

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
of the
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES
June 11, 1986

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

Absent: Trustees Patricia Hartmann and Ken Morris

Chairman Wallace Riley called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. in Lounge II of the Oakland Center. He noted for the record that this is a regular meeting, notice of which has been appropriately posted.

Approval of minutes of May 14, 1986

Mr. Riley asked for any additions or corrections to the proposed minutes. There were no additions or corrections. Mr. Handleman, seconded by Mr. Mair, moved to approve the minutes as proposed. The motion was unanimously carried.

Approval of recommendation to accept gifts and grants to Oakland University--April 15 through May 14, 1986

Mr. Robert Swanson, Vice President for Developmental Affairs, drew the Board's attention to the \$11,000 gift to the Alumni Fund from Ms. Janet N. Bennett, who, along with her husband, has given a total of \$72,520 to Oakland University. He also noted the \$12,000 contribution from the Oakland University Scholarship Committee of Macomb County. The contribution came from the proceeds of a very successful annual Town Hall Lecture Series. The gifts for the April 15 through May 14, 1986, period total \$233,809, of which \$33,470 represent gifts made to various programs and projects of the University through the Oakland University Foundation.

Mr. Keith Kleckner, Senior Vice President and Provost, noted the diversity of the grants list and drew the Board's attention to the grant from the American Chemical Society to be administered under the direction of Professor Kenneth Harmon for the 16th consecutive year. He observed that new faculty members were also successful in receiving grants. The Environmental Protection Agency has awarded \$95,443 in support of the work of Professor Satish Walia, who is in his second year of employment; and the National Institutes of Health has granted \$87,906 to Professor Sheldon R. Gordon, who is in his first year of employment with Oakland. Mr. Kleckner also pointed out the 19th consecutive grant from the National Institutes of Health in support of Professor Venkat Reddy's work.

Mr. Sims, reporting in place of the University Affairs Chairperson, Mrs. Hartmann, stated that the Committee reviewed the

gifts and grants and recommends that they be accepted with gratitude. He moved, seconded by Mrs. Googasian, to accept the gifts and grants totaling \$740,763. The motion was unanimously carried.

Acceptance of report of gifts and grants to the Oakland University Foundation--April 15 through May 14, 1986

Mr. Swanson reported total gifts and grants to the Oakland University Foundation of \$57,144.

Approval of faculty personnel actions

Mr. Kleckner requested approval of the following faculty personnel actions:

Appointment

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

Hubbard, Karen W., Instructor in Dance, effective August 15, 1986

Nathan, Ruth G., Adjunct Professor of Psychology, effective August 15, 1986, through August 14, 1988

Osborne, Laurie E., Assistant Professor of English, effective August 15, 1986

Pappalardo, Paul A., Assistant Professor of Chemistry, effective August 15, 1986

Rapin, Ronald F., Instructor in Spanish, effective August 15, 1986

Villalobos, Miguel A., Assistant Professor of Mathematical Sciences, effective August 1, 1986

Change of Status

Osthaus, Carl R., from Associate Professor of History to Associate Professor of History and Acting Chair, Department of History, effective June 30, 1986, through August 21, 1986

Leave of Absence

Hunter, R. Douglas, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences, sabbatical leave from January 5, 1987, through April 25, 1987 (with full pay)

Reischl, Uwe, Associate Professor and Director, Program in Industrial Health and Safety, sabbatical leave from August 26, 1986, through April 25, 1987 (with half pay)

Vann, Carl R., Professor of Health Behavioral Sciences and Political Science, sabbatical leave from August 26, 1986, through December 13, 1986 (with full pay)

Mr. Handleman, speaking for the Finance and Personnel Committee Chairman, Mr. Morris, stated that the Committee reviewed the proposed faculty personnel actions, and moved that the Board approve such actions. Mr. Mair seconded the motion which was unanimously passed.

Approval of early retirement agreement with Administrative-Professional, Audrey Marriner

Mr. Willard Kendall, Director of the Employee Relations Department stated that the Board is being asked to approve an early retirement arrangement requested by Ms. Audrey Marriner, an Administrative-Professional in the Continuing Education Division. The University does not intend to fill this position in order to save funds. The administration believes this action would be in the University's interest, and requests approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approves an early retirement incentive arrangement with Audrey I. Marriner as specified in the attached "Agreement between Oakland University and Audrey I. Marriner", with Ms. Marriner's voluntary termination to be effective at the end of the work day on July 10, 1986.

