

BOARD OF CONTROL
SAGINAW VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

Pioneer Room--Pioneer Hall of Engineering and Technology
December 13, 1978

Present: Arbury
Curtiss
Darin
Gilmore
Kendall
Saltzman
Suchara
Zahnow

Others

Present: Clark
Colvin
Dutcher
Elashhab
Finney
Gilbert
Gill
Gross
Lange
Lee
Munitz
Novey
Robinson
Rummel
Ryder
Sharp
Smith
Weist
Whittaker
Willertz
Woodcock
Yien
Press (3)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Curtiss gaveled the meeting to order at 2:12 p.m. and noted that all eight Board members were present. He expressed appreciation for their interest and continued support.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 13, 1978

Mr. Curtiss stated that the Minutes of the Regular Monthly Meeting of November 13, 1978 were mailed and asked for any additions or corrections.

Mr. Curtiss asked that the substantive part of the discussion on November 13 regarding the SVSC Mission Statement of the College be added as an Addendum to the Minutes. Dr. Ryder indicated it would be done (see Attachment).

Mr. Curtiss asked for any further additions or corrections and finding none indicated the Minutes were approved as distributed subject to the provision of the Addendum.

III. OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Chairman Curtiss welcomed Dr. Janet Robinson, President of the SVSCFA to the meeting and asked if she cared to make any comments. Dr. Robinson indicated she would read a statement from the Association (see Attachment) and entertain questions afterwards.

Dr. Suchara asked a question about procedure since she had nothing before her.

Mr. Curtiss responded that there was nothing before the Board regarding academic reorganization at this time but it was his impression that the administration is convinced that some action is required in the very near future.

Dr. Suchara observed that the concerns expressed by Dr. Robinson did relate to the report Dr. Munitz would be presenting to the Board shortly and suggested any reaction await hearing the report.

Mr. Curtiss indicated that it was his understanding the administration had responded to the Faculty Association's request for more time to consider the matter



SAGINAW VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

2250 Pierce Road
Saginaw, Michigan 48710

Faculty Association

MEA-NEA

IN PROFESSIONAL SOLIDARITY

"Prudentia Dicitur Genitrix Virtutum"

OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF FACULTY ASSOCIATION

The academic structure is a very important element in the life and well-being of this College. When we set out to reorganize the academic structure, therefore, it is a vital endeavor in the life of faculty and administration as we teach and carry out other professional duties. We strongly believe that we and you and indeed everyone in this room have a major stake in this reorganization.

When the two proposals regarding reorganization were presented to the faculty last Friday, we were stunned to find that we were isolated from the reorganization process, even though our input was formally invited. At the faculty meeting following the presentation, the faculty were as surprised as anyone at the unanimity of their votes of rejection of both plans. In the aftermath it has become clear that the Faculty and the Administration have been operating in isolation on this, and possibly other issues, regarding the life of the College. This has led to a different set of expectations about what constitutes the well-being of the College and therefore, subsequent problems in communication.

It is not our role today to place blame. Instead, we have come here to invite ~~your~~ best efforts and to offer our best efforts in structuring this College in the most beneficial way possible for its future well-being. For this to be realized we strongly believe that some meaningful dialogue and planning must occur among the Board, the Administration and the Faculty. The exact format of this dialogue is less important than its content. Certainly the day of discussions that occurred a year ago September, along with the follow-up discussions later in the year, were positively viewed by the Faculty. Other formats would probably also lend themselves to the task. The essential part is the dialogue that occurs when a group working toward a common goal can sit together and work through the problems. We recognize the need for reorganization and can contribute positively to its development.

If such a dialogue is to occur and the group to move toward a common reorganization plan, the January 8 board meeting seems to be an unrealistic deadline for a completed plan. Though we well understand the necessity for some deadline, to rush through such a vital task, seems to invite unnecessary difficulties.

We have, therefore, two requests of the Board. First, that there be constructed a procedure for the three-way dialogue to which we have referred; and secondly that the January deadline be deferred to allow such a process.

Frank Rubin

ATTACHMENT

II. Approval of Minutes of Regular Monthly Meeting Held on November 13, 1978

ADDENDUM

ITEM 6 MISSION STATEMENT FOR SVSC

UNDER

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

SVSC BOARD OF CONTROL

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

NOVEMBER 13, 1978

Dr. Ryder indicated there were two committees, with some overlapping membership, working toward the development of a Mission Statement. One is the NCA Accreditation Committee and the other is the Title III Committee whose purpose is to draw up a proposal to the Federal Government to gain support as a developing institution. The basic purpose is to provide a strategy document in terms of future growth and development. It is the Board of Control that must be satisfied since it has the ultimate responsibility.

Mr. Zahnow asked about the timing for completion of the report and Dr. Ryder replied that it should be completed by January if possible subject to review each year.

Mrs. Arbury asked when the NCA would make its visit and Dr. Ryder replied it would be in April but that the basic Self-Study must be in by January 1.

Mr. Curtiss indicated that the Mission Statement originally adopted in 1966 had been modified several times since...the latest in 1973 or '74. He asked if Dr. Ryder was implying that SVSC was not accomplishing what that latest statement set forth. Dr. Ryder replied that SVSC was accomplishing the objectives to a considerable extent although some things had not been done at all, others only partially and new objectives had been added.

Mr. Curtiss asked if it was sufficient that the SVSC Self-Study reflect the extent to which it had achieved those objectives rather than manufacturing a new Mission Statement.

Dr. Ryder replied that the primary emphasis would be on how well SVSC had

done with respect to the past but the NCA would also be concerned about future plans.

Mr. Curtiss pointed out that the Mission Statement should be reviewed frequently, perhaps once a year...it may be drafted for a five-year period but reviewed each year to determine how accurately it reflects the direction the institution wants to take.

He called attention to Criteria #1 of the Board's Self-Study of a year ago... "No institution can be all things to all people. Each institution must decide what its particular mission is...its real purpose...*real purpose in italics*...if it is to have some direction. The mission must be clearly defined so that students will know the institution's purposes and objectives. Faculty members will know how to direct their efforts and the several publics on whom the campus community depends will know what they are supporting. An official statement setting forth the specific mission of a college or university should be a cooperative effort of the administration, the faculty and the governing board. Acting alone, the Board lacks the professional experience to define educational goals in detail. Its role is to insure that the mission is clearly stated."

Some of the questions they were asked to respond to were: "Is there a written and officially adopted statement of the institution's mission?" "In your opinion, is the statement sufficiently clear to serve as a guide to academic planning, decision-making, and student recruitment?" "Do you feel the institution lives up to its stated mission?" "Does the Board periodically review its statement of purpose and educational goals and examine the policies which implement them?" "Does the Board assume the role in helping to determine basic educational policies?" Those were the questions that they addressed in some way or another a year or more ago.

Mr. Curtiss further indicated that comments made by the State Department of Education ombudsman Dr. Gordon Reithmiller would be of interest to the Board. Reithmiller said, "While most of the institutional mission statements look very much alike, that Michigan has fifteen distinct separate and unique institutions within its boundaries...that is public institutions. By implication he was saying that "darn few of those institutional mission statements actually reflect what the institution is or what it does." If SVSC is really going to do the kind of planning it should, Mr. Curtiss said, it was going to have to not only say what it would like to do but begin to define its uniqueness.

In that regard, Mr. Curtiss said, he thought it was interesting when he reviewed all fifteen statements comprising 102 pages, that only two of the institutions in the state specifically addressed students. The rest of them were built on so-called bureaucracy of teaching, research and public service, which are the traditional three functions of a college, and they moved very rapidly from that to "let's provide programs"...they were all program oriented rather than student oriented.

One of the major achievements in this third rewrite of the Mission Statement, Mr. Curtiss noted, was that SVSC is beginning to address...beginning to address...what it is SVSC expects to provide for students...that's got to be a very important part of this institution's Mission Statement. It's important, he supposed, in a mission statement to try to keep it broad, but the harder one tried to keep it broad, and the less specific it was, the less direction it really would give the institution for planning.

Mr. Curtiss indicated he thought it was important, if possible, that they improve substantially on the specificity of the Mission Statement...he thought a well-drafted Mission Statement should probably do four things at least, and perhaps more...that is

four in addition to trying to define the ways in which this institution is unique and is carving out its own role in Michigan higher education.

Those four would be:

1. To provide a foundation for program planning and development...something from which program planning can flow and give some direction to it...not just broad enough to allow any program to develop.

2. To provide a foundation for resource allocation...that is...it should be integrated with the budgeting process. If it's not, it really isn't a mission that's achievable and it becomes just an exercise in mental gymnastics.

3. It should be the basic document and the basic foundation from which program evaluation stems...that is to say...it's just not where do we want to go from here, but how much do we want to take with us and why. So it should be sufficiently specific so that it can begin to lead the college down a evaluative process with regard to program and total institutional effectiveness.

4. It has a very important role to play in explaining ourselves to prospective students and to the legislature.

Reading that first paragraph of the Mission Statement, Mr. Curtiss asked, "Would you pay \$5 million for it?" This was not to say that SVSC was going in the wrong direction, but he thought they needed some really hard thought...further thought...on the mission itself. The goals they could talk about, but he would like to see if they couldn't really concentrate on the mission statement initially.

With regard to who it has to satisfy and how it's derived, Mr. Curtiss said, he thought they had a process problem frankly...that it might very well be that with some outside help their skills could be sharpened in the area of process over the course of the next year or so.

Mr. Curtiss suggested that to be effective as a Mission Statement, it appeared to him that they should have substantially more faculty involvement than they had had...he had had discussions with faculty who insisted adamantly that they knew what it was they wanted to have happen to students in their classrooms. He indicated he thought that was the stuff with which a good Mission Statement for the '80's would be made.

He indicated he didn't want to denigrate the efforts of the people who had worked on the committee at all, that wasn't his intent...he understood that there had been a couple of faculty members working in this area...he didn't know to what extent they had gone back into a broader context of the faculty as a whole...but ultimately the people who most needed to be satisfied were the faculty who must commit themselves to trying to achieve those objectives. How they were to do that, Mr. Curtiss concluded, he wasn't entirely certain himself...but he would encourage the institution to address that issue.

Mrs. Saltzman indicated that she saw the faculty and administration responsibility as suggesting or recommending with regard to mission but ultimately the mission is the responsibility of the Board. Mr. Curtiss agreed.

