

SAGINAW VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

BOARD OF CONTROL

MINUTES

JANUARY 11, 1982

INDEX OF ACTIONS

PAGE

RES-532	RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A CONTRIBUTION ESTIMATED AT \$238,125 FROM THE CHARLES J. STROSACKER FOUNDATION <u>APPROVED</u>	9
RES-533	RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 1981-82 HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE BUDGET AND AUTHORIZING CAPITAL EXPENDITURES <u>APPROVED</u>	12
	RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD TO NEGOTIATE AND APPROVE AN AGREEMENT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF APARTMENTS ON CAMPUS <u>WITHDRAWN BY DR. RYDER</u>	17
BM-616	AFFIRMED THE POSITION TAKEN BY THE SVSC ADMINISTRATION WITH REGARD TO PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT OFFICERS BEARING ARMS <u>APPROVED</u>	21
BM-617	RECOMMENDATION FOR THE REAFFIRMATION OF THE COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT AS ADOPTED 3/12/79 <u>APPROVED</u>	27

BOARD OF CONTROL
SAGINAW VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
Pioneer Room--Pioneer Hall of Engineering and Technology
January 11, 1982

Present: Arbury
Braun
Curtiss
Darin
Gilmore
Kendall

Others

Present: Colvin
Dickey
Gilbert
Hamling
Lange
Lee
Maxwell
Rayfield
Rummel
Rybkowski
Ryder
Sharp
Tepe
Woodcock
Yien
Press (2)

Absent: Saltzman, excused
Williams, "

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kendall gaveled the meeting to order at 9:50 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present.

II. PROCEDURAL ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes of Regular Monthly Meeting held on December 14, 1981

Chairman Kendall stated that the Minutes of the last Regular Monthly Meeting held on December 14, 1981 were mailed. He asked if there were any corrections or

additions. Mrs. Arbury, referring to Item No. 8. "Recommendation for the Appointment of a Board Member to the SVSC Foundation Replacing Dr. Melvin J. Zahnow" on Page 7, noted that the information was there, but that the thrust of her remarks was wrong. Someone reading the Minutes, she said, might think that she didn't want to see anyone from the Detroit area on the Foundation...quite the contrary, it was just that they were trying to accommodate the Detroit area people...it was a great inconvenience for them to drive up for one meeting that started at 3:30 p.m. and maybe didn't conclude until 6:00 or 6:30 p.m. She recalled that Jo Saltzman had been on the Foundation and had given it a good try, but it was just a bit too much to ask of the Detroit area Board members. She noted she just wanted to change the thrust in the sentence "Mrs. Arbury felt that it was important to have someone from the Valley area represented from the Board." Any Board member, she stressed, would be acceptable. She asked if that sentence couldn't be changed.

Mr. Curtiss suggested changing the word "important" to "convenient" which would clarify the sentence. Discussion revealed this change would be acceptable to all of the Board members and that it satisfied Mrs. Arbury's concern about misinterpretation of her remarks.

Mr. Kendall asked if there were any further corrections or additions and Dr. Ryder pointed out that Item 11. "Recommendation for Approval of a Change in the April 30, 1982 Regular Board Meeting Date to May 7, 1982" on Page 8, should be identified as BM-615 instead of RES-532 and should read as follows:

BM-615 It was moved and supported that the Regular Board Meeting scheduled for April 30, 1982 be changed to May 7, 1982.

Mr. Kendall asked if there were any other corrections or additions. Hearing none, he declared the Minutes approved as corrected.

2. Official Representative of Faculty Association

Chairman Kendall called for the official representative of the SVSC Faculty Association. Dr. Ryder advised there was no representative present.

3. Communications and Requests to Appear before the Board

Chairman Kendall asked if there were any communications or requests to appear before the Board. Dr. Ryder indicated there were none.

4. Remarks by the President

Dr. Ryder stated that he wanted to comment about two things.

A. Student Aid Support at the Federal Level

Dr. Ryder recalled that the last budget was decreased slightly with respect to overall Federal aid in certain categories and noted that there was information available, which apparently was not official at the moment, with respect to a recommendation that the Reagan administration was making to cut back even more within the existing year, and for 1983 to have very substantial cut-backs for student aid.

In his judgment, Dr. Ryder stressed, in terms of the national interest, higher education should be taking a very high place, along with defense. In fact, he would say that this was a cornerstone to defense of the country, along with weapons. While there had been abuses, he noted, particularly in the area of Guaranteed Student Loans, and that there was no doubt about it that that situation should be corrected, the reduction of BEOG, or so-called PELL grants, it seemed to him, was going to strike at the heart of providing higher education to the people of this country, and particularly those who couldn't afford to pay the cost. It appeared to him that at the national level they were moving in the direction of higher education for those who could already afford it.

Dr. Ryder concluded that students were caught in the middle of reduced Federal aid, State aid and an economy in Michigan particularly where they were finding it more and more difficult to find jobs, and with that kind of an environment, he observed, there was a need for this situation to be addressed...they needed to communicate with their legislators not only at the national level particularly, but even at the state level as well, in terms of setting priorities as to how they spent their money. He indicated he would be communicating with the members of the Board in more detail about this, and hopefully they would consider taking whatever actions they felt were necessary in this connection.

He asked if there were any comments. Chairman Kendall commented that when they de-emphasized education in peace time and emphasized bullets or defense, as Dr. Ryder had said, they all had a very greivous problem...how they resolved it between the State and Federal level, he said, it was going to take everybody in the nation to do something.

Dr. Gilmore indicated that he would hope that the term "defense spending" had a broader sense to it than just the manufacture of ammunition...it involved administration development, technical development, etc.