(A copy of the agreement is on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees.)

Mr. Handleman stated that the proposed action had been reviewed and recommended by the Finance and Personnel Committee. He moved, seconded by Mr. Mair, that the early retirement request be approved. The motion was unanimously passed.

Approval of proposed Faculty Hiring Procedure

Mr. Riley stated that the proposed Faculty Hiring Procedure was originally on the May 14, 1986, Board meeting agenda. At that meeting, Mr. Kleckner indicated that a few minor changes needed to be made in the policy before adoption. The Board then placed the Faculty Hiring Procedure on the agenda for this meeting.

In response, Mr. Kleckner stated that there are three areas of revision, all of them minor and none change the intent or the thrust of the original document. The changes in Item VII pertaining to part-time faculty positions were developed to facilitate the appointment of approximately 250 part-time faculty each semester. In addition, the Provost's office will develop guidelines for the various academic areas regarding part-time employees. The waiver conditions on the procedure will apply to both full-time and part-time faculty if circumstances warrant this action. Other than these revisions, the document is unchanged.

The recommendation that the Board is being asked to adopt is also slightly different than last month in that it permits the University to make minor changes in the document language if, in using the procedure, unanticipated problems occur. The administration will report to the Board regularly, starting January, 1987, on the procedure and any changes that are made, so that the Board can review the effectiveness of the plan.

Mr. Kleckner asked approval of the following recommendation:

WHEREAS, The Oakland University Board of Trustees adopted a policy of nondiscrimination and affirmative action in all hiring and employment decisions on May 21, 1981; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of specific procedures for the hiring of all faculty personnel will facilitate the implementation of the Board's policy and maximize the opportunity for all individuals to obtain faculty status; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees has reviewed and accepts in principle the Faculty Hiring Procedure document dated May 27, 1986; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes the implementation of a Faculty Hiring Procedure that is consistent with the University's policy of maximizing equal employment opportunity, and requests that a report on the effectiveness of such procedure shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees in January, 1987, and annually thereafter; and be it further

RESOLVED, That any amendment to the Faculty Hiring Procedure shall be reported to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Bemis asked for clarification of the degree of change in the procedure that would need to be brought before the Board. Mr. Kleckner replied that the proposal indicates that "any" amendment

should be brought before the Board, and the Board will determine if a change is substantive. If the Board determines that changes which have been previously implemented are undesirable, it may act to rescind the changes.

Mr. Bemis suggested the addition of the words "at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting" at the end of the recommendation.

Mr. Sims asked for clarification that substantive changes would not be made without Board action and that non-substantive changes could be made by the administration without prior Board approval.

President Joseph E. Champagne stated that such a stipulation could be included in the resolution or reflected in the minutes. He asked the Board which method it preferred.

Mr. Bemis responded that he wished to have any changes in the Faculty Hiring Procedure reported at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting, and suggested the inclusion of such a stipulation in the recommendation.

President Champagne stated that the wording of the third paragraph of the recommendation is in error. The words "in principle" should be deleted.

Mr. Sims moved that the amended recommendation be approved as follows:

WHEREAS, The Oakland University Board of Trustees adopted a policy of nondiscrimination and affirmative action in all hiring and employment decisions on May 21, 1981; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of specific procedures for the hiring of all faculty personnel will facilitate the implementation of the Board's policy and maximize the opportunity for all individuals to obtain faculty status; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees has reviewed and accepts the Faculty Hiring Procedure document dated May 27, 1986; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes the implementation of a Faculty Hiring Procedure that is consistent with the University's policy of maximizing equal employment opportunity, and requests that a report on the effectiveness of such procedure shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees in January, 1987, and annually thereafter; and be it further

RESOLVED, That any amendment to the Faculty Hiring Procedure shall be reported to the Board of Trustees at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Mr. Bemis seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Approval of workers' compensation redemption

Mr. John De Carlo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Vice President for Governmental Affairs and General Counsel, stated that this matter was discussed in closed session in accordance with the Open Meetings Act, and authorization was granted to the University to negotiate a redemption in the matter relating to Ms. Jacqueline Hibler. A redemption was negotiated in the interest of both parties, and approval of this recommendation will authorize the administration to conclude the matter with the former employee, subject to the approval of the Workers' Compensation Commission. Mr. De Carlo asked approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the University's General Counsel is authorized to settle the workers' compensation claim filed by Ms. Jacqueline Hibler in accordance with the written recommendation from retained counsel dated May 27, 1986.