Dr. Ryder pointed out that the more involvement by the faculty, the more commitment to carry out the mission adopted by the Board. He further indicated that faculty had been involved in considerations over the past two years and the committee, which included faculty, drafted this Mission Statement which still needed review by the faculty.

Mr. Curtiss indicated that he felt the Mission Statement should address itself to some of the over-riding goals, or the goals should at least flow from the Mission Statement.

There was much further discussion on specific items in the Mission Statement draft and it was concluded that more effort needed to be made by the faculty, administration and student representatives in actually fleshing out the Mission Statement, including very specific goals and objectives, and further, that some outside assistance might be helpful in the planning process.

It was decided that the last Mission Statement approved in about 1973 or '74 should be sent to the Board members to form a more common basis for discussion. Dr. Ryder said it would be done.

JMR:omc
1/4/79

and he was hopeful that whatever mechanisms required would be employed to jointly evolve a recommendation to the Board of Control.

Upon Dr. Suchara's recommendation that discussion of the matter be delayed until later in the meeting, and with no other comments, Chairman Curtiss moved to the next item on the Agenda.

IV. REQUESTS TO APPEAR BEFORE THE BOARD

Mr. Curtiss asked if there were other requests to appear before the Board and Dr. Ryder advised there had been none.

V. COMMUNICATIONS

When Mr. Curtiss called for communications, Dr. Ryder stated that none had been received.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

1. Presidential Evaluation

Dr. Ryder indicated the first item was the Presidential Evaluation and introduced Dr. Barry Munitz, Consultant to the Board, to carry the discussion.

Dr. Munitz pointed out that his report (see Attachment) did contain a recommendation related to the statement read by Dr. Robinson and read the statement from the report.

Dr. Munitz indicated that he wanted to make a brief presentation and then respond to the questions of the Board. Even more important, he stressed, were Board reactions or concerns not covered in the report since in the end there must be a document useful to the Board and the President.

He further indicated that this assessment review was as useful and as construc-

ATTACHMENT

PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION

VI.

ANNOTATED OUTLINE FOR BOARD PRESENTATION

1. Presidential Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

1. Significant credit due President and Board for initiating review.
2. President's role is extraordinarily complex and difficult at any contemporary college.
3. Evaluation was for mutual benefit of President and Board.

I. Original Objectives of Assessment Process

- A. Review of presidential strengths and areas requiring improvement of performance.
- B. Establish agenda for strengthening office of the President.
- C. Determine current status of Board performance and suggest areas for improvement.
- D. Enhance relationship between chief executive officer and Board.

II. Accomplishments of the President

- A. The original assignment from the Board:
 1. Improve legislative relationships - accomplished.
 2. Strengthen dormitories and their occupancy rate - accomplished.
 3. Enhance the Physical Plant - accomplished.
- B. General confidence in the President as person, and good feeling for his honesty, candor, and integrity.
- C. The prestige and the image of the campus and the community have been changed for the better, even though much work remains to be done. The strengthening of athletics seems to have played a role in this regard, although some Board members are held responsible for pushing this issue with the President.
- D. The enrollment is attributed in large measure to the personal environment and the admissions procedures established by the President.
(Registration process requires improvement!)
- E. External groups feel the President is a good listener without imposing a sense of formal hierarchy.
- F. It is clear that the President has a strong commitment to the campus and its people.
- G. Although not held directly responsible for the situation, the President is given indirect credit for strong alumni and student support of the faculty, and for general satisfaction with classroom relationships and confidence in teachers. There is general agreement that the faculty is interested in, and committed to the college and its educational environment.

III. The Setting for Implementing and Evaluation Agenda

It is impossible to undertake a meaningful assessment of the chief executive officer without a relatively clear set of governing board procedures and objectives. At Saginaw Valley State College although Bylaws exist, they do not contain adequate guidance for participating in institutional concerns, and specific board objectives do not exist, and some Board members raise questions regarding the role and the function of the Board. Attached to this outline is the questionnaire developed by the Association of Governing Boards for their membership. A careful look at the introductory statement for each section, and at the questions which follow, provides an implied set of recommendations for the improvement of governing board performance. In addition, the AGB can assist governing boards with examples and guidelines for their regulations and planning.

The recommendations which follow in the next two sections of the outline are directed toward the improvement of Board, and then chief executive performance. They establish an agenda for periodic review, and they are specific enough to allow the establishment of criteria for monitoring the success or failure of future developments. Conditions will change and it is inevitable that the relative priority for each step will be adjusted for a new environment. Although the agenda is presented as positive recommendations for both Board and President, they clearly imply areas where current performance is not adequate, and where problems have been identified by raising questions such as those in the Munitz manuscript, the criteria discussed at the beginning of this process with the Board, and the attached AGB Self Study materials.

IV. Recommendations to the Board of Control

- A. The Board is responsible for endorsing those policies which establish a general program statement for educational direction of Saginaw Valley State College. If it does not know what the institution stands for and what it requires, and if those desires are not stated first to the chief executive officer, and then with and through him to the institution, there will be no stable basis for college progress, and no meaningful context for assessing the quality of institutional leadership. A board planning committee, supported by a president who drafts materials and analyzes options, can create the initiative for clarifying the college's mission. The Board and the President inevitably will be engaged in a mutual education process. For that process to work trust and good faith are required, but a constant testing of each other's assumptions and desires are even more essential.
- B. The nature of the Board of Control is changing (both in type of people and their expectations), and in order to lend credibility to the administrative process each member must encourage public analysis of and response to basic policy issues. The Board cannot see itself as just one of many constituencies confronting the President's office. They are ultimately responsible for the President, just as he is responsible to them. They have a right to expect timely information and firm decision making. They must not and can not be in a position of cajoling or subtly hinting for that information or for those decisions.

- C. Since the Board establishes policy and then leaves implementation to the administration, they must expect from the President a continuing clarification of his short and long run agenda for leading the institution, and a relatively specific timetable for accomplishing each major objective. The President will then periodically review that agenda with the Board, and provide them with an opportunity for revising priorities, assessing progress, and suggesting new areas of concern. Although they serve as guides for executive leadership, and therefore delegate to that leadership the appropriate authority to implement basic policy guidelines, they must also insist that when new areas of concern are raised, they must be followed up by the administration, and the results of such analysis and problem solving must be presented at subsequent meetings and entered into the formal public minutes.
- D. The Board's organizational structure and operating procedures must encourage conversation directed toward institutional priorities and the quality of administrative leadership. Its responsibility is to judge whether or not college objectives are appropriate, and then to test periodically the degree to which those objectives are being met.
- E. If the recommendations above are followed, then the President will be placed in a position to administer the institution within the basic planning and policy context approved by the Board. If indications of problems come to individual Board members they should be raised immediately with the President - privately at first, and at public Board meetings if the nature of the issues warrant such treatment. It is not how the Board gathers or receives its information (provided that they do not aggressively seek comprehensive information in a manner that bypasses the President), which becomes a problem for the college, but rather what is done with that information once it is brought to their attention.
- F. The role of the chairman is crucial in structuring the Board agenda so that it provides a context for consideration of policy issues. He or she cannot be exposed directly by people on the campus to conflicting institutional pressures, or be perceived as working around rather than through the campus decision making structure. The Board and its chairman must remain an ultimate recourse for appeal and revision of policy decisions. There are no longer circumstances at Saginaw Valley State College to justify an extraordinary involvement of the Board or any of its members in the administration of the college.
- G. In the formulation of policy decisions, the Board can not be placed continuously in a position of mutual suspicion ~~of~~ ambiguity. If they demonstrate a better understanding of various groups at the college, they can build innate trust in their functions amongst the campus community. They in turn must respond with trust and support for their student, faculty, and administrative constituencies. The element of ambiguity will be avoided to the extent that the Board publicly debates policy alternatives and publicly provides direction to the administration for the implementation of policy decisions.
- H. The President's leadership, as suggested in detail in the next section, will be equally crucial in educating and directing the Board through those policy deliberations. He must not be in the position of constant reaction rather than initiative, although there

will be legitimate occasions for his response to Board initiatives. If the Board role is to set policy, then it must articulate what it wants to know, and it must periodically insure that its earlier requests have been met. The Board will be, if appropriately involved and educated, an effective buffer and filter system which enhances the institution's relationship with the outside world, and protects it in turn from a less informed set of external pressures.

- I. To play its policy role the Board must get its information early, in a concise form, with the background required for analysis. It must have procedures which assure effective establishment and understanding of priority goals, including programmatic as well as fiscal implications for balancing requirements and meeting current needs. In the long run, this balance will depend upon the informal relationship between the Board chairman and the President. However, these procedures will more likely be forthcoming if the administration presents alternatives to the Board for responding to major policy issues, outlines the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative, and then provides supporting material for its own recommendation. Subsequent public review of the alternative finally selected will enhance confidence in further decisions made at Board meetings.

J. Implications for Board Agenda

1. Materials should be prepared early, including the alternatives and implications described above, so that administrative recommendations are received by the Board in ample time for comprehensive discussion at the committee level, and for analysis by each Board member prior to the public meeting. The President - chairman relationship is crucial to the formulation of the Board agenda. They must shape its general structure, and identify specific items for consideration. In addition, they must insure the early mailing of complicated material and the timely scheduling of committee meetings.
2. Time must be set aside at each meeting for the Board to discuss general institutional strategy, be updated on current issues, and review the priority for institutional goals.
3. Board meetings should not be so driven by the formal agenda that time is not allowed to explore ad hoc or emergency questions.
4. The agenda should reach the Board, after it has been established by the President and the chairman, so that at least one full week is allowed for study and for informal exploration before the public meeting itself. This agenda should include relevant reports from each standing committee of the Board, or an informal discussion of committee discussions undertaken close to the current meeting.

K. Committee structure and functioning

1. Each of the principal committees should be supported by the administrator within the presidential team most responsible for the function assigned to that committee.