Dr. Ryder responded that it did, and some of that would relate to education...there was no doubt about that. He noted that he didn't look at a strong national defense and education as opponents or antithetical at all...it seemed to him that they had to look at other places...they had to maintain a strong defense for the nation, but they could always debate how that was to be done...where they had to spend the money, but he believed these two things together were critical... both of them being critical to the long-term security of this nation, because they were in an economic war and were not doing very well, and education was going to be

the keystone to competing in the economic war.

Dr. Gilmore suggested they could move to Venezuela...he never saw so much money in all his life.

Dr. Ryder indicated he didn't know about that, but observed that if Michigan were to "hit it big" in the oil industry, as Alaska had, and where there was a lot of money and little taxation, they would still have to look at the whole country...they couldn't just say "well, here is a rich state and that's great" and not care about the rest of the country, so he thought that was the important thing, with the tremendous unemployment they had in this state, it really concerned him that they were not doing more in the area of education, even at the national level.

B. Comments to the Media made by Representative William R. Bryant

Last week, Dr. Ryder said, Representative William R. Bryant of Grosse Pointe, met with newspaper reporters and made comments about the revenue problems in the State of Michigan and discussed the idea that perhaps they should eliminate one or two, or more of the institutions of higher education in this state, and that really the only ones that should be sacrosanct from consideration for elimination would be the Big Three...Wayne State, Michigan State and the University of Michigan.

As he had said on other occasions, Dr. Ryder observed, he felt personally that this was an irresponsible kind of comment. If that was what they would like to do, they ought to get the Governor and the legislators together in a room and talk about what the real problem was and the strategy should be in terms of meeting that objective of reducing expenditures in the state. Then, he said, if they should decide together that that should be done, they ought to have joint action to do it...politically whether or not they could do it was another question.

In any event, Dr. Ryder stressed, this kind of throwing out comments occasionally sort of created fear in the minds of people around the state, and certainly in the minds of students, and from his point of view, how they could expect people to continue to contribute through the private sector to institutions of higher education where state legislators were saying "well, maybe we should be doing away with them." He didn't identify SVSC per se, other than just as a block of institutions, Dr. Ryder noted, and he might make a case of "well, maybe SVSC should be here as opposed to another institution." However, from his point of view, all of Michigan's state colleges and universities were really essential to it's economic recovery. How many industries, Dr. Ryder asked, were going to come into this state where their work force...and he was talking about high technology development now, wouldn't have readily accessible higher education available to them. Even if Michigan were to develop its own industry and business within, it was going to take people with imagination, foresight, encouragement and education, particularly at the higher education level, to develop the kind of business and industry they were going to need to compete throughout the world.

This was the sort of thing the legislators ought to be saying publicly, Dr. Ryder concluded...he said so and the Saginaw News printed it. He distributed a copy of the article in the Saginaw News on Friday, January 8, 1982 and indicated he wanted to reinforce that position right now.

Mr. Braun stated that on that point he would like to add that he was in complete concurrence with Dr. Ryder's remarks as quoted in the paper...he thought the term "irresponsible" for that sort of a legislative statement was the correct term. Also, he said, he would echo Dr. Ryder's concern that that kind of statement not only had a devastating potential effect on students and faculty, but also

on potential benefactors...he had had actual personal experience with potential benefactors who had said "I am considering making some sort of a gift, either a testamentary gift or a present gift to this institution...is it going to be around in five years?" Fortunately in those cases, he said, he had been able to satisfy those people that they were, but he thought it was that kind of a statement which he believed was made in a wholly political context, that deserved the term "irresponsible."

Mrs. Arbury added that Representative Bryant was an irresponsible legislator and had a history of being so.

Dr. Ryder observed that there was one other thing that he should say, and that was...it seemed to him illogical to talk about closing state institutions which were in existence and made available to the total public, whether rich or poor if they had the resources to attend, because they still had to pay the tuition. But how the State of Michigan could spend \$37 million in support of private higher education in this state, and talk about closing the state institutions, he didn't know.

In the past, Dr. Ryder said, he had been one who had supported modest support for the private institutions. Why? Because it was important to continue to have the proliferation of institutions...private and public...in terms of a strong educational program in this state, but, when the state could not support its public institutions, it ought to say "well, I am sorry, but the State of Michigan cannot really provide additionally to the private institutions." On the other hand, he concluded, if resources were available, or if the State set its priorities in such a way as to provide reasonable support to the public institutions, then he would support some modest support of the private institutions for this reason.

Dr. Gilmore asked if there had been any rebuttal to Representative Bryant's statement.

Mr. Braun noted that it was quoted in the press that there were several people who spoke out against it.

Dr. Ryder agreed and stated that Gary Owens, who was a Democrat, and who was the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the House, took issue with the statement strongly. Also Mike Busch, who was a Republican, took issue with it, and then the press went to Fred Whims in the Governor's office who said the Governor had no plans for closing any of the institutions of higher education in the state. He said that there might be cutbacks in terms of level of support, and trimming of programs, and all that sort of thing, but they did not anticipate closing any institutions.

Chairman Kendall observed that looking at the way this subject kept cropping up, perhaps they should be lobbying the Governor to make some kind of a positive public statement to try to "put that issue to bed" to stop it...maybe they should give it some consideration.

Dr. Ryder indicated this was a good point...he recalled the Governor had made a statement at Mackinaw and also at Grand Valley, each of which were along that line. The question was about Grand Valley and the Governor said that Grand Valley was not going to be closed and he made a direct statement like that...so he didn't see that what Chairman Kendall was suggesting was inconsistent with the Governor's views at all. Also, Dr. Ryder concluded, the Governor had made that sort of statement to the presidents of state colleges and universities when meeting with them.

This, Dr. Ryder concluded, was all that he had to say with respect to "Remarks by the President."

III. ACTION ITEMS

5. Recommendation for Approval of a Resolution Accepting a Contribution Estimated at \$238,125 from the Charles J. Strosacker Foundation

Chairman Kendall noted that this proposed resolution was included in Board packets and asked if someone would care to move its adoption.