Mr. Bemis moved, seconded by Mr. Mair, to approve the recommendation as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

Approval of 1986-87 General Fund budget

Mr. Robert McGarry, Vice President for Finance and Administration, stated that the 1986-87 General Fund budget is being recommended at a level of approximately \$49.4 million, an increase of about \$3.7 million over the previous year. Major assumptions in the budget are that the State appropriation for the State's fiscal year which ends on September 30 will be at the level recommended by Governor James J. Blanchard, which is \$29.4 million. This is a 5.4% increase when comparing this amount to the State's previous fiscal year. Adjusted to the University's fiscal year which ends on June 30, the appropriation revenue would be \$29 million, which represents a 6.94% increase over 1985-86. The budget also assumes a tuition revenue increase which will realize \$579,000. The assumptions include a reduction in the Indirect Cost Recovery account of \$100,000 because of a change in federal regulations in the calculation of the rate on grants. The 1986-87 fiscal year equated student enrollment will be limited to

9,520 which is an estimate for the current year. This means that enrollment is capped and no additional revenues should be expected from growth next year.

The budget assumes a reasonable level of compensation for faculty and staff, and it provides an inflation allowance of 4% for general operating supplies and expenses, and an additional inflation allowance for specific items such as telephone system maintenance, computer maintenance costs, and insurance. The utility budget is being reduced by \$307,000. This places the General Fund utility budget at \$1.5 million. This is generally a no-growth budget. The budget projects a fund balance at June 30, 1987, of \$81,000. For the current year, a carryforward of approximately \$1.3 million is anticipated to balance the budget. He asked approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approves the General Fund Budget for 1986-87, with estimated revenues of \$48,170,864 and estimated expenses of \$49,389,418 with the shortfall to be covered by the estimated 1985-86 carryforward of \$1,300,000.

Mr. Handleman stated that the Finance and Personnel Committee reviewed the proposed budget and recommends its adoption.

Mr. Riley suggested considering the next agenda item on tuition before voting on the General Fund Budget.

Approval of tuition increase

Mr. McGarry said that budgeted 1986-87 expenditures exceed revenues and fund balance by nearly \$500,000. To balance the budget, a tuition increase is recommended which would realize \$579,000. The proposed increase would result in an average tuition and fee increase of 3.62% for resident undergraduate students, which is well below the Governor's guideline of 4.3%. The increase will be \$2.00 per credit hour for undergraduate resident students and \$4.00 per credit hour for graduate resident students. Mr. McGarry asked approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approves the attached schedule of proposed student Tuition and Fee Rates for 1986-87.

(The following is the schedule of proposed tuition and fee rates for 1986-87.)

Oakland University
1986-87 Tuition and Fee Schedule
Effective Summer Term 1986

	1985-86 Rate	Changes	1986-87 Rate	Percent Increase (Decrease)
1. <u>Tuition per semester credit hour:</u>				
a. Michigan residents:				
Undergraduate: Lower	\$ 45.50	\$ 2.00	\$ 47.50	4.40%
Undergraduate: Upper	52.50	2.00	54.50	3.81%
Graduate	82.00	4.00	86.00	4.88%
b. Non-residents:				
Undergraduate: Lower	129.00	6.00	135.00	4.65%
Undergraduate: Upper	140.00	7.00	147.00	5.00%
Graduate	173.00	9.00	182.00	5.20%
c. Competency credit exam fee:				
Undergraduate: Lower	12.00	-	12.00	0.00%
Undergraduate: Upper	14.00	-	14.00	0.00%
Graduate	22.00	-	22.00	0.00%
All Non-residents	37.00	-	37.00	0.00%
d. Off-campus:				
Undergraduate: Lower	52.00	2.00	54.00	3.85%
Undergraduate: Upper	58.00	2.00	60.00	3.45%
Undergraduate: Early College Study Program	45.00	<u>Discontinued</u>		
Graduate	87.00	4.00	91.00	4.60%
2. <u>General service fee per semester (on-campus students)</u>				
a. Undergraduates taking 10 credits or more:				
Oakland Center Allocation	\$ 25.00	-	\$ 25.00	0.00%
Activity Allocation	9.75	-	9.75	0.00%
Transportation Use Alloc.	6.00	-	6.00	0.00%
Enrollment Allocation	40.00	-	40.00	0.00%
Athletic Allocation	6.00	-	6.00	0.00%
Health Service Allocation	6.00	-	6.00	0.00%
Total	\$ 92.75	-	\$ 92.75	0.00%
b. Undergraduates taking less than 10 credits:				
Oakland Center Allocation	\$ 12.50	-	\$ 12.50	0.00%
Activity Allocation	7.25	-	7.25	0.00%
Transportation Use Alloc.	3.00	-	3.00	0.00%
Enrollment Allocation	40.00	-	40.00	0.00%
Athletic Allocation	4.00	-	4.00	0.00%
Health Service Allocation	3.50	-	3.50	0.00%
Total	\$ 70.25	-	\$ 70.25	0.00%