2. A primary role for each committee is the education of the full Board. They must be able to function and express their concerns without intrusion, and then treat the President as their line connection to each functional area within the institution.
 3. The danger of committee organization is over specialization. Therefore, a mechanism must be developed to bring committee material before the full Board so that it can be described and analyzed for each member, without having the committee itself feel that all of their deliberation has been moved back to ground zero. If the trustees are to be informed, active, and aware, so that they can focus upon effective and well informed decision making policies, then they must lean on committees which are chaired by carefully chosen individuals who can be responsible to the full Board for their area of assigned expertise.
- L. The Board should consider bringing in an external consultant to advise the President on the initial design of a planning and budgeting system. Such a system would include a process for determining immediate and longer run priorities, for analyzing resources required to support those priorities, for identifying the sources of that support, and then for allocating annually the basic budgets for each programmatic and administrative area.
- No modern public college can exist without public priorities and without an up-to-date assessment of academic programs. A long range plan, and a budgeting process which includes cost benefit analysis for each program area, reduce the likelihood for crisis budget decisions, and increase institutional stability when those decisions are inevitable. In addition, a planning and priority setting process encourages the building of an informal general consensus within the academic community regarding college direction and the expectations of its leadership.
- M. The Board must ask whether there are people on the campus who serve as a candid sounding board for the President, who can speak honestly with him about major policy issues, and who then can effectively support and implement his decisions once they are reached.
- N. An up-to-date and comprehensive policies and procedures manual will strengthen the overall performance of the Board as well as the administration. Similar materials prepared at other institutions and reviewed by the AGB should be studied by this Board's executive committee.
- O. Each term served by a member should be carefully appraised so that only those committed and performing are considered for renewal. When vacancies occur strengths which are absent on the Board should be analyzed carefully, and advice then provided for the governor as to serious requirements for membership.
- P. There should be a detailed orientation process for new Board members, which is shaped by the President and the chairman. At the orientation process the policy manual could be distributed and explained, and an organizational chart with job descriptions for major administrators would be provided as well.

- Q. There should be some place on campus where the Board members could visit with the administration or other constituencies, or simply rest and read while preparing for a Board or committee meeting.
- R. The President's office should provide to all Board members a weekly summary of media references to the college.
- S. The Board will feel comfortable that basic policies and specific problem solutions are being analyzed and implemented in a timely and consistent fashion, if they have the opportunity to review carefully their own agenda as well as the President's. Under the President's leadership they can be placed in a position of initiating and then monitoring implementation of basic policies, instead of responding to or hearing about decisions in a fragmented or ambiguous fashion.
- T. Ultimately there must be evidence that the Board has clearly defined expectations for the Office of the President. This evidence will include the periodic review of an agenda established by the Fall 1978 presidential evaluation process. There must be particular attention paid to items which are raised by Board members for clarification and review - whether or not they are part of the agenda identified by this evaluation. The President and the Board chairman, who established the agenda for each meeting, should insure that subsequent meetings allow adequate time for the President to report on any item raised concerning the leadership agenda or an immediate problem. It must be understood clearly that a timely response from the President, as well as a satisfactory resolution of major problems raised by any Board member, will become part of the normal evaluation process for the President.

V. Recommendations to the President

- A. As indicated in the section above, one of the President's prime responsibilities is as educator and organizer of the Board of Control itself.
- B. Within the planning process described in Section IV-L the President must provide an ongoing discussion of institutional priorities. The President and his administrative team must demonstrate an understanding of budgetary processes, and provide for the administrators of units below them a sense of meaningful control and authority over their fiscal operating responsibilities. This delegation must include a cost benefit analysis of policy decisions made earlier by that administrative team. The Board itself will have to accept budgetary limits and understand that "tradeoffs" are required in a constrained resource environment. A service oriented business office, working with a vital planning and budgeting system, will be able to provide the President and his staff with a framework for a meaningful establishment of priorities, and for a resource allocation process which supports those priorities in a timely and consistent fashion.
- C. The decision making process
 - 1. The President must design a process for participative governance which has realistic constituency involvement in decision making, combined with a reasonable delegation of operational responsi-

bility and authority. This process must make particular use of specialized talents available on the President's staff, and must be accomplished in a timely fashion.

2. Even correct decisions which come late can undermine the quality of that decision itself. "Chaotic procrastination" is something a modern president can not afford. Constituencies, and the Board itself, must perceive that materials pass through the President's office in a reasonable period of time. Careful analysis is required, however the President cannot be seen as an administrator who buries or refuses to confront difficult decisions.

3. This timely and public closure on substantive material will depend upon a legitimate flow of authority from the President to the Vice President, and in turn upon public support and accountability from each Vice President to the President. Such a process will clarify how decisions are made within the college community, and will enhance constituency confidence in the President and his principal administrative staff.

D. The administrative team

1. There must be a small group of people working with the President who can establish a candid decision making process within which issues are explored and decisions are reached by constant testing and by positive confrontation.
2. On that administrative team there must be sophisticated and consistent criteria applied to policy alternatives, options explored in an open setting, and hearing provided for unpopular positions. Combined with this discussion of issues each Vice President must receive a balance of delegated authority which allows him or her to establish and review priorities in his/her functional area.
3. The administrative team must function in a "check and balance" environment, without a requirement of presidential involvement in every detail, and with an intelligence that provides direction for the academic community.
4. The President must provide for the Board a current organizational chart, with job descriptions for each of his principal administrators, and with an indication of how the group functions collectively as a policy making body.

- E. The Academic Vice President will be a critical component of the President's administrative team. He must hold out a positive future for the faculty, express concern and support for their interests, and provide his personal commitment to inspiring confidence and demonstrating leadership to the teachers and the scholars at the college. Working with the President he must signal to faculty that the administration cares deeply for their goals, and will support quality people publicly and consistently.

- F. Given the signing of a new contract, there is now an urgent need for the President and the Academic Vice President to use the faculty as a creative resource instead of assuming an adversary relationship. The President can demonstrate a comfortable and confident relationship with members of the faculty, and respond to their concerns with timely and publicly consistent replies, then they in turn can be asked to contribute positively to the college in an atmosphere of good faith and public trust.

- G. In the area of public relations the President is seen as the ultimate representative of the institution. He sets a tone for key people in the community to exert an extra effort in building the political and the financial support required by Saginaw Valley State College. He must integrate the college into three local communities in order to

achieve such public support. While he undertakes this assignment he cannot be seen as the sole individual who makes a difference in achieving community support. There will be several critical people inside and outside of the institution, without whose cooperation and support the political, financial, and symbolic stability required will never be achieved.

- H. The question of academic organization at the college should be studied. Issues such as deanship versus division head, or cost effective investments in administration, should be explored under the guidance of the Academic Vice President and ultimately presented as a recommendation from the President to the Board regarding the most efficient means of organizing to support the academic enterprise.
- I. One symbol of the President's commitment to quality education and efficient administration would be a rigorous and systematic appraisal system for all principal staff. The Board expects such accountability and the students and faculty deserve it.
- J. There is one element of the staff which seems to require particular attention at this point. Last year 68% of the secretaries at Saginaw Valley State College changed position during the year. Their attitude is crucial for the success of the institution, and somewhere in the combination of compensation elements and a professional development plan, a more attractive environment must be created.
- K. There is some question about the merging of Student Affairs and Administrative Affairs. On the one hand, there is a reduction of administrative cost, on the other hand, there must be a symbolic and substantive commitment to separate attention for Student Affairs. This recommendation therefore suggests further conversation between President Ryder and Vice President Gilbert, along with their constituencies served, regarding appropriate priorities and delegation of responsibilities in Vice President Gilbert's area.
- L. Since these recommendations place such emphasis upon the timely flow of material and decision making, there must be someone in the President's office who can be responsible for organizing his own work and for distributing paper promptly and efficiently. The leadership skills of the President will be tested not only by how he delegates authority and demonstrates public accountability, but also by how he asserts the model of responsible governance in his own office. An executive assistant is required who can organize the President's calendar, insist that he stay away from detailed involvement in minor issues, facilitate the delegation process, and follow-up specific assignments so that the President is not held responsible for unavoidable delay. If the right caliber person is appointed to this position, then he or she can also serve crucial roles in relationships with external communities, and in assisting the President's liaison/educational function with the Board of Control.

Issues to discuss privately with President and spouse.

CONCLUSION

- A. Board accountability and progress achieved by evaluation process.
- B. Recapitulate Board's original objectives when consultant engaged.
- C. Steps taken already since Spring '78.
- D. Presidential implementation of assessment agenda.

Appendix 1. List of people and groups consulted during assessment process.

Appendix 2. Association of Governing Board Self-Study criteria.

APPENDIX 1.

LIST OF PEOPLE AND GROUPS CONSULTED DURING ASSESSMENT PROCESS*

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1978

Dr. Richard H. Gilmore
Mr. John W. Kendall
Dr. Helen T. Suchara

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1978

Dr. Jack M. Ryder
Mr. Frank D. "Muddy" Waters
Mr. Lawrence K. Fitzpatrick
Mr. Eldon L. Graham
Dr. Harold W. Peterson
Mr. M. S. "Cy" Smith
Students:
Ms. Suzanne Bowns
Mr. George Cook
Mr. James Donovan
Mr. David Dutcher
Mr. Mike Finney
Mr. Steve Jacobs
Ms. Pat Lindsey

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1978

Dr. Guy M. Lee
Mr. Robert D. Hanes
Mr. Allan C. Orr
Dr. Janet K. Robinson
Mr. Donald Novey
Mr. Melvin J. Zahnow
Mr. John P. Rummel
Mrs. Dorothy D. Arbury
Mr. John C. Burkhardt
Mr. Richard P. Thompson
Dr. Basil A. Clark
Dr. George W. Eastland
Dr. Douglas E. Hansen
Dr. Jack M. Ryder

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 1978

Dr. Crystal M. Lange
Mr. Gary R. Apsey
Ms. Louise R. Ferris
Mr. Eugene J. Hamilton
Mr. Zane L. Rybkowski
Mr. James G. Bandeen)
Mr. Calvin A. Campbell) Board of Fellows
Mrs. Diane Thaler and available SVSC Women's Club officers
Dr. Jack M. Ryder,

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1978

Dr. Jack M. Ryder

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1978

Mr. Thomas Eynon
Mrs. Jan Jones)
Mrs. Mary Jane Braley) Triskelions
Dr. Arthur Andrewes
Dr. Barron Hirsch
Dr. Rose S. Novey
Dr. Robert L. Pratt
Dr. Thomas J. Renna
Ms. Carolyn Davis
Dr. David R. Weaver
Mr. Stuart D. Gross
Mr. Max P. Heavenrich, Jr.) Board of Fellows
Dr. Hans H. Hennecke)
Dr. George M. Harmon
Mr. James L. Gaertner and available SVSC Alumni Association officers
Mrs. Barbara L. Darin
Mrs. Florence F. "Jo" Saltzman
Dr. Jack M. Ryder

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1978

Dr. Jack M. Ryder
Dr. Donald J. Carlyon
Mrs. Opal M. Colvin
Mr. George F. Ditzhazy
Mr. Stuart D. Gross
Dr. Ellis M. Ivey, Jr.
Prof. John A. Clinkenbeard
Dr. Anny R. Dadlez
Dr. William G. Elliott
Dr. Joy Hargrove
Dr. Walter R. Rathkamp
Dr. Kenneth Wahl
Dr. W. Leslie Whittaker
Dr. John R. Willertz
Prof. David E. Barker
Dr. Robert C. Braddock
Dr. William J. Doll
Dr. Thomas Gillespie
Dr. John V. Jezierski
Dr. Sam Sarkar
Dr. Maxon Wang

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1978

Dr. Fred Whims
Senator Jerome T. Hart
Representative James E. O'Neill, Jr.
Dr. David E. Murphy
Mr. Rick Bossard
Mr. Charles B. Curtiss

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1978

Mr. Charles B. Curtiss
Dr. Jack M. Ryder
Mrs. Lila J. Ryder

- * Mr. Charles B. Curtiss flew to O'Hare, Chicago to meet with Dr. Munitz on Thursday, August 17, 1978
- * Dr. Munitz interviewed Dr. Curtiss L. McCray via phone in September.
- * Vice Presidents Emerson D. Gilbert, A. Jefferson Sharp, Jerry A. Woodcock and Robert S. P. Yien interviewed by Dr. Munitz at unrecorded times.
- * "Walk-in" interviewees not listed.