RES-532 It was moved and supported that the following resolution be adopted:
WHEREAS, On October 26, 1981 the Charles J. Strosacker Foundation contributed 10,000 shares of common stock in The Dow Chemical Company with a value of \$238,125.00, and
WHEREAS, This gift is to establish an endowment for Pioneer Hall of Engineering and Technology "to help maintain the building and to help insure its continued aesthetic and functional properties," and
WHEREAS, "Only the income from the endowment shall be used, as long as Pioneer Hall is used or for ten years, whichever occurs first. Thereafter the endowment principal may be used for major renovation or other similar purposes." and
WHEREAS, The Charles J. Strosacker Foundation was a major contributor to the construction of Pioneer Hall of Engineering and Technology;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board of Control of Saginaw Valley State College accept this gift subject to the conditions and purposes stated above and express its appreciation to the trustees of the Charles J. Strosacker Foundation for their continued generosity to this college.

Chairman Kendall asked if there were any discussion.

President Ryder called upon Dr. A. Jefferson Sharp to review.

Dr. Sharp stated that the action called for in this resolution was a contrast to the preceding discussion...the Charles J. Strosacker Foundation had had a generous history of philanthropies so far as this college was concerned, going back to the '65 fund drive to start the institution...the Forward '71 project...the Academy of Applied Philosophy...and to the construction of Pioneer Hall of Engineering and Technology.

Dr. Sharp pointed out Dr. Strosacker's picture, which was the second from the left on the east wall, and noted that this building was dedicated to distinguished

contributors to American technology, and certainly Dr. Strosacker was a distinguished scientist with The Dow Chemical Company and was a remarkable man in terms of his own achievements and his philanthropic activities.

Dr. Sharp observed it was quite appropriate that the Strosacker Foundation took the leadership in creating the first building endowment on SVSC's campus and then reviewed the entire resolution, concluding that it meant there would be somewhere between \$15,000 to \$18,000 in earnings on the endowment available annually for the stated purpose in the resolution.

Dr. Gilmore quoted from the second paragraph "to help maintain the building and help insure its continued aesthetic and functional properties" and asked for clarification.

Dr. Sharp responded that this was quoted from the letter of transfer from the Strosacker Foundation. Dr. Ryder added that it specifically excluded normal housekeeping, such as custodial work, but it would include, for example, landscaping around the buildings, repair of any structural defects, heating system, and things of that sort.

Dr. Gilmore then asked if there would be a planning process...would they look each year for a way to spend the earnings from this endowment...or could the earnings accumulate for a new roof, for example, if it were needed.

Dr. Ryder indicated they wouldn't have to spend the money each year and thus, could set aside the endowment earnings for a future need.

Mr. Kendall observed that they might see a larger project coming down the road next year for which they might need \$30,000...so they could use two year's earnings for that project. He concluded there didn't need to be a goal to spend the earnings each year.

Dr. Gilmore stressed that the administration should keep in mind that SVSC seemingly always had some big things come along which called for crisis spending for replacements or repairs.

Dr. Ryder indicated that the administration certainly would keep that in mind. He pointed out that one thing SVSC did have coming up for Pioneer Hall of Engineering and Technology...the question of whether it should modify the heating system so that either gas or oil could be used. Right now, he said, only oil could be used. If they could switch from oil to gas, or gas to oil, it would give flexibility which wasn't possible when Pioneer Hall was built.

He pointed out that at the time Pioneer Hall was built, SVSC was not allocated to use gas at all, and theoretically, at the time, it would never be using gas again for heating such a building because gas was to be used for residential. There were limited gas resources then, but things had certainly changed.

Dr. Gilmore recalled a luncheon meeting Dr. Gilbert and he had had with Charlie Brown of Consumers Power Company, a couple of years ago, when they were trying to get assurance from him that SVSC wouldn't be taken off of their customer list...SVSC was restricted at the time as to what was being furnished in the way of natural gas, and Consumers was not selling as they did then.

Dr. Ryder agreed and indicated that they could buy more now from Algeria.

Chairman Kendall asked if there were any further discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

Motion unanimously carried to adopt RES-532 accepting the Strosacker Foundation's contribution of 10,000 shares of common stock in The Dow Chemical Company with a value of \$238,125.00 subject to the conditions and purposes stated, and that the administration, on behalf of the Board of Control, express its appreciation to the Strosacker Foundation.

6. Recommendation for Approval of Resolution Approving the 1981-82
Housing and Food Service Budget and Authorizing Capital Expenditures

Chairman Kendall stated that this resolution had been included in Board packets and asked if anyone would care to move its adoption.

RES-533 It was moved and supported that the following resolution
be adopted:

WHEREAS, Sufficient information regarding occupancy rates,
anticipated revenues and anticipated expenditures is known;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the attached Housing
and Food Services budget be adopted for the 1981-82 fiscal
year, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Administration is author-
ized to make capital expenditures as considered appropriate
from the Repair and Equipment Reserve with the understanding
that a minimum of \$25,000 is to be retained in that Reserve
Account as of June 30, 1982.

Mr. Kendall asked if there were any discussion.

President Ryder called upon Mr. Woodcock to review.

Mr. Woodcock observed that the process was one that when the Board and Room rates were approved for the upcoming year, that a pro forma financial statement was put together. Once the year actually began, he said, they then developed the actual operating budget for that year...this had been done and had been reviewed during November and December by the Business, Finance and Investments subcommittee and was now being brought to the full Board of Control for official approval.

He reviewed the Housing and Food Services Operating Budget for 1981-82 in depth and called attention to one change...SVSC was now establishing a Repair and Equipment Reserve from which it would be making certain types of capital expenditures directly, rather than from operations. This, he stressed, would put SVSC in a better light as far as reporting entities which it did in its financial statement...this was one of the purposes of the Reserve account and as established in the initial indenture dealings.