Oakland University
1986-87 Tuition and Fee Schedule
Effective Summer Term 1986

	1985-86 Rate	Changes	1986-87 Rate	Percent Increase (Decrease)
c. Graduates taking 8 credits or more:				
Oakland Center Allocation	\$ 25.00	-	\$25.00	0.00%
Activity Allocation	2.50	-	2.50	0.00%
Transportation Use Alloc.	6.00	-	6.00	0.00%
Enrollment Allocation	40.00	-	40.00	0.00%
Athletic Allocation	3.00	-	3.00	0.00%
Health Service Allocation	6.00	-	6.00	0.00%
Total	<u>\$ 82.50</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>\$ 82.50</u>	0.00%
d. Graduates taking less than 8 credits:				
Oakland Center Allocation	\$ 12.50	-	\$ 12.50	0.00%
Activity Allocation	2.00	-	2.00	0.00%
Transportation Use Alloc.	3.00	-	3.00	0.00%
Enrollment Allocation	40.00	-	40.00	0.00%
Athletic Allocation (see notes)	2.00	-	2.00	0.00%
Health Service Allocation	3.50	-	3.50	0.00%
Total	<u>\$ 63.00</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>\$ 63.00</u>	0.00%
3. <u>Special course fees per course:</u>				
ED 455	\$ 35.00	-	\$ 35.00	0.00%
ED 597	50.00	-	50.00	0.00%
Applied Music:				
Individual Instruction				
2 Credits	85.00	-	85.00	0.00%
4 Credits	170.00	-	170.00	0.00%
Group Instruction	25.00	-	25.00	0.00%
4. <u>Other Fees:</u>				
Application Fee	\$ 20.00	-	20.00	0.00%
Graduation Service Fee	20.00	-	20.00	0.00%
Late Registration	25.00	-	25.00	0.00%
Late Addition-of-Course (per course added)	10.00	-	10.00	0.00%
Reissue of Diploma	20.00	-	20.00	0.00%
Transcript Issuance Fee	3.00	-	3.00	0.00%
5. <u>Summary comparison of on-campus tuition and fee costs (exclusive of special course fees):</u>				
a. Undergraduate Michigan resident student taking a 31 credit hour load for two semesters:				
1) Lower Division:				
Tuition	\$1,410.50	\$ 62.00	\$1,472.50	4.40%
General Service Fee	185.50	-	185.50	0.00%
Total	<u>\$1,596.00</u>	<u>\$ 62.00</u>	<u>\$1,658.00</u>	3.88%

Oakland University
1986-87 Tuition and Fee Schedule
Effective Summer Term 1986

	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>Changes</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	<u>Rate</u>		<u>Rate</u>	<u>Increase</u>
				<u>(Decrease)</u>
2) Upper Division:				
Tuition	\$1,627.50	\$ 62.00	\$1,689.50	3.81%
General Service Fee	185.50	-	185.50	0.00%
Total	<u>\$1,813.00</u>	<u>\$ 62.00</u>	<u>\$1,875.00</u>	3.42%
b. Graduate Michigan resident student taking a 24 credit hour load for two semesters:				
Tuition	\$1,968.00	\$ 96.00	\$2,064.00	4.88%
General Service Fee	165.00	-	165.00	0.00%
Total	<u>\$2,133.00</u>	<u>\$ 96.00</u>	<u>\$2,229.00</u>	4.50%
c. Non-resident undergraduate student taking a 31 credit hour load for two semesters:				
1) Lower Division:				
Tuition	\$3,999.00	\$186.00	\$4,185.00	4.65%
General Service Fee	185.50	-	185.50	0.00%
Total	<u>\$4,184.50</u>	<u>\$186.00</u>	<u>\$4,370.50</u>	4.44%
2) Upper Division:				
Tuition	\$4,340.00	\$217.00	\$4,557.00	5.00%
General Service Fee	185.50	-	185.50	0.00%
Total	<u>\$4,525.50</u>	<u>\$217.00</u>	<u>\$4,742.50</u>	4.80%
d. Non-resident graduate student taking a 24 credit hour load for two semesters:				
Tuition	\$4,152.00	\$216.00	\$4,368.00	5.20%
General Service Fee	165.00	-	165.00	0.00%
Total	<u>\$4,317.00</u>	<u>\$216.00</u>	<u>\$4,533.00</u>	5.00%

