthal, Jeffrey, from Instructor in Chemistry to Assistant Professor of Chemistry, effective August 15, 1980

Leaves of Absence

Reddan, John R., Professor of Biological Sciences, sabbatical leave from January 5, 1981 through April 29, 1981

Shichi, Hitoshi, Professor of Biomedical Sciences and Acting Assistant Director of the Institute of Biological Sciences, leave from August 15, 1980 through June 30, 1981

Shantz, David W., Associate Professor of Psychology and Chair, Department of Psychology, sabbatical leave from January 5, 1981 through April 29, 1981

Zohdy, Mohamed A., Assistant Professor of Engineering, leave from August 25, 1980 through December 16, 1980

Mr. Matthews requested that Mr. Frederick W. Obear, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, comment on the faculty recommendations.

Mr. Obear explained that the appointment and leave of absence request for Mr. Hitoshi Shichi were presented at the same time in order to establish Mr. Shichi's identification with the university so that he could file grant proposals through the university to support his activities. Mr. Obear further noted that Mr. Shichi's appointment culminated a search process of approximately two and one-half years.

Mr. Matthews then presented the following recommendations from the Employee Relations Department:

Academic Affairs

Center for Community & Human Development
Establish budget position #300551, Coordinator, Cooperative Education and Field Experience, AP-IV.

Source of funds: An externally funded grant which will not commit general fund resources.

Campus & Student Affairs

Oakland Center
Establish budget position #400538, Accounting Clerk II, salary grade C-6, in lieu of budget position #400538, Accounting Clerk I, salary grade C-5.

Source of funds: The revenue generated by a self-supporting operation which will not commit general fund resources.

Physical Education & Athletics
Establish budget position #300552)
#300553),
Promotions Representative, AP-III.

Source of funds: The revenue generated by a self-supporting operation which will not commit general fund resources.

University & Community Counseling Center
Establish budget position #300554, Vocational Counselor, AP-IV.

Source of funds: The revenue generated by a self-supporting operation which will not commit general fund resources.

Mr. Lewis moved that the personnel actions be approved. Mr. Mair seconded the motion.

Mr. Katke requested clarification of the statement, "An externally funded grant which will not commit general fund resources in connection with the establishment of new positions. He inquired about the consequences if a grant was not approved.

Mr. Matthews replied that the position would not be established.

Mr. Obear added that the Academic Affairs Division would not bring an appointment to the Board until the grant was received, and he believed that the same standards would apply for all university positions funded by grants.

Ms. Wilma Ray-Bledsoe, Assistant to the President and Director of Urban Affairs, stated that Mr. Obear was correct and that this condition prevailed in the non-academic area.

The motion to approve the personnel recommendations was voted on and approved by all of the Trustees present.

Approval of Candidates Recommended to Receive Bachelor's and Master's Degrees as of August 15, 1980

Mr. Matthews recommended approval of the candidates for bachelor's and master's degrees as of August 15, 1980. (The list of candidates is on file in the Office of the Secretary to the Board of Trustees.)

Mr. Frederick W. Obear noted that there were 163 bachelor's degrees and 207 master's degrees included in the recommendation.

Mr. Lewis moved that the recommended candidates be approved with congratulations. Mr. Katke seconded the motion which was voted on and approved by all of the Trustees present.

Approval of Proposed Disposition of Books from the Bass Collection of Fine Bindings

Mr. Matthews stated that the university library purchased a collection of some 1,629 volumes from the estate of Mr. George A. Bass of Oxford, Michigan on November 7, 1968. The cost of the collection was $3,405.25. Sixty-one titles or 618 volumes of the collection were leather bound; they were housed in the Archives and Special Collection Room of the library where they became known as the Bass Collection of Fine Bindings. The valuation of this segment of the purchase was estimated to be $1,700 in 1968. The remaining 1,011 volumes were added to the library's circulating or other special collections. Mr. Matthews noted that the original reasons for acquiring the Bass Collection were its availability and favorable costs as well as the fact that the library was in the initial stage of development and could benefit at that time from the acquisition. The fine bindings collection no longer has any intrinsic bibliographic, literary or educational value for Oakland University, and occupies much-needed shelf space. Mr. Matthews stated that the proposed policy would permit the disposal of this collection which has increased in market value since the date of its purchase. The following recommendation was presented for Board approval:

> RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of Oakland University authorize the Dean of the Library to negotiate the sale of the Bass Collection of Fine Bindings at the highest price possible after obtaining an appraisal by a disinterested party knowledgeable in the antiquarian and fine book market.