SAGINAW VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICES
OPERATING BUDGET
1981-82

	80-81 BUDGET	80-81 ACTUAL	81-82 BUDGET
Design Capacity	496	496*	496*
Adjusted Design Capacity	487*	487	486
Average Occupancy	462	481	452
Rate - 21 Meal Plan	1934	1934	2126
Increased Amount	175	175	192
Percent of Increase	10%	10%	9.9%

Revenue:

From Operations (Net)	\$163,403	\$188,051.18	\$124,040
Interest Income	15,000	35,309.24	25,000
Debt Service Grant	<u>10,002</u>	<u>10,002.00</u>	<u>10,002</u>
Amount Available	188,405	233,362.42	159,042
Less Debt Service Required Payment	<u>(110,975)</u>	<u>(110,975.00)</u>	<u>(112,815)</u>
	<u>\$ 77,430</u>	<u>\$122,387.42</u>	\$ 46,227
Indirect Cost Recovery Study-Estimate			(5,000)
Unidentified expenditure savings or additional revenue sources			<u>13,773</u>
Contribution toward required reserves			<u>\$ 55,000</u>

*9 spaces utilized for staff single rooms, 1 for handicap.

JAW:pkz
12/18/81

Mr. Woodcock pointed out that SVSC had done a lot to upgrade the dorms and their furnishings, while at the same time maintaining the integrity with the bond holders.

Mr. Curtiss questioned what fuel was used to heat the dorms...gas or oil, and when advised that it was gas, he observed that on a long-term basis, it seemed quite likely that natural gas would be two and a half to three times its current price by 1986, and since SVSC didn't have the flexibility to change fuel, it ought to be continually looking for ways to make those dorms more fuel-efficient...he had said this before...he really thought it was important, and urged the administration to start planning and not ignore the need to effect energy savings.

Mr. Woodcock advised that that was to be a topic for discussion at the Business, Finance and Investments subcommittee meeting in the afternoon...the college engineer would be present to discuss the issue.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Kendall called for a vote.

Motion unanimously carried to adopt RES-533 approving the 1981-82 Housing and Food Service Budget and authorizing Capital Expenditures.

7. Recommendation for Approval of a Resolution Authorizing a Special Committee of the Board to Negotiate and Approve an Agreement for the Construction of Apartments on Campus

Chairman Kendall noted that the Board members had received material earlier regarding this Agenda item from Dr. Gilbert in a separate mailing from the Board packets.

Dr. Ryder indicated that there was no resolution...if action were taken, a motion would be required. He noted that the Special Committee of the Board consisted of Mr. Braun, Mr. Curtiss and Dr. Gilmore. He referred to the letter from William C. Collins, SVSC's counsel, to B. J. Humphreys, counsel for the

architects, covering the December 15, 1981 meeting, which had been mailed (see Attachment), and noted that it set forth the provisions which were going to be involved, and that SVSC was still waiting for the corporation to come together with its financing, etc.

Dr. Ryder indicated he was asking for action by the Board at this time, since it did not have a regular Board meeting until March, and if the corporation were to complete its financing arrangements, the administration would need to be able to take action as quickly as possible so the apartments would be up by next fall...even a three week delay would be more than they should let occur.

Considerable discussion ensued. Mrs. Darin expressed her concern over the rental rate of \$350-\$400 a month, which might be too much for a married student couple. She indicated perhaps four students as a group might rent the apartments instead of living in the dorms.

Dr. Ryder indicated that as far as married couples were concerned, that was what they were paying now basically in the surrounding area, but at SVSC, they would have the convenience of being close to the college and they could get along with one car as opposed to two...if one of them worked, and the other could ride a bike or walk, which was an advantage.

Also, Dr. Ryder said, originally they were looking at apartments having 1,000 square feet, but now they were considering apartments having 650 up to 1,000 square feet...there could be differences in apartment sizes, or they might be only 800 square feet. Reduction in square footage, he stressed, would reduce the price, and the price was something that SVSC was very concerned about...SVSC had to be completely satisfied that the price was going to be reasonable for the married couple as opposed to a group of students occupying them.

ATTACHMENT

III. 7. Recommendation for Approval of a Resolution Authorizing a Special Committee of the Board to Negotiate and Approve an Agreement for the Construction of Apartments on Campus CURRIE, KENDALL, KEITH, LARKIN, POMMERVILLE AND MERRILL, P.C.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

POST OFFICE BOX 1848

MIDLAND, MICHIGAN 48640

GILBERT A. CURRIE
1882-1960

GILBERT A. CURRIE
JAMES A. KENDALL
DANIELLE M. KEITH
JEFFREY B. LARKIN
ROBERT W. POMMERVILLE
WILLIAM H. MERRILL

WILLIAM C. COLLINS
THOMAS L. LUDINGTON
WILLIAM D. SCHUETTE

TELEPHONE
517/839-0300

RECEIVED
JAN 4 1982
December 21, 1981
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS

Correction Copy

Reviewed by
✓ R. Haines
✓ J. Woodcock
✓ J. Ryder

6024 EASTMAN ROAD
AT HARCREST DRIVE

✓ E. Gilbert
✓ T. Braun
✓ C. Curtiss

Mr. B. J. Humphreys

Lamson, Humphreys, Snide and Clarke, P.C.
502 First Savings & Loan Building
Saginaw, MI 48607

Re: Student/Faculty Housing Lease Agreement

Dear Mr. Humphreys:

Both you and I attended a meeting held at Saginaw Valley State College ("SVSC") on Tuesday, December 15, 1981, between representatives of SVSC and your clients. Present at that meeting, in addition to ourselves, were Mr. Guy Wegener and Mr. Marvin Brandel, whom you represent, and Dr. Jack Ryder, Dr. Emerson Gilbert, Ted Braun, Charles Curtiss, Robert Haines and Jerry Woodcock of SVSC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed lease of certain parcels of real property owned by SVSC to your clients for the construction of housing units. Although the general terms of the transaction are outlined in a Letter of Intent dated March 2, 1981, signed by Dr. Gilbert and Dr. Ryder on behalf of SVSC and by Mr. Guy Wegener, on behalf of The Design Collaborative, Architects, Inc., it was deemed desirable by all concerned to review the contents of that Letter of Intent so that the present understanding and intentions of the parties could be clarified.