NOTES: Tuition rates are per credit hour and do not vary between fall and winter semesters and spring and summer sessions.

General Service Fees as shown are for each semester (fall and winter). For each session (spring and summer) the rates are one-half of the amounts shown except for the enrollment fee of \$40.00 which is the same for every semester or session.

Graduate students taking less than 4 credits are exempted from the Athletics Allocation.

President Champagne stated that the requested increase is comparable to, and on the low side of, the increases sought by other institutions.

Mr. Riley added that Oakland did not seek a tuition increase for the 1985-86 year or for the 1984-85 year.

Mr. Handleman reported that the Finance and Personnel Committee reviewed and approved the proposed tuition and fee increase. He moved approval of the proposed General Fund Budget and the tuition increase.

Mr. Sims stated that the comparison graphs on the budget were very helpful, and he assumed that the "little twelve schools" include all institutions except Wayne State University, Michigan State University and the University of Michigan. President Champagne responded that Mr. Sims was correct and the term "little twelve" is gradually being replaced by the term "comparable twelve".

Mr. Bemis stated that he had spent considerable time on the proposed tuition increase and budget. He expressed his belief that the proposed budget represents the mission of the University expressed in terms of dollars. He wished to be on record that he is satisfied that Oakland is fulfilling its mission for the State of Michigan by the implementation of this budget and the tuition increase. He commended the staff on the development of the budget, and noted that the requests of the Board on budget constraint items are reflected in the recommendation. He asked that quarterly reports on "target positions" be made to the Finance and Personnel Committee to alleviate any concern on future budgetary problems.

Mr. Riley asked if the practice of using carryovers of unspent money from a previous year creates future budget problems for the University. Mr. McGarry replied that he and Mr. Bemis have discussed this situation, and the University is monitoring its expenditure levels very closely to avoid any fiscal problems.

Mr. Bemis stated that he believes an effective plan is in place so that Oakland will not be in a precarious fiscal position over the next three years. He added that he believes it important that Oakland position itself so that every State economic crisis does not create a problem for the students.

Mr. Riley asked what the effect would be if Oakland were to receive more money from the State than anticipated. Mr. McGarry responded that unmet program needs would be considered.

Mr. Bemis stated that these resources should also be available to

meet future problems in the next several years. President Champagne concurred in these statements.

Mrs. Googasian noted for the record that the members of the Finance and Personnel Committee expressed great concern and resisted a tuition increase. There was even a consideration on making cuts rather than increasing tuition. She personally preferred a system similar to the State of California where attendance is based on qualification and not financial status. Unfortunately, this State at this time does not have the resources to fund the universities to a level where tuition is minimal. There was a long discussion on this issue and great reluctance to an increase. There was, however, a recognition of the need for additional funds to sustain the institution. Therefore, the increase was kept to the lowest rate possible.

Mr. Bemis pointed out that with the increase Oakland will maintain its relative position in the State in regard to student tuition and fees.

President Champagne stated that all of the Trustees and all members of the Oakland administration are deeply concerned about tuition and fee increases. There is no disagreement that the public system must be as accessible as possible, hence the tuition and fee increase has been kept as low as possible, approximately 3.6%, which is well below the Governor's suggested guideline.

President Champagne said that he and Trustee Ken Morris have discussed this matter at great length on many occasions. Mr. Morris regrets that he is not able to be here to express his concerns, and he asked President Champagne to relate his strong position on maintaining current tuition levels. President Champagne stated that "we shall be good stewards of the resources entrusted to us." He added that Oakland's record of efficiency is unprecedented in Michigan. On the average Oakland receives approximately \$400 per student less in appropriation than the comparable twelve public institutions, "yet we believe we have not sacrificed quality due to the hard work, motivation and dedication of our faculty and staff. To the students who will have to pay a little more next year, we pledge our strongest efforts to be as efficient and as effective as possible with the financial resources you provide us. No one likes to pay more, but sometimes cost increases are inevitable. In education, quality has to be uppermost for an education without quality and relevance, in my opinion, is worse than no education at all."