JMR:omc
12/1/78

Criterion 1

Institutional Mission and Educational Policy

No institution can be all things to all people. Each institution must decide what its particular mission is — its *real purpose* — if it is to have sound direction. The mission must be clearly defined so students will know the institution's purposes and objectives, faculty members will know how to direct their efforts, and the several publics on whom the campus community depends will know what they are supporting.

An official statement setting forth the specific mission of a college or university should be a cooperative effort of the administration, the faculty, and the governing board. Acting alone, the board lacks the professional experience to define educational goals in detail. Its role is to insure that the mission is clearly stated; and because it stands apart from day-to-day operations, administrative preoccupations, and faculty special interests, the board is in a unique position to lead, seek consensus, and stimulate action.

	Yes	No
1. Is there a written and officially adopted statement of the institution's mission or purpose?	_____	_____
2. In your opinion is this statement sufficiently clear to serve as a guide to academic planning, decision-making, and student recruitment?	_____	_____
3. Do you feel that the institution lives up to its stated mission?	_____	_____
4. Does the board periodically review its statement of purpose and educational goals, and examine the policies which implement them?	_____	_____
5. Does the board assume a role in helping to determine basic educational policies?	_____	_____

Criterion 2

Institutional Planning

In the difficult period stretching ahead for higher education, effective planning is essential. The number and future sources of students should be anticipated. Projections of expenses and income need to be studied. The character of the educational program and student services must be considered. The size of the faculty and its distribution by rank and tenured status are matters to be carefully plotted.

	Yes	No
1. Does the board require, participate in, review, and approve comprehensive institutional planning regarding:		
a. enrollments?	_____	_____
b. staffing?	_____	_____
c. physical facilities?	_____	_____
d. availability of resources?	_____	_____
e. educational programs?	_____	_____
2. Was the faculty involved in the plan's development?	_____	_____
3. Is there a schedule for reviewing and, if desirable, revising the plan at regular intervals?	_____	_____

Criterion 3

Physical Plant

It is the board's responsibility to create and maintain a physical environment that is conducive to learning and consistent with reasonable expectations of future funds and enrollment trends. Decisions that involve the campus master plan and the capital plan budget request are the major concerns. Prudence demands that maximum use be made of the present physical plant before construction or remodeling is considered. Credibility in capital funding requests should be ensured. Efficient use of the board's time and effort requires that it be concerned only with those matters that cannot properly be delegated to the staff.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Has the board approved a master plan for the physical campus which includes both present and anticipated needs? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Do you feel that the board makes decisions on details related to buildings and grounds that really should be delegated to the administrative staff? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Within the past two years, has the board received and reviewed a report on physical plant utilization - classroom, laboratory, office and other building space? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Prior to its consideration of requests for remodeling or new construction has the board satisfied itself that present spaces are being used effectively and instructional areas are scheduled for optimum utilization? | _____ | _____ |

Criterion 4

Financial Resources and Management

Two very important functions of the board are the approval of the budget and the support of requests to state agencies. Louis Heilbron, veteran trustee in public higher education has said: "The condition of success is credibility. The trustees must have a record of fiscal responsibility in operations. They also should have a reputation for making supportable budgetary requests, for asking for what is needed, taking into consideration a realistic approach to the state finances . . . They should not hesitate to tell their story more directly - to the appropriate executive agencies and legislature and to the public . . . This posture - affirmative to obtain appropriations to meet demonstrated needs, yet restrained to show credibility - is difficult to establish and maintain." (Louis H. Heilbron, *The College and University Trustee*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973)

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Are the board's review and approval of the budget carried out with sufficient care so that a defensible budget results? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Do you feel that the board has established credibility in its operating budget and capital fund requests by reasonably equating the necessity for programs with the availability of funds to support them? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Do the board and its individual members take an affirmative stand throughout the state's budget approval procedure? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Do you feel that the board fully accepts its responsibility for prudent fiscal management? | _____ | _____ |

Board/Chief Executive Relations Criterion 7

Trustees and the chief executive officer share at least one major characteristic: they have a total institutional perspective. The quality of the "working relationship" between the board and the executive officer is of critical importance to the effectiveness of each. While the board must take responsibility for basic policies and their consequences it must also give the chief executive the authority and flexibility to act decisively.

Selection of the chief executive officer is a major responsibility of the governing board. This selection should be preceded by a clear definition of his or her qualifications and expected accomplishments.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Is there a climate of mutual trust and support between the board and chief executive? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Have the board or some of its members counseled with the chief executive to provide guidelines or strengthen certain areas of performance? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Do you feel that the board has delegated to the chief executive the authority he or she needs to administer the institution successfully? | _____ | _____ |
| a. Is such authority set forth in a board policy document? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Is the executive's authority to act decisively in emergency situations clearly stipulated? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. If you were a trustee when the incumbent chief executive was selected: | | |
| a. were the selection procedures carefully planned and documented? | _____ | _____ |
| b. was there a prepared statement of specific duties, responsibilities, expectations? | _____ | _____ |
| c. were such constituencies as the faculty, administrators, students, alumni/ae consulted? | _____ | _____ |
| d. was there a specific list of perquisites (retirement plan, house, auto, etc.) in the terms of appointment? | _____ | _____ |

Board/Faculty Relations Criterion 8

In academic affairs a measure of the board's success is the nature of its relationship with the faculty. Most lay board members lack the professional expertise to legislate in this area, yet they share the burden of responsibility for the quality of the institution and for the manner in which the institution fulfills its academic goals. Therefore, the board must trust the professionals for advice, and delegate to them authority to carry out educational policies and procedures.

The line between governing policy and operating policy is not easily drawn but it must be established with reasonable clarity. The institution needs to be given academic direction, yet the faculty must be free to perform its professional work.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Does the board have effective means of two-way communication with the faculty? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Does the board, through the chief executive, seek the advice and recommendations of faculty leaders in formulating basic educational policies? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Do you feel that the board exercises authority over: | | |
| a. more aspects of educational affairs than it needs to? | | |
| b. fewer aspects of educational affairs than it should? | | |
| c. neither. Its participation in educational affairs is about right. | | |
| 4. Does the board delegate to the chief executive and faculty full responsibility for implementing educational policies? | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Has the board adopted adequate policies concerning: | | |
| a. grievance procedures? | _____ | _____ |
| b. processes for selection, promotion, retention, tenure? | _____ | _____ |
| c. standards for faculty performance? | _____ | _____ |

Criterion 9

Board/Student Relations

The board has ultimate responsibility to protect the welfare of students and to provide a healthy campus environment that is conducive to scholarship and personal development. The students' health and comfort are essential to learning. The students' freedom to learn independently is a basic tenet of academic freedom, and like other freedoms it must be exercised under the obligation to protect the welfare of the community as a whole. The board should have good lines of communication to and from students.

	Yes	No
1. Does the board have a satisfactory means for continuing two-way communication with students?	_____	_____
2. Has the board approved policies that make adequate provision for the students' health, welfare, and non-curricular (cultural, educational, recreational) activities?	_____	_____
3. Has the board set adequate policies for student appeal of perceived injustices (academic or other)?	_____	_____
4. Are students and student organizations free to examine and discuss questions or issues of interest to them and to express opinions publicly, so long as it is made clear that they speak only for themselves?	_____	_____

Criterion 10

Court of Appeal

Governing boards may be called upon to fulfill a quasi-judicial function in the settlement of disputes arising within the institutional community, though generally disputes should be settled at the lowest possible administrative level to avoid inappropriate board involvement in operational matters. The board should carefully develop due process policies and delegate authority.

	Yes	No
1. Has the board developed procedural due process or "fair hearing" requirements which delegate the management of conflict situations to the chief executive and to academic administrators or faculty leaders?	_____	_____
2. Are the disputes that have been brought to the board:		
a. accurately and concisely briefed for your study?	_____	_____
b. brought to the board before they have escalated to crisis proportions?	_____	_____
c. settled without unduly prolonged debate?	_____	_____
3. Do you feel that disputes have been settled with sympathetic understanding of the human and institutional issues involved?	_____	_____
4. Do you feel that the board has been called upon to adjudicate cases of conflict that should have been settled before they came to the board?	_____	_____

Criterion 11**Accountability and Autonomy**

Every university or college needs to reassure constituencies that it is doing what it is supposed to be doing. The institution is accountable for the quality of its educational product to those who pay for that product. It is held responsible for the prudent use of available fiscal resources. It may also be accountable for performance standards that have been made conditions of the direct or indirect acceptance of certain public funds. However, the call for accountability must not be allowed to become a demand for added control or for ill-advised intrusions on its internal affairs. Sound communication with the public and its agencies is essential. The institution must not only serve the public interest, it must be perceived as serving the public interest.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Do you feel that the institution as a whole has the confidence of people outside the institution—that they feel it is doing well those things that it can and should be doing? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Has the board or its representative established good working relationships with state offices and agencies, including state coordinating or planning commissions? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Does the board see to it that the institution takes advantage of all opportunities to inform the public and other interested parties about educational and scholarly attainments, administrative objectives and accomplishments, and evidences of how well funds have been utilized? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Has the board been willing to take a stand against unwarranted controls or other intrusions on the institution's internal affairs? | _____ | _____ |

tive as any he had participated in, thanks to the cooperation of the Chairman of the Board and the President and the many other representatives of the constituencies who were in contact with him during the process. He called attention to the list of people at the end of the report and pointed out that there were others who took advantage of the scheduled walk-in sessions and were not to be identified. He apologized for missing any who might be listed who, for one reason or another, may not have made the scheduled session, but noted that the list did give some insight into the types of conversations one might expect.