Accordingly, I will attempt to set forth in this letter the consensus which emerged from the December 15 meeting. In order to do this, I will refer to the items addressed in the Letter of Intent seriatim, briefly reciting the present understanding on each point.

I. PROPERTY. It is anticipated that parcel B will be developed first, and that the initial lease will cover only that parcel. SVSC would, however, agree to give your clients the first opportunity to develop another ^{10 ac.} site, if such a site were later to be made available for similar development.

II. CONDITIONS PRECEDENT.

(1) SVSC has received the requested Attorney General opinion. I enclose a copy herewith, along with a copy of the concurrent resolution of the Michigan legislature relating to this transaction.

Mr. B. J. Humphreys
Page 2
December 21, 1981

(2) At present, it is not known which individuals or entities will be involved in undertaking the proposed development project. Also, although it has been tentatively decided that commercial, and not private, financing will be utilized, investigation into possible manners of financing the project have been preliminary in nature, and no firm financing commitments have been received. Further discussion will be necessary when the terms of any financing begin to take definite shape.

(3) It was understood that sixty days will be required by your clients to pursue financing for the project and another sixty days to prepare schematics and construction ^{documents} drawings. These ^{documents} drawings are to be subject to SVSC's approval. ~~While some question was raised concerning whether SVSC's approval would be required on the master plan only, or also on subsequent and more detailed drawings, it was felt that this problem could be resolved without significant difficulty.~~

*I was
agreed it
SVSC appo
would be
required.
allowance*

III. LEASE.

(1) The rental will remain \$100 per acre per year.

(2) As the Attorney General opinion refers to a thirty-five year lease term, this would be the maximum to which SVSC could commit at the present time.

(3) Net Lease. The lease is to be a net lease, with your clients paying all taxes, assessments and similar charges which may be levied against the property.

(4) Construction. An April, 1982 starting date is the present target. Concerning the design of the units, the parties will cooperate in setting the specifications. It was agreed, however, that the minimum size of the units could possibly be less than eight hundred square feet, and that a separate community building would not be necessary so long as laundry facilities exist inside ^{each townhouse unit} the project itself. Although your clients indicated that earth shelter construction and a passive solar system would probably not be possible, SVSC is still interested in some sort of a passive solar system, if economically feasible. Concerning the lighted walkway, it was understood that your client's responsibility would be to extend the same ^{from the project site} to Davis Road.

Finally, concerning the requirement of performance and labor and materialmen bonds, it was understood that a clearer picture of the financing involved was required before the question of bonding could be addressed in a meaningful way.

Mr. B. J. Humphreys
Page 3
December 21, 1981

(5) Completion. Your clients ^{would} ~~hope to~~ complete construction of the initial phase by ~~September~~ ^{August}, 1982. The number of units to be constructed on Site B in the initial phase will not be less than forty. All construction disbursements are anticipated to be made through a licensed title insurance company, with usual requirements of execution of lien waivers by contractors as drawings are made.

(6) Rental of Units. No firm understanding was reached concerning the way in which unit rental rates would be set and adjusted. SVSC expressed a desire to see that the units will be affordable for married students, and indicated that for this reason SVSC could not grant your clients a completely free hand in this area. The previously suggested rental rate of \$350-\$400 per unit was felt by SVSC to still be appropriate, ^{but it was recommended} ~~that the~~ ^{what the} ~~possibility of charging one (low) rate to married students, a~~ ^{rate be} ~~second rate to single students, and a third rate to members of~~ ^{lower} ~~the public was discussed. The possibility of requiring a specified number of units to be reserved for students and faculty through a certain date, such as August 1 of each year, and thereafter be open to the general public was also addressed without any firm conclusion being reached.~~ ^{at all}

(7) Occupancy of Units. SVSC was unwilling to guaranty occupancy of any minimum number of units. Also, it was recognized that it would be impossible for your clients to police the marital status and sex of the occupants of each unit. The suggestion was made that SVSC might be able to have students who would be residing in the units go through an initial sign-up procedure with the SVSC housing office so that at least some controls could be maintained. Aside from such a procedure, there was doubt even concerning the ability of SVSC to investigate the sex or marital status of occupants of units. Both parties agreed that the term of the leases, for individual units would not exceed one year.

(8) Utilities. There will be no charge imposed by SVSC on your clients for tying into existing water, sewer and utility lines. The construction costs involved in accomplishing such hookup, however, would be the responsibility of your clients.

(9) Maintenance. It was tentatively agreed that your clients could contract with third parties for grounds care, snow removal and similar services, so long as such care meets reasonable standards to be set by SVSC. Alternatively, your clients could contract directly with SVSC for such services.

Mr. B. J. Humphreys
Page 4
December 21, 1981

Concerning interior maintenance, the possibility of SVSC contracting with your clients to provide this service was discussed but not resolved.

Finally, concerning police protection, SVSC expressed a strong desire to provide this service itself. The charge therefor was to be reasonable.

(10) Project Manager. The term "project manager" in the Letter of Intent was understood to mean a person who would be ^{operation and care} ~~the caretaker~~ of the project after construction was completed. Your clients indicated that the project manager would probably himself reside in one of the units. While your clients are to select the project manager, SVSC insisted that it have the right to approve or disapprove such choice, and further, that it be allowed some voice in periodic review of the project manager's performance.