Mr. Handleman restated his motion to approve both the General Fund Budget and the tuition increase, which was seconded by Mrs. Googasian. The motions for the approval of the General Fund

Budget and the tuition increase were voted on separately and each motion passed unanimously.

Approval of installation of air cooling/ventilation system for
Shotwell-Gustafson Pavilion

Mr. Riley stated that the Board of Trustees requested a study on air conditioning the Shotwell-Gustafson Pavilion. He then called on Mr. McGarry for a report.

Mr. McGarry stated that the Shotwell-Gustafson Pavilion is used extensively and there is a great need for an air conditioning system. The firm of Hoyem-Basso and Associates has been engaged to do a study on energy and air cooling for the building. Their recommendation is that four roof-top air conditioning units should be installed at a total project cost of about \$200,000. He said that the proposal has been reviewed by both the Finance and Personnel Committee and the University Affairs Committee. He requested approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees gives the Vice President for Finance and Administration authority to enter into a contract for the air-conditioning of the Shotwell-Gustafson Pavilion at a total cost not to exceed \$200,000; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the award will be to the lowest qualified bidder and be in compliance with university contract and affirmative action policy.

Mr. Sims stated that the recommendation was reviewed and approved by the Finance and Personnel Committee; however he wished to suggest certain minor changes in the recommendation. The Board is, in reality, being asked to act on two contracts rather than one, and the word "contract" should be changed to "contracts" in the first paragraph of the recommendation. He said that a paragraph should be added to indicate that a professional services contract with Hoyem-Basso Associates will be awarded, provided that the firm is in compliance with University contract and affirmative action policies.

Mr. De Carlo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Vice President for Governmental Affairs and General Counsel, suggested the following amendment to the recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees gives the Vice President for Finance and Administration authority to enter into contracts for the air conditioning of the Shotwell-Gustafson Pavilion, total cost not to exceed \$200,000; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a professional services contract be awarded to Hoyem-Basso and Associates provided that such firm is in compliance with University contract and affirmative action policies and that this contract is within the limitation of \$200,000 provided above; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the award to the lowest qualified bidder be in compliance with University contract and affirmative action policies.

Mr. Bemis asked if a contract has been entered into with Hoyem-Basso. President Champagne replied in the negative and stated that Hoyem-Basso merely did a feasibility study.

Mr. Bemis asked if the bid should come in at \$120,000, does this mean the administration has a license to add an \$80,000 fee for professional services? Mr. McGarry replied that Oakland uses the State Curve Formula employed by the State of Michigan.

Mr. Bemis stated that the Curve is negotiable, and he would assume that the Hoyem-Basso contract would be negotiated.

Mr. Sims stated that, given the size of this particular project, more could be spent in lost time and manpower resources in negotiating than would be gained. The State Curve has generally been considered an "equitable curve", and for the most part, the State universities tend to use those figures. That is not to say that on larger projects, they do not negotiate.

Mr. Bemis stated he is not objecting to the proposal. He suggested that the Finance and Personnel Committee should discuss this general subject further with a possible change in the University bidding policy.

Mr. Bemis asked that the Board Secretary report to the Board on the results of the project bids. Mr. McGarry stated that such a report was discussed in Committee and the administration will comply with the request.

Mr. Bemis moved, seconded by Mrs. Googasian, to approve the following amended recommendation drafted by Mr. De Carlo:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees gives to the Vice President for Finance and Administration the authority to enter into contracts for the air conditioning of the Shotwell-Gustafson Pavilion at a total contract cost not to exceed \$200,000; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Vice President for Finance and Administration is authorized to award the professional services contract on this project to Hoyem-Basso and Associates provided that such agreement is within the \$200,000 total project contract limitation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That all construction contracts for the project shall be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder in compliance with University contract and affirmative action policies.

The amended motion was unanimously approved.