Dr. Munitz said that more time was spent on the Board of Control function than he might have expected. That turned out to be very useful and therefore there were a significant number of recommendations addressed to the organization and functioning of the Board. Many of them in turn rest directly on the performance, functioning and support of the President in the education of the Board. This function of educating the Board is probably as vital a role for the President as any he might have.

He called attention to the fact that the evaluation was at the initiative of the President and of the Chairman of the Board, and second, that the presidency of any educational institution at this time is a terribly complicated and demanding responsibility, and third, the process was to strengthen the role of the Board as much as it was to improve the performance of the President.

He indicated that he chose to present his report in this form of an annotated outline and he did not envision a 50 to 60 page document. He thought he could be most helpful, based upon his discussions with the constituents, by making recommendations for improving performance and removing areas of concern.

Dr. Munitz pointed out that Dr. Ryder had accomplished his original assignment from the Board, which was to improve legislative relationships, strengthen dormitories and their occupancy rate, and to enhance the physical plant.

People have a general confidence in the President as a person and good feelings for his honesty, candor, integrity and commitment. He noted that the prestige and image of the campus and the community have been changed for the better, even though much work remains to be done. Remarkably strong and optimistic alumni and student support of the faculty was found in the study, and Dr. Munitz said he consistently heard about the faculty's commitment to the classroom and students. As a result, he said, he is "optimistic about the potential for interaction between the faculty and Board and administration in the future."

Dr. Suchara asked Dr. Munitz if he would identify the populations or groups making up the constituents for the benefit of those not having copies of his report.

Dr. Munitz indicated that over the past half-year he had interviewed virtually all the principal members of the college administration, technical, service, clerical support, variety of groups of faculty, students, alumni, people in the community, staff and elected members of the state legislature. A broad spectrum of people were interviewed. Also several National Association people at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities were interviewed.

He indicated that he structured his interviews in relationship to the assessment material generated by the Board of Control at the outset of the process. Also, he felt there was a one-to-one match between the original assessment of where his time should be spent and his interview schedule.

There was great willingness on the part of the participants to either come by the campus or make themselves available, he said.

Recommendations to the Board of Control included changes in the governing Board procedures and by-laws, so they will contain more guidance for participating in institutional concerns as well as specific Board objectives.

Dr. Munitz felt that the Board is responsible for endorsing those policies which establish a general program statement for educational direction of the College. "If it does not know what the institution stands for and what it requires, and if those desires are not stated first to the chief executive officer, and then with and through him to the institution, there will be no stable basis for College progress, and no meaningful contacts for assessing the quality of institutional leadership," Dr. Munitz said.

He proposed a Board Planning Committee, supported by a President who drafts materials and analyzes options, to create the initiative for clarifying the College's mission.

He felt that each member of the Board must encourage public analysis of and response to basic policy issues. "They are ultimately responsible for the President, just as he is responsible to them. They have a right to expect timely information and firm decision-making; they must not and cannot be in a position of cajoling, or subtly hinting for that information or for those decisions," Dr. Munitz stated.

The Board must expect from the President a continuing clarification of his short- and long-run agenda for leading the institution, and a relatively specific timetable for accomplishing each major objective. When new areas of concern are raised, they must be followed up by the administration, and the results of such analysis must be presented at subsequent meetings and entered into the formal public minutes.

Dr. Munitz believes the the Board's operating procedures must encourage conversation directed toward institutional priorities and the quality of administrative

leadership. "Its responsibility is to test whether or not College objectives are appropriate, and then to test periodically the degree to which those objectives are met," he said. If this occurs, the President will be placed in a position to administer the institution within the basic planning and policy contacts approved by the Board. Indications of problems coming to individual Board members should be raised immediately with the President, privately at first, and at public Board meetings if the nature of the issues warrants such treatment. He feels it is not how the Board gathers or receives its information generally which becomes a problem for the College, but rather what is done with that information once it is brought to their attention.

Mrs. Saltzman called attention to the problems of Board members who, in casual conversations, hear of problems but find it difficult to respond for fear of undermining the President who is the Board's primary source of information. She was concerned, however, that the public may see the Board members as simply rubber stamping the decisions of the President.

Dr. Munitz indicated that Board members should not be in a position of responding to individuals by promising action or making a decision on the matter. However, the item should be taken up with the President and the Board has the right to a timely response by the President.

Dr. Munitz said the role of the Chairman is crucial in structuring the Board agenda, so that it provides a context for consideration of policy issues. "He or she cannot be exposed directly by people on the campus to conflicting institutional pressures...the Board and its Chairman must remain an ultimate recourse for appeal and revision of policy decisions. There are no longer circumstances at Saginaw Valley State College to justify an extraordinary involvement of the Board or any of

its members in the administration of the College," he affirmed.

Mr. Zahnow indicated that it had been pretty hard for some of the members of the Board who had been with the College from the very beginning.

Dr. Munitz indicated he was not concerned about the past, as much as the involvement which may have been required, but about what the Board will do in the future. If there is to be a valid test of the President's effectiveness, then he must be left to carry out his responsibilities without the extraordinary involvement of the Board.

He stated that the Board cannot be placed continuously in a position of mutual (i.e., flowing in both directions) suspicion or ambiguity. "The element of ambiguity will be avoided to the extent that the Board publicly debates policy alternatives and publicly provides direction to the administration for the implementation of policy decisions."

The President's leadership is crucial in educating and directing the Board, he said, and "he must not be in the position of constant reaction rather than initiative."

If the Board role is to set policy, Dr. Munitz said, "then it must articulate what it wants to know and it must periodically insure that its earlier requests have been met. The Board will be an effective buffer and filter system which enhances the institution's relationship with the outside world."

To play its policy role, the Board must get its information early, in a concise form, and with the background required for analysis. It must have procedures which assure effective establishment and understanding of priority goals. He proposed that the administration should present alternatives to the Board before responding to major policy issues, outlining the advantages and disadvantages of each, and then providing supporting material for its own recommendation.

Implications for the Board agenda were that materials should be prepared early, time must be set aside at meetings for the Board to discuss general strategy, to be updated on critical issues, and review the priority for institutional goals, and that Board meetings should not be so driven by the formal agenda that time is not allowed for ad hoc or emergency questions. The agenda should be established by the President and Chairman with at least one full week for study and informal exploration before the public meeting. Relevant reports from each standing committee should be included, or an informal discussion of committee deliberations undertaken close to the current meeting. "This depends on when committee meetings are scheduled. Some work must be done by committee, but the Board must know what's going on so it can test different models," Dr. Munitz felt.

Each principal committee should be supported by the administrator most responsible for that function and the primary role for each committee is education of the full Board. Dr. Munitz warned that the danger of committee organization is overspecialization and indicated he felt that a mechanism must be developed to bring committee material before the full Board.

Mrs. Arbury suggested then that mini-minutes should be kept and provided for the Board and the sub-committees. Dr. Munitz indicated that the respective Vice Presidents would be responsible for summarizing the basic points, comments and suggestions and provide them for the President and members of the Board prior to the Board meeting.

Dr. Munitz said the Board should consider bringing in an external consultant for a short time, possibly one day, to advise the President on the initial design of a planning and budgeting system. "If the planning process is working properly, the operating budget should flow from it. You should get the process established, people must participate, and this should be made the framework for budgeting and the planning

process. A long-range plan, and a budgeting process which includes cost benefit analysis for each program area, reduce the likelihood for crisis budget decisions and increase institutional stability when those decisions are inevitable. It should be like peeling an onion, so that the planning and priority-setting process will be organized much like the layers of an onion. Then if budget cuts are necessary, these should be like the outer layers and stripped away without confusion or indecision. A planning and priority-setting process will encourage the building of an informal general consensus within the academic community.

Dr. Suchara suggested that the Faculty Association request in relationship to reorganization of academic administration represents a good example of where a well-developed planning process would help in evaluation. She further concluded that she could now see the importance of making some decision today about the next steps to be taken regarding the matter...perhaps there will be an interim solution, which, based upon more extensive planning, would result in a permanent solution.

Mr. Curtiss referred to Dr. Munitz's recommendation for bringing in a consultant regarding the planning process and asked that he make suggestions as to the kinds of consultants or individuals who could assist the President in selecting the consultant.

Dr. Munitz indicated that he was not personally interested in the task but there were organizations particularly the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the Association of Governing Boards, of which SVSC is a member, which could be very helpful. While he considers the planning process and its implementation of major importance, the employment of a consultant to help begin the process was really a minor footnote to the recommendation. He felt that the involvement of the Board, administration, and faculty in drawing up the set of expectations for the role of the consultant would be the most fruitful approach.

Dr. Munitz also stated that there must be more people on the campus who serve as a candid sounding-board for the President and who can speak honestly with him about a variety of major policy issues. "SVSC needs a better faculty-administration-Board interaction. Too much separation exists now."

He indicated that in the process of unionization barriers have developed between the faculty and administration. However, there are some institutions where collegiality has been maintained and negotiations have been limited to primarily wages, hours and working conditions. It is important that the collegial relationship be pursued and that it be improved at SVSC.

An up-to-date and comprehensive policies and procedures manual is needed. Only those Board members committed and performing should be considered for renewal, and there should be a detailed orientation process for new Board members. Board members should have some place on campus where they could visit with the administration or other constituencies or simply read and rest while preparing for meetings. In addition, the President's office should provide to all Board members a weekly summary of media references to the College.

Under the President's leadership, the Board can be placed in a position of initiating and then monitoring implementation of basic policies. They will feel comfortable that basic policies and specific solutions are being analyzed and implemented in a timely and consistent fashion if they have the opportunity to review carefully their own agenda as well as the President's. Ultimately there must be evidence that the Board has clearly defined expectations from the office of the President, including the periodic review of an agenda, which was defined as the Munitz Presidential Evaluation Document discussed at the Board meeting. A timely response from the President plus satisfactory resolution of major problems raised

by any Board member are to become part of the normal Presidential evaluation process.