Mr. Matthews informed the Board that Mr. George Gardiner, Dean of the Library, was present to answer any questions. No questions were asked.

Mr. Katke moved that the recommendation be approved. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion which was voted on and approved by all of the Trustees present.

Approval of Meadow Brook Art Gallery Outdoor Sculpture Recommendatio

Mr. Matthews stated that on June 19, 1980, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution that read in part, "... the Board of Trustees gratefully accepts the gift from Mr. and Mrs. S. Brooks Barron for a proposed outdoor sculpture by Michael Hall entitled 'Sabbathday' without cost to the university". He noted that Mr. Barron and Mr. Hall failed to reach an agreement regarding this commission. Therefore, the following recommendation is presented to the Board to rescind the resolution of June 19, 1980, and accept a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Barron for the purchase of a sculpture to be selected by a committee:

> WHEREAS, the terms of the resolution dated June 19, 1980, regarding a proposed outdoor sculpture by Michael Hall are no longer appropriate; and
>
> WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. S. Brooks Barron have given a handsome gift to the university in contribution toward the purchase and installation of a piece of outdoor sculpture; and
>
> WHEREAS, the Board and the President require consultation on the commissioning of this new piece of sculpture; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the resolution dated June 19, 1980, be rescinded; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees hereby requests its chair to establish a small committee to work with the President and other appropriate officials in the selection, location, and installation of the sculpture; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board gratefully accepts the generous contribution from Mr. and Mrs. S. Brooks Barron.

Mr. Lewis moved that the recommendation be approved. Mr. Mair seconded the motion which was voted on and approved by all of the Trustees present.

Mr. Robert Williamson, Professor of Physics, suggested that an artist be included on the committee.

Mr. Matthews said the intention was to name two Trustees from the Board to serve as part of the jury which would include an artist to select the winner from Michigan sculptors. Mr. Matthews added that there was every expectation that the National Endowment for the Arts would match the Barrons' gift which would give the university a "tidy sum" for the jury to work with in its selection.

Approval of a Closed Meeting for October 21, 1980

Mr. Matthews stated that Mr. Laszlo Hetenyi, Executive Secretary for the Presidential Selection Committee, requested a special closed meeting at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, October 21, 1980 to review in a confidential manner the applicants for the presidency of Oakland University. He presented the following resolution for the Board's approval:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes a closed session commencing at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, October 21, 1980 for the review of confidential applications of candidates for the appointment to a public office, which is the presidency of Oakland University, in accordance with the provisions of Michigan Act No. 267 Public Acts of 1976.

Mr. Matthews added that Public Act No. 267 requires approval by roll call vote of two-thirds of the Board members appointed and serving.

Mr. Katke moved that the resolution be adopted. Mr. Handleman seconded the motion. Mr. John De Carlo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, took the following roll call vote:

Trustee Handleman	-	"Yes"
Trustee Headlee	-	"Yes"
Trustee Katke	-	"Yes"
Trustee Lewis	-	"Yes"
Trustee Mair	-	"Yes"
Trustee Morris	-	"Yes"

The motion was approved by all of the Trustees present which constituted a two-thirds majority of the members of the Board appointed and serving.

Mr. Edward Heubel, Professor of Political Science, asked if this closed session would be held after the interviews.

Mr. Headlee responded that it would.

Mr. Heubel then inquired if all of the applicants had requested that their dossiers be confidential.