Approval of amendments to Alumni Association Bylaws

Mr. David Rodwell, Vice President for External Affairs, stated that Oakland University enjoys a "healthy and productive relationship" with its Alumni Association, so much so that the alumni are busily engaged in carrying out a \$1 million pledge to the Capital Campaign for the Kresge Library addition. It is traditional for the Board of Trustees to approve bylaw changes for the Alumni Association. The proposed bylaw changes are essentially routine "housekeeping" matters. Mr. Rodwell then asked for approval of the following recommendation:

RESOLVED, That the Oakland University Alumni Association Bylaws submitted with this agenda and bearing the date February 3, 1986, be approved.

(A complete copy of the Alumni Association Bylaws are on file in the Office of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees.)

Mr. Bemis asked if it is necessary, even though it is traditional, for the Board to act on the Alumni Association bylaws. Mr. Rodwell replied that it is necessary because the creating document states, "The Association is to function in accordance with such articles of organization as may be approved or amended by resolution of the Board of Trustees." The Association recommends that the Board of Trustees continue to act on bylaws amendments because such action makes clear the link between the University and the Alumni Association.

Mr. Bemis expressed his appreciation of the Alumni Association's efforts. He stated that his reluctance to act on the bylaws is based on his need for a clear understanding of the relationship between the Association and the University. He asked if the Association operates with external funds. Mr. Rodwell responded that the Association raises funds in accordance with University rules and procedures, and the University holds the funds and conducts an accounting on their use.

Mr. Bemis asked if all funds of the Alumni Association appear on the University's books. Mr. Rodwell responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Bemis reiterated his reluctance to become involved in the internal organization of a group for which the Board of Trustees may have no legal responsibility. Mr. Rodwell stated that the Board does have responsibility for Oakland's Alumni Association. He added that there are two types of alumni associations--one is free-standing over which the Board would have no control; the other is an internal alumni association over which the President and Board do have authority. Mr. Rodwell added that, while the proposed changes are essentially routine and housekeeping, he suggested that the Board should retain the privilege of reviewing the Alumni Association's bylaws.

President Champagne asked Mr. De Carlo to comment on the matter. He added that the University Affairs Committee asked the same question at its meeting on why the Board was being asked to approve the proposed bylaw amendments.

Mr. De Carlo stated that it is his understanding that in 1971 there was an effort to develop a strong relationship between the alumni and the University. It was felt at that time that Board recognition of the Association would assist in establishing this relationship. There was some discussion about the possibility of developing a Board-approved constitution similar to other University organizations such as the University Senate and the Student Congress. That action has never occurred, and the Alumni Association has operated without a constitution and under bylaws. Amendments to the bylaws have been presented on occasion to the Board for approval, and this is another amendment. Mr. Bemis' concern is well taken in that this status is an aberration that should be reviewed and action taken to make the process consistent with other University organizations. Mr. De Carlo suggested that in the interim, since the Board has historically authorized the Association's bylaws, the amendments should be approved if there are no substantial objections. Mr. De Carlo called on Mr. William Connellan, Assistant Provost, to confirm the historical facts on the creation of the Association.

Mr. Connellan stated that the Alumni Association was formed in 1971 as a merger of the Alumni Council, which was clearly an internal and informal group, and the Friends of Oakland, which was essentially a parents' group that was substituting for an Alumni Association. Both of these organizations operated under bylaws rather than a constitution. It was a natural evolution that bylaws, rather than a constitution, were established for the Alumni Association when it was formed. It very clearly is structured as an internal organization. Each year the Association makes recommendations to President Champagne as to the expenditure of the funds raised by the Association. There is an effort

to determine the University's needs so that the President has never rejected the Association's recommendation. The President does have the authority to do so.

Mr. Riley stated that the agenda material indicates that the by-laws were first adopted on December 6, 1971, and amended thereafter six times. He added that the University Affairs Committee did not question the amendments, but merely wondered why the Board was being asked to approve them.

Mr. Sims reported that the University Affairs Committee, after deliberating on the issue, recommended the approval of the bylaws. He therefore moved their approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Handleman, which was unanimously passed.

Approval of Board meeting dates for fiscal year 1986-87

Mr. Riley stated that at the last meeting a list of proposed Board meeting dates for the fiscal year 1986-87 was presented for consideration. The proposed meeting time is 5:00 p.m. He asked if any Board member wished to comment on the proposed dates and time.

Mr. Sims stated that he has appreciated the consistency of the dates and time of the Board meetings.

Mr. Riley said that, in his opinion, choosing a date and adhering to it has many advantages: a member knows in advance whether he or she can attend the meeting, and there is no need for telephoning each month in an attempt to establish a convenient meeting date. He added that the attendance of Trustees has improved because of the advance establishment of firm meeting dates.