(11) Reserve Account. SVSC explained its concern that sufficient funds be available as the project ages to cover the cost of major repairs. In that regard the possibility of your clients setting aside a portion of revenues on an annual basis for this purpose was discussed, the amount of such annual sum to be established by some formula or floating rate to be agreed upon. The balance of any such fund at the expiration of the lease term would become the property of your clients or their assigns.

(12) Financial Statements. It was made clear at the meeting that the reference to financial statements in paragraph III(12) of the Letter of Intent refers only to financial statements for the specific project or projects here involved. Thereafter, your client's concern was with the requirement that such financial statements be audited. SVSC indicated that the auditing requirement could not be waived. However, it was mentioned that audits are customarily conducted at different levels of exhaustiveness (and expense), so that perhaps a lower-level audit would be acceptable.

(13) Ownership of Buildings. The proposed transaction is understood to involve SVSC retaining unencumbered fee title to the underlying real estate at all times. Accordingly, any commercial financing for the project would have to proceed with the lender or lenders receiving a security interest only in the ground lease given by SVSC to your clients. SVSC could not be required to give a mortgage subordinating its interest in the real property to the interest of the lender. A question was

Mr. B. J. Humphreys
Page 5
December 21, 1981

raised concerning whether any commercial lenders would proceed with the transaction on that basis. This question, remains unanswered, pending further discussion between your clients and prospective lenders. It is, however, understood that at the expiration of the lease term, all improvements (including the building ^{themselves} itself) will become the property of SVSC.

(14) SVSC is to be granted a right of first refusal to purchase the project in the event your clients should desire to transfer their interest under the lease. In addition, SVSC must give its consent to any such transfer to a third party, even if SVSC itself does not desire, or is not able, itself to exercise its right to purchase the project.

The foregoing reflects my own imperfect recollection of the outcome of the December 15 meeting. Recognizing that the instant transaction remains in the status of a proposal, with many important items still to be resolved, I would ask that you sign in the place indicated below to evidence that the foregoing also reflects your understanding of what transpired at the December 15 meeting. If you feel that I have omitted or mischaracterized any items of importance, please let me know, and this letter can be revised to reflect those points as well.

Sincerely,

William C. Collins

WCC:dc11/D

The foregoing states my understanding of the December 15, 1981 meeting.

B. J. Humphreys

With respect to students occupying the apartments rather than the dorms, Dr. Ryder emphasized that a precedent had been established at SVSC and that it could control where students were to live...it would fill the dorms first before allowing students to live in the apartments. For example, Dr. Ryder said, SVSC could require that all freshmen, sophomores and juniors could be required to live in the dorms, unless they had a special waiver, or whatever. SVSC was looking at that and had to assure itself that its dorms would stay full to the extent possible

Mr. Curtiss concurred, noting that the SVSC Board of Control had committed itself to do so when it entered into the bond issue...the indenture required SVSC to establish rules that would assure the financial stability of the dorms.

Dr. Ryder indicated this was not unusual...not just for SVSC, but other institutions had done that for years...it had been relaxed a lot in the last 10 years.

Mr. Curtiss observed that it changed with circumstances...SVSC had not had to establish firm rules since the dorms were in reasonable financial condition, however, if that situation were not sustained, then they, as a Board, would be required to establish whatever rules were necessary to assure that the dorms were successful.

Mr. Hamling noted there might be trouble with the apartments after Mrs. Arbury asked him how he thought students would react to being denied permission to live in the apartments rather than dorms which were not filled. In the past, he said, SVSC had always had a big waiting list to get into the dorms and there was a lot of need for additional housing. Last semester, 70 people wanted to get out of the dorms to live off-campus. About 30 of them quit school and the other 40 remained

in the dorms because of their contracts, but they did want to get out. He said he was wondering if SVSC were going to have the big need next year, with the economy the way it was, prices going up, and students not getting financial aid.

If there were still going to be a waiting list, he observed, and they could get four people in an apartment, that would be cheaper for them than the dorms, plus there wouldn't be eight people in a suite. He stressed he thought that would be a lot nicer and most students were going to prefer to live in the apartments. There might be a problem, he concluded, if SVSC said "no, you have to wait until the dorms are filled."

Mrs. Darin expressed another concern...one she had voiced previously... and that was having a Special Committee of three Board members act for the total Board...she was opposed to that before and still was.

Mr. Curtiss indicated he didn't see any problem of calling a Special Meeting so long as they were sure they could get a quorum...if they couldn't get five Board members to attend, they would get nowhere...perhaps they should be asking whether Board members were going to be out of town or busy over the next few weeks.

Mr. Braun stated that as a practical matter, having sat in on that last meeting which lasted for quite some period of time, that the Board members were going to see the final contract in substantially different form than it was here. He indicated he thought that the developers were going to run into some problems and some considerations and that there was going to be substantial renegotiation, which was all the more reason, he felt, that it should come back to a Special Meeting of the Board.

Mr. Curtiss observed that that didn't mean that they should not move ahead as rapidly as they could to finalize.

Mr. Braun agreed and indicated that he was simply saying that they saw the

first "Letter of Intent"...the second version was substantially different from the first, and he thought the final was going to be substantially different from the second, and all the more reason to have it approved by the full Board of Control, assuming, as Mr. Curtiss said, that they could have a quorum, because the developers, as far as he could tell, were absolutely dedicated to their construction timetable that they had put out...he thought they could do it if SVSC responded quickly.

Mr. Curtiss suggested that the Special Committee of three Board members could continue to be involved in the negotiations.

Dr. Ryder agreed, noted he would withdraw the request for a motion authorizing a Special Committee of the Board to negotiate and approve an agreement for the construction of apartments on campus, and would procede ahead on the negotiations and call a Special Meeting of the Board when they were finalized.