Mr. Headlee responded that they had.

Approval of Resolution on Tisch II and the Future of Oakland University

Mr. Matthews stated that there would be three tax proposals presented to the people of Michigan on the November 4, 1980 general election ballot. He noted that of the three proposals, there was great interest in Proposal D designated Tisch II. He noted that many of his "colleagues" were taking sides. He informed the Board that the University Senate adopted the following resolution on October 9, 1980 with only one dissenting vote:

> RESOLVED, That the Senate recommend to the President and the Board that the Board adopt a resolution to condemn Proposition D (Tisch II) on the 1980 General Election ballot; that the Board direct the President to make every effort to communicate to students, parents, and alumni the likely effects of the passage of Proposition D on the future of Oakland University.

Mr. Matthews added that on the same day the Administrative-Professional Assembly passed an almost identical resolution except that they had inserted "Interim" preceding the word "President." Mr. Matthews indicated that he had informed the Board members of these actions and requested that they give serious consideration to adopting a resolution which would at least incorporate the general substance of the resolutions of these two university bodies. Since the passage of these two resolutions, the University Congress, the student government body, adopted the following resolution on October 15, 1980:

> WHEREAS, Proposal D, the Tisch Amendment if it passes, may result in cutbacks of State aid in scholarships, programs, administrative, faculty and clerical positions, police protection, health services, physical plant services, athletics and others; and
>
> WHEREAS, if "D" passes it will drastically affect Oakland University's governing body's ability to increase tuition in order to meet the consequential needs posed by these cutbacks; and
>
> WHEREAS, if "D" passes it may cause the university to make the transition to a private institution, thus affecting the Oakland Students' ability to pay for their education; and
>
> WHEREAS, if "D" passes it may finally result in the closing of Oakland University and other State supported institutions of higher education; and
>
> WHEREAS we agree with the University Senate's recommendation to the Oakland University Board of Trustees concerning "D"; be it
>
> RESOLVED, That University Congress take a stand against Proposition D; and be it further
>
> RESOLVED, That all efforts be made to communicate to students, parents, and alumni the likely effects of the passage of this proposal on the future of Oakland University and that every effort be made to have this resolution discussed at the next Board of Trustees meeting.

Mr. Matthews stated that on October 15, 1980 the Association of Black Students adopted the following resolution:

> We, the Association of Black Students hereby urge the Board of Trustees, to publicly oppose all tax proposals on the November 4 ballot.
>
> We urge further that the Board adopt a policy directing the university administration to develop and implement forthwith an education program for the university community to assure that students understand the issues. Students must be made aware of the damaging effect of these proposals and we believe it is the duty and responsibility of the university to inform them of relevant and important issues.
>
> While much emphasis is placed on Proposal D (Tisch), we the Association of Black Students believe that if any of these tax proposals go through, they will have a devastating effect on an already floundering State economy.

Mr. Matthews then presented the following resolution which he designated as the "main" resolution for the Board's consideration:

> WHEREAS, the citizens of the State of Michigan will have presented to them at the November 4, 1980 election a series of tax proposals which will have an economic impact upon the citizens of this State and will affect the operations of State government and higher education; and
>
> WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees is of the opinion that it has a duty and responsibility to review the consequences of the proposals on the university and its student body; and
>
> WHEREAS, the Presidents Council of State Colleges and Universities and the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Michigan have informed the university that these bodies have adopted a position in opposition to Proposal D; and
>
> WHEREAS, the university is currently operating on a restricted budget due to the State's depressed economy; and

WHEREAS, any further reductions of any amount of funding could seriously impair the quality of the educational program and could result in program reductions, reduced enrollment and large tuition increases; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees acknowledges that at this time it does not have alternative resources to replace any major reduction in State revenue; and

WHEREAS, the need to replace these revenues by substantial tuition increases would be undesirable since the large tuition increase required would result in financial barriers to education to many of the State's citizens, particularly those from low and middle income families; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has reviewed the implications of these issues on the university; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees is of the opinion that every individual has a duty to become informed on public matters and a right to express a personal opinion on such matters and that the university as an entity should avoid the advocacy of political issues; be it therefore