Dr. Suchara said that as the report is to focus now on recommendations for the President that she wanted to have it again pointed out that the President called for this evaluation at the time of his initial employment and, therefore, was willing to risk a thorough and comprehensive study of his performance. This obviously represents on his part and the Board's faith in the possibility of improvement.

While it may seem to the public that the college constituencies are at odds, it is because the focus is on areas where improvements can be made. She felt that a great deal had been achieved and that the functioning of the faculty, administration and Board was better now than before and will get better as a result of the report.

Recommendations to the President were that one of his prime responsibilities is as educator and organizer of the Board and that this flows in both directions. The President must provide an ongoing discussion of institutional priorities. He and his administrative team must demonstrate an understanding of budgetary processes, and provide for the administrators of the units below them a sense of meaningful control and authority over their fiscal operating responsibilities. This delegation must include a cost-benefit analysis of policy decisions made earlier by that administrative team. The Board, as well as everyone else, will have to accept budgetary limits, and understand that "trade-offs" are required in a constrained resource environment. "We all must understand that if there was a time that the goal was to do as much as possible as well as possible, that time is now past. We must make tough decisions as part of the planning process," Dr. Munitz emphasized. A service-

oriented business office, working with a vital planning and budgeting system, is to provide a framework for a meaningful establishment of priorities.

Dr. Munitz indicated that some Presidents are reluctant to make public planning decisions which might adversely effect certain program areas because of the assumption that faculty in those areas might view themselves as second-class citizens and leave the institution. He saw no such inclination among the faculty interviewed at SVSC and instead believed the faculty is seeking more definite decisions about the direction of the institution and its programs.

He noted that Board members should be provided with an Administrative Chart and the functions of the various roles. Mrs. Saltzman wanted to see the first box on the chart as the "Board of Control" since the Board has ultimate responsibility. Dr. Munitz agreed.

A legitimate flow of authority from the President to vice presidents is necessary, as well as public support and accountability from each vice president to the President.

The administrative team is a small group of people working with the President in a candid decision-making process which utilizes constant testing and positive confrontation of issues. The team must apply sophisticated and consistent criteria to policy alternatives, and options must be explored in an open setting, with a hearing provided for unpopular positions.

Mr. Curtiss differentiated between Board policies, which are the responsibility of the Board, and administrative policy and procedure, which is the responsibility of the administration, and useful in implementing Board policy. He did not want the administration tied up by Board policies that were so narrowly defined as to place unreasonable constraints on administrative implementation.

Each vice president must receive a balance of delegated authority which allows the establishment and review of priorities in each functional area. The team must operate in a "check and balance" environment, without a requirement of Presidential involvement in every detail.

The Academic Vice President and the President now have an urgent need to use the faculty as a creative resource instead of assuming an adversary relationship, now that the new contract has been signed. "The President can demonstrate a comfortable and confident relationship with members of the faculty, and respond to their concerns with the timely and publicly consistent replies, then they in turn can be asked to contribute positively to the College in an atmosphere of good faith and public trust."

He suggested that there may be oversensitivity to the "contract." While it may be easy for him to say it, he felt that mechanisms which in the long range would be to the benefit of the faculty, administration and the institution should not be discarded just because they might be interpreted as not fitting exactly within the contract.

In the area of public relations, the President is the ultimate representative of the institution, and sets a tone for key people in the community to exert an extra effort in building the financial and political support of the College. This external responsibility is harder to delegate and therefore requires more and more of the President's time. He must integrate the College into three local communities, but is not the sole individual who makes a difference in achieving community support. Several critical people inside and outside are required to provide cooperation and support so that political, financial and symbolic stability can be realized.

The question of academic organization should be studied under the guidance of

the Academic Vice President and ultimately presented as a recommendation from the President to the Board, regarding the most efficient means of organizing to support the academic enterprise. A rigorous and systematic appraisal system for all principal staff would demonstrate the President's commitment to quality education and efficient administration. A more attractive environment must be created for secretaries...68% of whom changed positions during the past year.

There must be symbolic and substantive commitment to separate attention for student affairs, Dr. Munitz said. He indicated there is some question about merging of student affairs and administrative affairs and that "further conversation" should take place between the President and Vice President Gilbert.

An Executive Assistant from the President's office should be responsible for organizing his own work and for distributing paper promptly and efficiently. This person should organize the President's calendar, insist that he stay away from detailed involvement in minor issues, facilitate the delegation process, and follow-up specific assignments so that the President is not held responsible for unavoidable delay. The right caliber person in this position could also serve crucial roles in relationships with external communities and in assisting the President's liaison/educational function with the Board. Dr. Munitz also indicated he discussed privately with President and Mrs. Ryder the role of the presidential family on campus, including social, professional, presidential residence, and family expectations. Dr. Munitz praised the President, Board, College administration, faculty and students for their cooperative and constructive input during the evaluation. He complimented both the Board and President for taking the "courageous step" of instituting the evaluation. "This administration has made many accomplishments and I am listing steps for improvement because of the optimistic feeling I have that a positive framework exists. It would

be impossible to say positive things unless these were built on other positive things. SVSC can build and pull together," Dr. Munitz concluded.

Mr. Curtiss questioned Dr. Munitz as to whom he felt this Evaluation Report should be available. Dr. Munitz replied that he wrote the report as a public document and he hoped it would be available to all those interviewed.

Dr. Ryder indicated after discussion that more copies would be produced and made available to the library and others involved or who cared to read it.

Mrs. Saltzman indicated that she had a sense of urgency about the report and that it should be an agenda for action. She thanked Dr. Munitz for the report, expressed appreciation to Dr. Ryder for having asked for the evaluation as part of his agreement to become President of SVSC and thanked Mr. Curtiss for providing the initiative to implement the evaluation under the direction of Dr. Munitz.

She said she had felt the Board of Control could do the job by itself, but in the middle of the process she was so glad to have an outside evaluator because he could provide an objective point of view...perhaps in the future, the Board could conduct an ongoing evaluation or progress report.

BM-524

Mrs. Saltzman moved that the Board of Control:

1. Accept Dr. Munitz's Report.
2. Adopt the Report's recommendations to the President and Board as formal agenda under Board responsibility.
3. Request a report from the President at the next Board meeting (and subsequent meetings, if needed) giving the progress status of each recommendation in the Evaluation Report and the general approach for implementation.

Mr. Kendall supported.

Ayes: Arbury, Curtiss, Darin, Gilmore, Kendall, Saltzman, Suchara, Zahnow

Motion unanimously carried.

Mr. Curtiss asked for any comments about the Report from those in attendance.

Dr. Whittaker indicated that he hadn't time to read the report and study it

and asked if the Board would be willing to open it for discussion at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Curtiss pointed out the subject would be one of ongoing discussion, but Dr. Munitz would not be back and thus, this would be the time to ask questions of him.

Dr. Munitz indicated that each time the report is discussed at a Board meeting people should have a chance to interact with it. If people should have further questions of him in the future, they should feel free to call.

Dr. Elashhab indicated that he was deeply impressed with Dr. Munitz's effort and asked if he envisioned that joint committees of the Board, administration and faculty would be in any way violative of the legal situation between the collective bargaining unit and the Board of Control.

Dr. Munitz suggested that he was not familiar with the contract nor a good enough lawyer to comment. His concern, he said, was that some opportunity be found for administration and faculty to talk together about the planning process and institutional priorities and that as recommendations shape up and they are presented to the Board that both those sides in turn have a chance to meet with the Board on that issue. The exchange of conversation, he said, would be far more important than the formal form for that exchange.

Mr. Curtiss suggested that the term "Task Force" might be used rather than a term drawn from the contract.

Dr. Willertz indicated that there were a lot of good things that could have been said about the Board that weren't in the report...speaking as one faculty member, he expressed the thought that the Board was doing a good job and that the faculty had confidence in the Board and enjoyed its past contacts.

Dr. Munitz clarified that he did not wish to be interpreted as being uniformly or even strongly critical of the Board of Control.

Dr. Robinson remarked that she had some deep concerns going into the evaluation but that in one form or another Dr. Munitz had taken them into account. The report seemed to be a valid reflection of the kinds of concerns that she had in mind.

Mr. Finney remarked that in the students' meeting with Dr. Munitz, students expressed concern about more or less the inability of the President to be available to students...furthermore, that the students expressed quite a bit of confidence in the President's staff, especially Dr. Gilbert, which was not included in the report. The students seemed a little concerned that their confidence was more in the staff than the President.

Dr. Munitz pointed out that he had addressed the question in several places in the report...one "the organization for student affairs." Also, since an individual evaluation of each of the President's staff members was not called for in his assignment, it was not in the report. He said, however, that he discussed questions of delegation and accessibility with the President and both he and the President were aware of the problems. The sum total of calls upon the President's time vastly exceeds the hours in the week. He expressed hope that there be substantial improvement.

Dr. Suchara asked that the Board reaffirm in discussion what it was doing in the action it had taken on the motion.

Mrs. Saltzman responded that (1) the report was accepted, not rejected, (2) that the recommendations represent a formal agenda for action, and (3) that the President at subsequent Board meetings give the Board a status report on progress

being made and information on how he planned to implement the recommendations. It was agreed all college publics must be involved in the implementation of the recommendations.

Mr. Curtiss suggested that each Board member bind their copy of the Evaluation Report and bring it to each Board meeting. While much of the burden will fall on the President's shoulders, he said, he will need the help of the Board's willing participation and clear evidence of the Board's desire to improve.

He commended Dr. Munitz for his efforts on behalf of the Board and indicated he was very pleased with the recommendations. They would, he said, not solve the problems but the spirit of the recommendations, if implemented, would move the institution giant strides forward. He invited Dr. Munitz to stay for the balance of the meeting, if he cared to.

Mr. Curtiss called a recess at 3:45 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Curtiss offered the floor to David Dutcher, a student who wanted to pose a question to Dr. Munitz.

Mr. Dutcher indicated that the report gave recommendations for getting the faculty, staff, administration and Board of Control together...he wondered where the students fitted in on the recommendations.

Dr. Munitz pointed out that when he used the word "constituencies" in the report he was referring to the students as one of the most important groups.

Mr. Dutcher said that he wanted to point out that he believed the administration had brought the students in...the Board of Control had shown it by having the President of Student Government sitting at the table...and further, that he had been a part of committees and he enjoyed it and felt that he had significant input into them.