Mr. Mair moved, seconded by Mr. Sims to approve the following recommendation:

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approves the following dates for the regular Board meetings for the University fiscal year 1986-87 to be held at 5:00 p.m. in the Oakland Center, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan:

Wednesday, July 9, 1986
Wednesday, August 13, 1986
Wednesday, September 10, 1986
Wednesday, October 8, 1986
Wednesday, November 12, 1986
Wednesday, December 10, 1986
Wednesday, January 14, 1987

Wednesday, February 11, 1987
Wednesday, March 11, 1987
Wednesday, April 8, 1987
Wednesday, May 13, 1987
Wednesday, June 10, 1987

The motion was unanimously approved.

Other items

Mr. Riley stated that this is the time when audience comments are invited and that he had cards from Mr. James A. Doyon and Mr. Randy Swansey, who wished to speak.

Mr. Riley recognized Mr. Doyon, a graduate student in the School of Human and Educational Services (SHES).

(What follows is an edited paraphrase of Mr. Doyon's comments. The first person presentation is retained for ease of reading.)

My classmates and I are here to speak on behalf of our other classmates attending evening classes in the School of Human and Educational Services (SHES). Most of us are adults, working professionals and evening students who hold a Bachelor's Degree in a variety of disciplines. We are paying graduate level fees for our course work.

We are encountering a variety of difficulties in achieving our educational objectives, and are here to ask your assistance. These difficulties include student and university communication, course descriptions and offerings, student support services, admissions and program criteria, and career planning.

We request that this body establish a subcommittee to hear the details of concerns of graduate students, that the meeting be held at 9:00 p.m. on a Tuesday or Wednesday, and that all evening students be notified so they may attend to state their individual concerns.

(The complete text of Mr. Doyon's comments is on file in the Office of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees.)

Mr. Riley asked if Mr. Doyon had spoken to Mr. Kleckner regarding his concerns. Mr. Doyon replied that he had approached Mr. Kleckner on a specific problem and that he was very helpful. Mr. Doyon added that his presentation is made, not only on his own behalf, but for other evening students with similar problems.

Mr. Riley recognized Mr. Swansey, an undergraduate of SHES and a member of the Student Association for Teachers of Education (SATE).

(What follows is an edited paraphrase of Mr. Swansey's comments. The first person presentation has been retained for ease of reading.)

Our presence here tonight concerns class listings, the efficiency of several of the offices of Oakland University which render services to students, and the insufficient advising for SHES students, given the major influx of enrollment in the department. We have been forced on several occasions to "team up" in classes with classmates who are taking classes which have nothing to do with what we are taking. This has caused a problem especially in the spring term because it is eight weeks long as opposed to sixteen weeks. We are being forced to cram two topics into one class session, both student groups being responsible for both classes. We are in a graduate and undergraduate class. The graduate level class is Classroom Management, and the undergraduate level is Testing and Assessment.

Many students have expressed concerns regarding the efficiency of some of the offices at Oakland. Two of the major problems occur in the Financial Aid office and the Student Services office, especially regarding re-admissions. There are unnecessary delays in processing and unnecessary pressures on students. Improper processing and handling of student records, forms and applications; and discourteous treatment of students are also serious problems.

Insufficient advising for SHES students is a serious problem because of the major influx of enrollment in the department. All of the SHES classes are overcrowded. I was enrolled for 20 credit hours last semester in the undergraduate program. Twelve of those credit hours were for SHES classes. None of the classes had an enrollment of under 60, with one class enrollment being 75 students. The department is trying to alleviate this situation by limiting future enrollment. Advising has not been sufficient the past two terms. There is only one advisor for all SHES students, both graduate and undergraduate, and many students are being advised improperly due to a lack of communication between SHES and the advisor.

We would like to suggest again that, whether through a task force or through individual members of the Board, this situation be investigated. We would like to be informed as to the results of your investigation.

Mr. Riley asked Mr. Swansey to furnish the Board with a written list of his concerns, and stated that the Board will determine the best way to address the situation.

Mr. Bemis expressed his appreciation to Messrs. Doyon and Swansey and indicated that the matter would be reviewed.

Mr. Handleman moved, seconded by Mr. Mair, to adjourn the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Approved,

John De Carlo, Secretary
Board of Trustees

Wallace D. Riley, Chairman
Board of Trustees