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees encourages every member of the university community and the friends of the university to fully inform themselves of all of the facts relating to each of the proposals which will be presented to the electorate at the November 4, 1980 election; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees encourages all members of the university community and its friends to inform themselves of the implications of these proposals on all State programs including the operations of the university in the event of tax reductions which would result in severe operational reductions as portrayed by the Governor; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees urges the electorate to become informed; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board urges all parties to submit objective information to the electorate regarding the provisions of the tax proposals and the results from the implementation of such tax proposals, including those areas which may require reduction or termination of services, in order that the citizenry may be informed regarding the results of their decision as voters; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the President of the university take appropriate action to inform the university community and the friends of the university, in an objective fashion, of the facts and the possible effects of the ballot proposals on the university.

Mr. Richard H. Headlee moved that the resolution be adopted. Mr. David B. Lewis seconded the motion.

Mr. Ken Morris moved that the following resolution be substituted for the foregoing resolution:

WHEREAS on November 4, 1980 the Tisch property tax proposal will be on the Michigan general election ballot as Proposal "D"; and

WHEREAS the Governor of the State of Michigan has informed the general public of the potential disaster to the State of Michigan generally and higher education specifically if the Tisch proposal is adopted; and

WHEREAS most public supported universities and colleges in the State have strongly opposed the Tisch proposal as a threat to their very existence, and have encouraged their students, parents of their students, the faculty and supportive staffs to oppose the Tisch proposal; and

WHEREAS the trust placed in the Oakland University Board of Trustees by the parents of students and by the students themselves requires the Oakland University Board of Trustees to speak out and lead the university community to prevent the impairment of opportunities for social and economic mobility which higher education at Oakland University and in Michigan offers; and

FINALLY, the State of Michigan will not be a place for businesses to locate, people to move to, and for businesses and citizens to stay if the State is savaged by a tax proposal that wipes out essential services, closes all but the three universities with elected Boards of Control and reduces them to half their current size: Therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Oakland University Board of Trustees does hereby record its opposition to the Tisch II Proposal "D", and the Interim President is hereby directed to notify Oakland University students and their parents of the negative impact of Tisch II and seek to give leadership to the mobilization of the university community against Proposal "D".

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. Matthews ruled that the discussion should be addressed to the substitute resolution.

Mr. Morris stated that the consequences of Proposal D required the attention of the Board. He added that Proposal D could be a fiscal "disaster" for the State. The proposal calls for cutting personal property taxes by better than 50 percent. A reduction in tax income would require major readjustments in State and local services. He noted that there has been growing resentment over the increase in taxes on housing, and that this attitude of discontent fostered the Tisch amendment. However, he did not believe that the university community should "sit idly by" and not give the tax proposals the benefit of its thinking. In his opinion the Board should take a position on the proposal. Mr. Morris called upon those present to visualize the chaos that would ensue as various governmental departments vied for the available dollars as the result of a massive cut in revenues if Proposal D passed. He asked the Board to imagine the impact on the State colleges and universities if State support was withdrawn as has been suggested by the Governor. Mr. Morris said most educational institutions in the State felt that the passage of the Tisch amendment would mean the "devastation in Michigan" of higher education.

Mr. Morris said he did not believe that if taxes were cut that it would bring new businesses in the State because most companies research the educational facilities and services that are available before asking their employees to relocate. He said, "If you minimize the educational potential in the State of Michigan, you dry up the future of Michigan."

Mr. Morris conceded that there may be "waste" in government, but added there is "waste" in all human endeavors, including "private industry." He stated that no one is advocating waste. We have to work to resolve these problems in government operations.