Chairman Curtiss offered Dr. Ryder the opportunity to comment.

Dr. Ryder commended Dr. Munitz for the forthright, candid analysis in his Evaluation Report and called attention to the fact that Dr. Munitz's picture had appeared recently in "Change" magazine as one of the outstanding young men in higher education in the country. He observed that, based upon his experience with him, he clearly deserved that kind of distinction.

He indicated that the report and the conversations that he had with Dr. Munitz would be very helpful to him in serving as President of SVSC. He repeated the purpose as to look at how improvements can be made.

He pointed out that any president going into an institution asking for such an assessment, as he had done, ran the risk of finding that evaluation so negative that it clearly would give the Board an opportunity to say, "Well, we think we had better change things"...he was willing to take that risk and that was why he asked for it.

He observed that whether he was here as President, or not, that SVSC would move forward in a much better way as a result of having had the evaluation. He said that the evaluation would be important in the event a President left...the Board would be in a much better position to know what to look for and the new President would be in a much better position to know what the Board's expectations would be.

He clarified, suggesting that no one lives forever or necessarily stays in the same place forever and thus, the expenditure of funds for the evaluation had been worthwhile and would help the institution move forward in the future.

Dr. Ryder called attention to the tremendous resources in the SVSC faculty, administration and student body. He expressed the feeling that the SVSC student

body was the finest around. He indicated that it made him feel good that Dr. Munitz, who was an outside observer from a major institution, would reinforce his own view that the SVSC faculty was of very high quality.

He expressed the feeling that with the kind of resources available, and the opportunity for working together to mutually meet the needs of the people of the area and students throughout the state, SVSC was unique in the state.

He further indicated that the recommendations of the Munitz Report were a challenge to him, the Board of Control, the administration and the student body to move into the future in a very positive way. He assured the Board that he would present to the Board his suggestions and recommendations in the future to act upon the areas of weakness and thereby move the institution forward.

Mr. Curtiss suggested the Board move to further consideration of the SVSC Faculty Association statement read by Dr. Robinson and called upon Dr. Suchara for any further comments.

Dr. Suchara asked Dr. Munitz if he would care to comment.

Dr. Munitz suggested that perhaps the faculty and administration, working together, could bring a jointly acceptable recommendation to the Board...he was not talking about contract, but an interim decision which both the faculty and the administration could live with. He expressed the feeling that a permanent resolution on academic organization would follow decisions about where the institution was going and its priorities.

He indicated that while the interim decision was for the administration to make, it should be one fundamentally comfortable to the faculty until the planning process and the priority documents were in place allowing for a permanent longer-run organization decision. He said he was not hired to make that comment and it

might be worth in value as much as the Board had paid for it.

Dr. Suchara suggested that it was her understanding then that the faculty and administration would take on the task of considering organization through joint meetings and that a date of January 8 had been set for action.

Dr. Yien, in response, indicated that he did not have the benefit of the Munitz report when he initiated contact with the faculty on the question of academic administrative organization since it was started on November 6, 1978... because of Dr. Harmon's leaving he felt that perhaps it was the right time to re-evaluate the structure. He sent out a memorandum to the faculty after conferring with Dr. Ryder and requested a meeting on November 17. He held one other meeting with the faculty leadership on December 8 prior to the Board meeting.

He called attention to the prime recruiting season in late fall and the early part of the year and thus, the need to move expeditiously if staffing were to be completed successfully. If, he said, recruiting were put off much beyond February or March, a whole year might be written off.

Dr. Suchara responded that she was hearing that a certain risk was involved in delaying decisions on the organization. However, if as Dr. Munitz had suggested, this were to be a test case of faculty and administration working toward a resolution of the problem, it might be worth it.

Mr. Curtiss suggested there were two aspects to the problem...one was the need for a long-term solution which reflected institutional priorities resulting from completion of the first phase of the planning process...and an interim solution. He expressed the feeling that the faculty and administrative staff be encouraged to do everything they could between then and the January meeting to bring forth at least an interim solution, or more than one interim solution if they couldn't agree

on it. He wanted to see alternatives and have pro and con discussion on each and make some kind of decision, at least on an interim basis, in January.

Dr. Suchara expressed the thought that the date was unrealistic given the holiday period and the early January meeting of the Board and indicated that even a mid-January date might be unrealistic.

Mr. Curtiss indicated that he was not so concerned about the selection of personnel but rather some method to at least get over the hurdle until the planning process was clearly in place and beginning to produce results.

Mrs. Saltzman expressed the thought that the Board should not predict or try to anticipate the success of the groups in achieving the goal...perhaps they could. They knew it was urgent and the Board would hope they could bring it in by January.

Dr. Suchara questioned the reality of that expectation because of the holiday.

Mr. Curtiss recognized Dr. Robinson who called attention to the fact that final exams were in progress and that immediately following, the faculty would be away for Christmas...furthermore, that the faculty wouldn't even be into the new term by January 8 since it started on the 14th. She stated that she felt the faculty would feel extreme pressure to complete deliberations by January 8.

Mr. Zahnow indicated that he felt it was so important that the key people should be employed that not a day should go by in striving to resolve the problem.

Dr. Yien responded that after the meeting on December 8, he sent a memorandum to the faculty urging their participation in meetings...six meetings to be exact...to give further consideration to the matter. He further commented on the problems of going much longer than January in terms of competing for the best talent.

Mr. Kendall asked Dr. Yien what year he was referring to when he said if the decisions were delayed much longer the year would have to be written off.

Dr. Yien replied that he was talking about 1979-80.

After some discussion of the meeting process established by Dr. Yien, Dr. Suchara indicated that she would recommend that the faculty and the administration lose no days between now and some closure that would allow them at least one month...maybe to the February meeting of the Board.

Mr. Donald Novey agreed with Dr. Suchara that a formal structure by which the faculty could address the problem and submit and evaluate many different alternatives was indicated. He said it would seem the February date would be one which would give...even that would impose a lot of time constraints...sufficient time to achieve or at least fail in achieving the goal.

Dr. Suchara agreed and Mr. Curtiss indicated that if both the administration and the faculty should decide that it would take until March, it wouldn't bother him.

Mr. Kendall responded that if Dr. Yien's concerns were valid, some alternate plan would have to be developed to run the academic areas.

Mr. Saltzman suggested that the Board not be in the position of becoming involved in setting calendars for the meetings of the faculty and administration and that recommendations be made to the Board as soon as possible.

Dr. Ryder pointed out that in fact there was no recommendation from the administration before the Board...although it was hoped that a recommendation could be made, as a result of the faculty's concern for more time, no recommendation was submitted. He suggested, in response to the faculty concern over meeting the January 8 deadline, that it was possible for a special meeting of the Board to be called in mid-January...at least the Board should have an opportunity to mull over the options well ahead of the February meeting.

Mr. Curtiss took cognizance of consensus on Dr. Ryder's statement and expressed appreciation for the faculty's concern and willingness to work on the problem and indicated he hoped that it would continue to some solution.

2. Financial Aid Opportunities for Part-Time Students

Dr. Ryder recalled that at the last Board meeting a request had been made for a report on financial aid opportunities for part-time students and that Paul Gill, Director of Scholarships and Financial Aid, was invited to make a presentation on such aid for part-time students only...he requested that Board members not raise questions which might get into all the other ramifications of SVSC's financial aid...a full review of the total financial aid picture would be given at a later date. In the absence of Vice President Gilbert, Dr. Ryder called upon Mr. Gill for his report.

Mr. Gill distributed copies of his report entitled, "Financial Aid Recipients--Credit Hour Distribution--for Fall Semester 1978" (see Attachment) which he reviewed in depth.

It was pointed out by Mr. Gill that the definition of credit hours is made by SVSC in accordance with the Federal guidelines...and this definition is...full-time student--12 credit hours, three-quarter-time student--9 credit hours or more, half-time student--6 credit hours and that an undergraduate half-time student must carry a minimum of 6 credit hours in order to qualify for financial aid.

Mr. Gill noted the percentages of SVSC students receiving financial aid as follows: 85.6% full-time (or 12 credit hours or more), 6.2% three-quarter-time (9 credit hours or more), 4.1% half-time (6 credit hours), and 4.1% (less than 6 credit hours), and that according to his last analysis 49% to 51% of SVSC's students qualify for financial aid.

ATTACHMENT

VI. 2. Financial Aid Opportunities for Part-Time Students

FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS
CREDIT HOUR DISTRIBUTION
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1978

	Less Than Half Time 1-5	Half Time 6-8	Three Quarter Time 9-11	Full Time 12 & Over	Totals
<u>FEDERAL FUNDS:</u>					
Basic Educ. Opp. Grant	NA	9	20	295	324
College Work Study Prog.	NA	4	17	162	183
Law Enforcement Educa- tion Program	8	11	9	8	36
Nat. Direct Student Loan	NA	4	16	131	151
Nursing Program	NA	-	-	5	5
Supp. Educ. Opp. Grant	NA	3	12	132	147
					<u>846</u>
<u>STATE FUNDS:</u>					
Michigan Guaranteed Student Loan Program	NA	-	-	193*	193
Michigan Higher Educ. Asst. Authority Prog.	NA	NA	NA	111	111
					<u>304</u>
<u>GENERAL FUNDS:</u>					
Math Olympics	-	-	-	1	1
SVSC Athletic Asst.	-	-	1	83	84
SVSC Award for Excellence	-	1	1	24	26
SVSC Community College	-	1	-	5	6
SVSC Employee Dependent	21	9	8	12	40
SVSC Opp. Grant	-	1	5	57	63
SVSC Over Sixty	5	1	-	-	6
SVSC Residential Life	-	-	-	9	9
SVSC Tuition Grant	-	3	10	111	124
					<u>359</u>

FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS
CREDIT HOUR DISTRIBUTION
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1978

	Less Than Half Time 1-5	Half Time 6-8	Three Quarter Time 9-11	Full Time 12 & Over	Totals
Wickes Cardinal Schl.	-	-	-	10	10
Triskelion Merit Schl.	-	-	5	99	104
Lakehead Pipe Line Schl.	-	-	-	3	3
James B. Arnold Schl.	-	-	1	1	1
Hoern Grant	1	1	4	45	51
Miscellaneous	4	5	3	24	36
					<u>205</u>

PRIVATE RESTRICTED FUNDS:

Wickes Cardinal Schl.
Triskelion Merit Schl.
Lakehead Pipe Line Schl.
James B. Arnold Schl.
Hoern Grant
Miscellaneous

SPECIAL BILLINGS:

Dow Employee Program
Mid-Michigan Bi-
lingual Program
Saginaw Board of Educ.
Bilingual Program
SVSC Bilingual Prog.
Vocation Rehabilitation

17	6	NA	NA	23
3	5	3	1	12
4	9	3	4	20
8	4	1	7	20
5	4	4	7	<u>20</u>
				<u>95</u>

ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE &
UNDER FIN. AID REVIEW:

125*

125

DUPLICATED NUMBER

1,934

UNDULICATED NUMBER

1,215

* Estimated

TSG:dr
12/13/78

Dr. Ryder pointed out that slightly less than one-third of SVSC's students receive some kind of financial aid. Mr. Curtiss added that about one-third of them automatically weren't qualified because they were not taking enough hours.