Chairman Kendall called a recess at 10:47 a.m. and the meeting reconvened at 11:08 a.m.

8. Consideration of an Appeal by Dr. David Rayfield to Make Substantive Changes in Policy and Procedures of the Office of Public Safety

Chairman Kendall called upon Dr. David Rayfield and indicated that the Board had set aside 15 minutes for him to address the Board and asked him if that would be sufficient...if not, they could be flexible.

Dr. Rayfield asked if the Board subcommittee had talked with the full Board at all yet, or if this was the first time the whole Board had been exposed to the subject.

Mr. Kendall responded that this was the first time that the whole Board had faced the question in terms of an entire body, but that every Board member had been provided copies of all the correspondence.

Hearing this, Dr. Rayfield stated that he wouldn't have to go through and review all of the correspondence and thus, 15 minutes, he thought would be sufficient.

Dr. Rayfield recalled that in July of 1980 he had asked to have the policy allowing the SVSC Public Safety officers to be armed to be reconsidered. Dr. Ryder had sent him a letter in October of 1980 explaining that he had reconsidered the policy and that, at least as far as he could see, it was going to remain essentially the same...the only specific change might be that "when they hired new police officers, they were considering the possibility of having them dressed in blazers instead of the usual uniform"...he didn't say in his letter anything about whether these new people would be armed as the ones were now.

He was not satisfied with Dr. Ryder's answer, Dr. Rayfield said, and for that reason he appealed to the Board of Control on three grounds, all of which he had stated in his appeal:

1. Dr. Ryder's answer did not satisfactorily resolve the question that he and many other people had had.
2. The arguments Dr. Ryder gave did not support his answer.
3. He did not believe, from what he had been able to tell, that Dr. Ryder or anyone else had taken the kind of steps that were really necessary to make this kind of a decision in what amounted to a democratic community, mainly their campus community.

Reporting on anti-gun polls taken on the SVSC campus, Dr. Rayfield said that in a letter-writing campaign last year, approximately 140-150 anti-gun responses were received...this was a major victory to get that many people to respond on this campus to anything. Also, he noted, Student Government conducted an informal

poll a couple of months ago and the results showed that 55 percent of the 100-150 who responded were against SVSC police officers being armed.

Dr. Rayfield noted that there was "no unanimity" on the SVSC campus with respect to the police gun issue, however, he pointed out that since this was clearly a matter which directly involved every individual on this campus, that every individual on this campus should be consulted, and that had not been done. Nor, he added, could he or anyone else make any kind of an accurate prediction about what everyone on this campus would have to say on the matter.

Dr. Rayfield stressed that he was not asking the Board of Control to try to resolve the question of whether the police should be armed or not armed, as the only two alternatives...there were other alternatives, he thought, and those were the ones they should explore.

He named possible alternatives, such as:

Not having police officers routinely armed, but armed during certain hours, such as at night.

Not having police officers as visible on this campus as they now were, or to the extent they now were visible...this should be played down.

Speak directly to the problem which Mr. Rybkowski had pointed out...which Criminal Justice had pointed out, and which some of the literature on campus police law enforcement pointed out...that part of the trouble at SVSC was that there appeared to be a distinction between "police officers" on the one hand, and "security officers" on the other...and there was nothing in between...the difference between the two being that police officers regularly carried weapons and security officers did not. SVSC should try to develop another alternative which would lie somewhere in between.

Dr. Rayfield concluded his remarks by saying that he was a part of this community, as each of those present were...what happened to this community, what it did, and what it didn't do, must be decided by them and not by someone else. He stated that he was afraid that in SVSC's case, it had allowed communities of different structure, with different purposes, and so on, outside of its community to make its decisions...almost as if SVSC had made its decisions "by default."

Mr. Curtiss indicated he would like to say that Dr. Rayfield's point that each community had to decide for itself how it was going to treat itself was an interesting one that should not be lost in this debate. For example, he stressed, he hoped that SVSC didn't reach the point apparently the University of Missouri had where it was teaching women students how to handle handguns so that they could protect themselves...that was quite a bit beyond what they were talking about here. It would be a sad day to him, Mr. Curtiss observed, if SVSC ever came anywhere near that...he certainly hoped SVSC didn't.

On the other hand, Mr. Curtiss pointed out, this college did go through a period when it had a Security Force that was unarmed, and in his judgment, ineffective...he was not pointing to individuals with that accusation, but frankly, things got significantly out of hand, in his opinion, in the early '70's on this campus. When SVSC's security officers were deputized and they upgraded the on-campus force's authority with the weapons they carried, he began to see some significant improvement or decline in the incidence of serious problems. He stated that he hadn't seen a report recently, but he did know that some of the things that were relatively unreported in the early '70's had not been occurring recently.

Mr. Curtiss stressed that the issue, he thought, was one for which there was no

perfect or right answer...no answer would satisfy everyone. He concluded that perhaps it was something that should be subject to an on-going, careful review, but at this point in time, he was satisfied that the environment on the campus had been improved significantly and happily without any major incidents, and thus, he would like to make a motion with respect to this Agenda item.

BM-616 Mr. Curtiss moved that the Saginaw Valley State College Board of Control at this time affirm the position taken by the Administration with regard to Public Safety Department officers bearing arms.
Mr. Braun supported.