Mr. Morris also asked what would happen if Oakland University's funds were cut. Would it be necessary to raise tuition? If so, he asked if this action is desirable. He said that the future of this State was dependent on good education for its citizens and that it should be available to the citizens who desire an education. Mr. Morris felt that the members of the Board of Trustees had an obligation to take a position on Proposal D and if they did not provide the leadership in this area, they would be "breaking a trust" to the students and the total community. Mr. Morris stated that debating the issues was not "satisfactory." If his resolution failed then in his opinion the Board has "failed as Trustees".

Mr. Headlee said he did not wish to debate the Tisch proposal or any of the tax proposals. In his opinion it was important to provide an environment where all issues would be discussed. He did not wish to be accused of being "afraid to take a position," and as an individual, a resident, and voter, he will take a stand. He felt, however, that it would be imprudent for the Board of Trustees to take an advocacy position. Mr. Headlee emphasized that it was important to provide an atmosphere at the university where everyone would be comfortable to exchange ideas, and not feel intimidated in studying and discussing issues of great importance.

Mr. Headlee stated the Board members should not endanger the integrity of the institution by saying this is an official university position; that the role of the university should not be divisive, but one where everyone would feel comfortable to debate issues. Mr. Headlee stated that the university should not use university funds to promote an advocacy position; that Mr. George Matthews as an individual could advocate a position, but that schools should not.

Mr. Headlee affirmed his dedication to the university, but said he did not believe all the "horror stories" he has heard with regard to the impact upon government by the passage of the Tisch amendment. Mr. Headlee stated that "education is the only investment we make in the future; everything else is in the here and now." He reiterated that this is a very sensitive issue and felt it would not be wise for the Board of Trustees to take an advocacy position; that a "premier institution," such as Oakland University, should not take an advocacy position on a transient political issue. He added that when universities politicize an issue, it is a mistake. Actions of this nature occur in unstable republics, they should not happen at Oakland University.

Mr. Alex C. Mair said he personally found it difficult to discuss this subject since it was being considered in a political manner. He expressed concern that it was not possible to ascertain exactly what the passage of the proposal would do to State government services. He felt that "tinkering with taxes" involved a "high risk" at this point in time. He observed that taxes were too high and the cost of governing has risen exponentially higher than the rest of the economy. He noted that there was not a commensurate improvement in public services or facilities to match the rise in government cost. In his opinion roads, schools, public safety and other services were "poorer" today. We need to maintain and improve these services. He concluded there was a "high risk" involved in reducing services without a specific plan.

Mr. Headlee asked Mr. John De Carlo about the actions of the other universities on this issue.

Mr. De Carlo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, replied that as of this date to the best of his knowledge the University of Michigan had not passed a resolution; the Michigan State University Board of Governors had not passed a resolution; Wayne State University, Central Michigan University, and Western Michigan University had passed resolutions in opposition to Proposal D; Eastern Michigan University has a resolution under consideration this evening.

At this point Mr. David B. Lewis stated that he would be interested in the opinions of the various constituents in the audience if the members of the Board of Trustees had no objections. No objection was voiced.

Mr. Sid Mittra, Professor of Economics and Management, noted that he viewed the tax proposals as an economist, and as such, this posed the question of whether he or the government should decide on how best to utilize his money. The issue is whether personal interests should prevail or should the government determine what is for "the public good." Another question that should be considered is whether "it is really true that when government spends my money, it not only furthers my welfare, but improves the quality of life in the state and country so that the general welfare is also improved?" Mr. Mittra stated that there is an assumption that when taxes are cut, essential services and goods would not go down and that waste would be eliminated. He said that this conclusion does not automatically occur. It was Mr. Mittra's opinion that acting for "private good does not necessarily improve the quality of life."

Mr. Robert Williamson, Professor of Physics, inquired about the position of the University of Michigan and its president.

Mr. De Carlo responded that it was his understanding that the president of the university had taken a position in opposition to the proposal, but that the Board of Regents has not passed a resolution as of this time.

Mr. Williamson asked under what conditions Oakland University could spend money.

Mr. Headlee replied that he believed that President's Club funds could be used, but that public funds could not be used for an advocacy position.