Mr. Gill suggested that conceivably he would be touching bases with almost 80% of SVSC's students because of the Middle Income Assistance Act just passed by the Federal government...\$12.7 billion in student financial assistance basically available to the dependent students. He said that 80% of SVSC's students are dependent students with an average age of 19.2...the independent students' average age is 27.

Mr. Woodcock clarified that there is no question but that the half-time interpretation at SVSC (6 credit hours) was correct, because if the credit hours were reduced, the student would not be able to graduate in a reasonable period of time. He pointed out that the Federal government was not interested in paying somebody financial aid to take an equivalency of 8 years to complete a 4-year degree and pay twice what they would pay to somebody else in financial aid. SVSC is audited to make sure that the financial aid is in relationship to graduating in a reasonable period of time compared with the full-time student.

Dr. Gilbert noted that Mr. Woodcock was talking about Federal funds...SVSC did have an option on private funds.

Mr. Woodcock stated that the Federal situation was different from the private... in talking about new money coming through, that is Federal money...so it was important that they realize that the basis was not one that SVSC could adjust too much.

Too, Mr. Woodcock pointed out, in the late sixties and early seventies, financial aid money was given to the institutions which in turn picked the recipients. That has been changed, and under the Entitlement Program, the student, in effect,

carries with him a blank check, if he or she is eligible and has demonstrated financial need...it is the amount of the cost of the school that determines how much financial aid will be granted at a given institution.

The infusion of new Federal money...Middle Income Assistance Act...will basically aid those dependent students residing with their parents...the 80% Mr. Gill was talking about. The older students which SVSC is trying to reach, and mostly independent, taking less than 6 credit hours, might benefit only to the extent of a guaranteed loan if they previously may not have been eligible for it, but this new money will not help this particular type student in a direct grant or scholarship, Mr. Woodcock stressed.

Dr. Ryder added that a loan on this basis would be one where the student wouldn't have to pay the interest until completion of the college degree.

Dr. Ryder asked for clarification of a part-time student taking 6 credit hours with respect to financial assistance under BEOG and the time limitations for such assistance.

Mr. Gill advised that as long as the student were receiving financial aid as a part-time student, he could go for eight years...he has to monitor and recognize that the student is attending SVSC as a part-time or three-quarter-time student.

Mr. Curtiss noted that the principal reason he asked for this report was because he didn't know what aid was available to part-time students. He said he had read with interest the accounts last fall of the battle between increasing the maximum income for BEOG versus the tax credit, and he saw educational administrators across the country saying the tax credit approach was only for the rich and increasing the BEOGs from \$15,000 to \$26,000 was the best way to go. At the same time, he added, it struck him as almost ludicrous that these same administrators

were saying the big market was going to be in the part-time adult student, who is not eligible for this huge increase in funds which they had just seen approved.

So, Mr. Curtiss continued, he was wondering if there would be any merit in somebody taking a look at a tax credit for the part-time student up to a maximum of \$50...some kind of a program like that. He indicated he understood the tax credits were coming back, or at least he had read that they were likely to come back in the next session. He stressed that they need not apply only to the rich... they could be a very modest inducement for the adult student they have been viewing as a major increasing segment of the higher education market...the position they had taken on where the markets were going to be versus where the money ought to go were not necessarily consistent. He concluded that he didn't think they could resolve that one there today...he just threw it out as his thinking behind having asked for the report.

Dr. Ryder pointed out that what had been considered for a tax credit was 25% of the cost which would have enhanced the private institutions. Mr. Curtiss noted that the last version he had seen of it, it was up to \$500 which was fairly significant...he was saying, "let's take a look at what we are going to use the tax credit for...which could be the only form of assistance available to most of the adult, part-time students, where higher education in general was saying that's where its market rests." He reiterated they were not going to resolve this issue today...he wanted the information so that he could give it some more thought, and he hadn't been able to think about it enough to build a supportable position.

Dr. Ryder indicated he thought what Mr. Curtiss was saying was that in one way or another, they needed to be addressing the part-time student in this society in providing assistance...he agreed with that.

Mr. Curtiss concurred but emphasized he was not suggesting that SVSC's BEOG standards change...he thought they just ought to think about addressing the adult, part-time student as time progressed. He concluded that he could read articles with a little bit better background now.

Chairman Curtiss and President Ryder thanked Mr. Gill for his presentation.

3. Off-Campus Continuing Education Policy

Dr. Ryder suggested that discussion of this item be postponed because of lack of time.

Chairman Curtiss noted the receipt of "SVSC Continuing Education Service Statement of Policies" in the Board packet and indicated he would like to comment on it briefly. This, he said, was a good example of the subject they had been talking about earlier under the Evaluation...to him, what Dr. Ryder mailed, was primarily an administrative policy...that kind of policy should not be adopted at the Board level.

He suggested there was another area of investigation the Board should probably be addressing itself to...to determine whether or not there were some broad standards for where and when SVSC established off-campus programs of any consequence...what it was going to say about the quality of the program...as a very broad policy...he didn't see that in the packet and he didn't think they ought to try to develop it there at the meeting.

Dr. Ryder indicated there were just a few lines on the first page of the "Statement of Policies" that would really be Board policy...beyond that it was administrative policy. He concluded that what Mr. Curtiss was suggesting, or ought to be suggesting, was that administration develop a Board policy recommendation and submit it for consideration. Mr. Curtiss noted he would agree with that.

4. Sponsored Programs

Dr. Ryder distributed copies of the October and November 1978 Activity Report from the Office of Sponsored Programs. He asked Board members to take a moment and skim over the report and if there were questions, Cy Smith was present and could answer them. No questions were asked. Mr. Smith noted there was nothing unusual about this report.

5. NCA Accreditation

President Ryder announced that the North Central Accreditation Team, chaired by Dr. Rudolph W. Schulz, Dean for Advanced Studies of the Graduate College of the University of Iowa, would be at SVSC on April 18 through 20. He indicated he would send Board members a list of the team members.

6. Personnel Report

Dr. Ryder distributed copies of the December 13, 1978 Personnel Report as a matter of information to the Board.

7. SVSC's Cross Country Team

Copies of a proposed resolution regarding the Cross Country Team were distributed by Dr. Ryder who noted that for the second year in a row, SVSC's Cross Country Team had come in second in the nation and that two of its runners... Bob Bostater and Duane Johnson, had been designated as All-Americans...Dr. Hansen had done an exceptional job in bringing the runners up to this point. He added that if the Board members were to drive up and down the highways around SVSC, even in weather like that today, they would see the runners out, and would understand why they were doing so well. He recommended that the resolution be offered and adopted.

Mrs. Darin, noting that Dr. Ryder said this was national competition, asked

how many schools competed. Mr. Curtiss indicated there were about 650. Mrs. Darin indicated she was just amazed that SVSC, as a small school, had this fantastic accomplishment...it was usually the big name schools they heard about in athletic endeavors.

RES-402 Mr. Kendall offered the following resolution for adoption:
WHEREAS, Saginaw Valley State College's Cross Country Team has brought honor to the school by finishing second in the nation in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) Cross Country competition, and
WHEREAS, Cross Country runners Rob Bostater and Duane Johnson have received All-American honors for their achievements in competition from the NAIA;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board of Control of Saginaw Valley State College commends and congratulates these young men for their achievements, and the Cross Country Team and its coach, Dr. Douglas Hansen, for its very successful season of 1978.
Mrs. Darin supported.

Ayes: Arbury, Curtiss, Darin, Gilmore, Kendall, Saltzman, Suchara, Zahnow

Resolution unanimously adopted.

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chairman Curtiss declared that no committees had met since the November meeting and there were no reports to be made.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Board Communication to Dr. Munitz

Dr. Suchara recommended that the Board send some kind of a communication to Dr. Munitz commending him for the job he did...focusing on the process. Mr. Curtiss indicated he would do so.

2. Conflict of Interest

Mr. Curtiss recalled that last month they had had a very brief discussion on the development of a "Conflict of Interest" policy which he didn't think was

mentioned in the November Minutes. He said he would like to mention once again that the matter was something the Board should be addressing...he had some further information presented since last month and he just wanted the Board members to keep in mind that it needed addressing...he was not setting a time deadline, but felt it was important that it be done both from an internal point of view as well as in regard to some external constituencies.

He added that he was not referring solely to the subject "Conflict of Interest" Bill now in the House, to which Board members were referred to as state officers, but he was talking about an internal "Conflict of Interest" policy of some sort. He noted that he had an example of one from Eastern Michigan University and another in one of this year's Management letters. There were two levels...internal operation conflict of interest...conflict of interest for state officers. He concluded that this was a subject they should not just let go.

Dr. Ryder advised that he had learned that morning that the Bill which is in, and about which some people have been very concerned, would not be passed this session and would be, according to the sponsors of the Bill, and even the Speaker of the House, brought up early in the next session.

Dr. Suchara asked Mr. Curtiss if the conflict of interest affected her in any way. Mr. Curtiss responded that it could affect her, in two different cases covered by three Bills, as well as by some proposed Amendments which he had already objected to, and that he would be glad to discuss with her at a convenient time.

3. Basketball Schedules

Dr. Gilmore asked if anybody knew anything about the Basketball Schedules... were any available.

Mr. Kendall suggested that Mr. Rummel should be able to provide.

Mr. Rummel advised he would provide copies.

Mr. Curtiss asked that his name be added to the list...he had mentioned it on several occasions in recent weeks and was still waiting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to transact, Chairman Curtiss declared the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles B. Curtiss--Chairman

Dorothy D. Arbury--Secretary

JMR
omc

Opal M. Colvin

Opal M. Colvin--Recording Secretary