Mr. De Carlo added that he believed that university funds could be used in connection with the first or main resolution since it did not advocate a position on any proposal.

Mr. Matthews said he too would interpret the main resolution to mean that information could be disseminated.

Ms. Kathleen Walton, a third year student, stated her belief that the Board had a responsibility to the university community to make a statement on the impact of the tax proposals on the institution.

Mr. Headlee remarked that "in 1978 it was predicted that terrible things would happen to the university if the Headlee amendment passed." The university did not take a stand at that time. Various views were debated on campus. Mr. Headlee said he felt this was wholesome for the campus environment. However, he felt it improper to "stifle debate" on any subject by establishing positions.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Headlee if his position led him to the conclusion that there is no political issue upon which the Board should take an advocacy role.

Mr. Headlee replied that he has not had an opportunity to consider Mr. Lewis' question thoroughly, but essentially his opinion was that as an individual, he or any member of the Board, had a right to an opinion, but that the institution as an entity should be available for debate and should not take a formal position. The Board's action affects the university environment. Individuals would in the future wait for the Board's position befor considering a position on an issue. He noted that in his opinion, Proposal D would not pass.

Mr. Morris stated that the Headlee amendment has not "hurt" the university because the "Legislature has paid attention to the proposal." He added that he could not agree the "people (on campus) would be intimidated" by the Board's position. He stated that the "main resolution expressed no position but an educational" program. He concluded that he comes from an environment that requires "decisions and advocacy."

Mr. Headlee said he would be taking part in a panel discussion on Tuesday, October 21, 1980 on Proposal D which would be held on campus, and that presentation should be very interesting.

Mr. Edward Heubel, Professor of Political Science, informed the Board that the University Senate had passed a resolution "because the university was doing nothing." He asked the Interim President to take a position and was advised that he could not because the Board has not taken a position. He felt it imperative that the Board take a position so that information on the possible effects of the Tisch proposal could be provided to the university community. He added that Mr. Harold Shapiro, president of the University of Michigan, which is a very prestigious institution, did not hesitate to speak out, saying that the effect on State services would be chilling and that higher education could not survive.

Mr. Nathan Schwartz, Instructor in Political Science, said that regarding Mr. Headlee's concern about a Board decision having an effect on the internal structure of the university, it was his opinion that when the Board takes an action such as authorizing or not authorizing a program, or recognizing a union, it has a major impact on the 12,000 students. He agreed that the Board should be very prudent about what it endorses, but in this case, he felt it was appropriate for the Board to take a stand, and that it would not "stifle debate."

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Schwartz, assuming that it is appropriate for the Board to take a position, how he would decide when to take a position and when not to.

Mr. Schwartz replied that the Board should take a stand when an item threatens the existence of this institution. He concluded that his "judgment might be broader than that of the Board."

Mr. Headlee reiterated his opinion that it was appropriate for an individual such as President Harold Shapiro and Interim President George Matthews to do what they wished.

Mr. David Stevens, Assistant Professor of Communication Arts, replied to Mr. Lewis' question as to when the Board should take a stand by saying that when the Board believes a "clear and present danger" exists.

Mr. Lewis then inquired through whose eyes should the "clear and present danger" be judged?

Mr. Stevens answered "through the Board's eyes." If the Board believes there is a "clear and present danger," it has a duty to act as it sees fit.

Mr. Lewis commented that part of the Trustee's oath of office extends to the people of the State of Michigan, and he raised the question, "Is it appropriate in determining clear and present danger to attempt to predict the vote of the people regarding an issue that has been placed on the ballot?"

Mr. Stevens replied that he believed it was appropriate for the Board to make a decision not on whether or not the proposal would pass, but on whether or not it would impair the operation of the university if it passed.

Mr. Robert Williamson commented that during one of the State budget cuts of one percent, Oakland University lost the "Classics." He concurred that the Board has an obligation and responsibility to the people of Michigan as well as to the university, faculty, students, staff and community to protect higher education. He stated that the Board "must conclude" that there will be budget cuts if Proposal D passes. Therefore, the Board must "lead" the university and "protect higher education."

Mr. Lewis asked whether the Board should conduct informative programs or oppose Tisch.

Mr. Williamson responded that passage of the Tisch proposal would cause serious problems at Oakland University and throughout the State.

Mr. John Beardman, Associate Professor of Studio Art, Art and Art History, noted that the Board participates in "politics' when it lobbies for funds for the university. In his opinion there was no real conflict in taking a position of leadership in informing the people of Michigan about this issue.

Mr. Headlee agreed that "lobbying for dollars" was engaged in through a presentation of the university's position. This issue involved a constitutional amendment, and was an entirely different question.

Ms. Mary Ellen Burke, of The Oakland Sail, recounted that she had received a telephone call from a mother of an Oakland student who was indignant that the Board had not taken a stand on the effect that Proposal D would have on higher education. Ms. Burke felt it was imperative that the Trustees take a position.

Mr. Lewis asked for an elaboration of the opposition to all of the tax proposals by the Association of Black Students.

Mr. James B. Franklin III, student and president of the Association of Black Students, replied that the association felt that any substantial tax cut would hurt the economy and students who were attempting to progress in society.

Mr. Laszlo Hetenyi, Acting Dean of the School of Performing Arts, said he believed that taxation by way of constitutional amendment is not the "best way of passing taxes." The responsibility for taxation should be "in legislative hands."

Mr. Morris stated that he fears the Tisch proposal, and wants to see it defeated. He said he could live with either Proposal A or Proposal C, but he wants to see Proposal D defeated.

Miss Jane Hershey, member of the University Congress and Repolitic, said that there was great concern about the effects of Proposal D, and that attempts have been made to contribute information about Proposal D to students. A debate has been sponsored. She expressed concern about reaching all of the students, their parents and the university community, and felt that it was important for the Board to take a stand against Proposal D. She did not believe that the Board's position would stifle debate.

Mr. Matthews said it had been moved by Mr. Morris and seconded by Mr. Lewis that the substitute resolution be approved. He called for a roll call vote. The motion was voted on and approved by Trustees Handleman, Katke, Lewis, Mair and Morris. Trustee Headlee voted "No." Five Trustees constituted a majority vote for approval of the motion.

Mr. Lewis said he wished to state that he felt the evening's proceedings had been very informative. However, twice in the last week he has seen written accusations and allegations that a personal position of a member of the Board created a conflict of interest and that the member could not adequately discharge his duties as a member of this Board. Mr. Lewis stated that he wished to go on record as being deeply opposed to that position. He said that each of the Board members has an absolute right to express his or her opinion. Furthermore he was troubled by the fact that there appears to be an innuendo or suspicion of motivation, without any basis in fact, that a member is using the office to further personal views. This has never been the case. Mr. Lewis added that he is extremely proud of this Board of Trustees which has been historically very honorable in its conduct. All of the members have acted in the interest of the university. Mr. Lewis said he wished to make it very clear that he found any attempt to impugn the integrity of any member of the Board for a personal opinion or position to be very reprehensible. Such conduct was "not befitting people associated with a university."

Mr. Matthews thanked Mr. Lewis for his comments and said he believed everyone would subscribe to them.

Mr. Headlee noted that Mrs. Marie Pehur who serves in the Office of the Board of Trustees and attends the Board meetings was celebrating her 25th wedding anniversary this evening.

Ms. Gail DeGeorge, editor of The Oakland Sail, was recognized by Mr. Matthews. She stated that she wished to make a formal objection to the authorization for the closed meeting on Tuesday, October 21, 1980 for the Presidential Selection Committee.

Mr. Matthews said her comments would be noted in the minutes.

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Matthews at 9:40 p.m.

Approved,

John De Carlo, Secretary
Board of Trustees

Richard H. Headlee, Chairman
Board of Trustees

Date ______________________