Mr. Braun indicated he would like to make a couple of comments on this matter. He said that he had read and studied the material that had been presented, with great care...he had listened with very considerable interest to Dr. Rayfield, both today and at the subcommittee meeting recently, and he would simply say that Dr. Rayfield had presented a very thoughtful, logical and obviously sincere, and he might add, articulate presentation of those views. However, he stressed, he thought there were equally meritorious views on the other side of this issue and that Dr. Rayfield had presented them rather well in his communication

Continuing, Mr. Braun indicated that it seemed to him that there were points that could be made pro and con...that the objectives that Dr. Rayfield still spoke about could be achieved through differing approaches and also, he thought that at the bottom line it got down to the point that, they, as a Board of Control, had delegated to Dr. Ryder and to the administration the carrying out of those objectives...the preservation of order on SVSC's campus, the protection of property of the college and of the individuals on the campus as best they could, and obviously, most importantly, the safety of the students, faculty, and all the people who were on the campus. That could be achieved through different approaches, Mr. Braun

concluded, but having given that responsibility to the president, and having reviewed the way that he had carried it out, which, as Mr. Curtiss had said, "had stood the test of time" as being reasonable and logical, he didn't think it would be appropriate for this Board to modify that at this time.

Mr. Hamling observed that he would agree that the Public Safety officers needed to be armed, however he didn't think the Board should just say, "OK, we can leave the present policy like it is" without considering some of the changes that Dr. Rayfield had brought up...other possibilities as alternatives to the present policy should be considered.

Dr. Rayfield, referring to Mr. Curtiss' statement that "each community had to decide for itself how it was going to treat itself" indicated he wondered what then would happen to the 4,450 people that were on this campus, who might indeed want to make some contribution to making this decision...if the Board supported the current policy, the decision was already made without them.

Mr. Curtiss responded that a community was a dynamic, living thing, and at this point in time, he would recommend that this Board affirm the position of the administration, and that the administration's policy was not "cast in stone" for all time. No policy, he said, was "cast in stone" and these questions should be subject to on-going discussions, but for Dr. Rayfield to appeal the administrative position to this Board and ask this Board to establish the Public Safety policy, contrary to that proposed by the administration, he thought, was going beyond the kind of involvement that this Board should have...he didn't think it was up to the eight-member Board, or the six members present today, to make an arbitrary decision or to react to the appeal. Mr. Curtiss stressed that the real community discussion had to go on within the community...whether the administration's position accurately

reflected what it felt the community should have, was a fair question to ask, but along with that, they had to ask themselves to what extent was the college truly a microdemocracy. They went that route, Mr. Curtiss recalled, in '71 and '72. Parts of it worked and parts of it somehow got goofed up, and the Board's real role, he thought, was to try to assure reasonable safety on the campus, but most importantly, the educational process. What he was saying, Mr. Curtiss concluded, was that he didn't think this Board had a position to take other than the action he had proposed in his motion made earlier.

Dr. Rayfield observed that supposing the Board voted now on the motion, which was, in effect, in support of the current policy...or in support really of Dr. Ryder's duty to make that policy, and the motion was carried, would he be naive in assuming that after all of this, it would be reasonable to expect that Dr. Ryder and the other administrative officers concerned would begin to take some steps to find out really what the wishes of the people in this community were...to check to see whether their perceptions, which were really left over from several years ago, were accurate perceptions.

Chairman Kendall indicated he would like to tie that question, along with what Mr. Hamling had said, and then get on with the motion. He pointed out that the administration and Board of Control of the college, he thought, had the responsibility to continually look at all the policies and procedures that were at work here in this institution. These were not issues, as was already noted by Mr. Curtiss, that were "cast in stone" but up for continual review...and they had been doing that in rewriting the policies, the Mission, and so on. That, he stressed, was an on-going part of their responsibility...part of their responsibility to the state, and to this community, as an individual community, and to the community at large out there...

and that this Board of Control was charged by the Governor to continue to do that, so he didn't think that "yes, it was just going to die because the Board would say that it supported the administration" if that happened...so, he concluded, it was a continuing process which they were all involved in and committed to... which, he hoped, was an answer to both Dr. Rayfield and Mr. Hamling.

Dr. Ryder indicated that his letter to Dr. Rayfield stated his position, so he didn't really have any comments to make on the specifics of that at this time, but he would like to say that it would be easy for them to believe that this was some sort of a self-serving proposition that Dr. Rayfield had brought to the front, or to the consideration of this Board, however, in his judgment, as Mr. Braun had indicated, this was clearly an issue which was a reasonable, logical issue for an institution of higher education to be looking at. Dr. Rayfield's proposition was certainly, as he saw it, in no way self-serving to him personally. It was a logical thing for him to do, and he looked at it that way.

As far as the administration's position, assuming this was supported by the Board, Dr. Ryder stressed, it would continue to look at the issue...he wished there were a way in which that was not required...in fact, he could look back in his history as an administrator in higher education when institutions of higher education really didn't require any significant level of Public Safety type support such as SVSC had now...and over that period, he had seen that change.

The problem, he said, was...is the campus community just reflecting society, which he thought right now he would have to say it appeared to be...or was it possible that something they could do at the college would change or really influence the future in this respect. Dr. Rayfield seemed to feel that there was. There were certainly possible modifications and approaches, Dr. Ryder suggested, and when he

spoke in his letter about additional officers, he was speaking about any new officers when the demand in student growth dictated a need for them...should there be a sufficient number of uniformed and armed officers for patrol in cars etc., new officers conceivably could be dressed in blazers, unarmed or armed, but concealed. There was no money in the budget for the employment of any new officers at this time, Dr. Ryder stated, and there really was not the need for additional officers right now.

Dr. Ryder concluded that from his point of view, all of this was subject to continual scrutiny and evaluation and some decision that might be more acceptable for all of them could be made in the future.

Chairman Kendall observed that what Dr. Ryder had just said had been said before...it was part of that on-going process for change...he thought the very presence of Dr. Rayfield and his presentation was a part of that process that he spoke about earlier...this institution...along with others...was open to change...and certainly to ideas that would better their community...and that was part of their responsibility.

Mr. Curtiss indicated that it was his understanding that all of the four-year colleges and universities, except the three branches of the University of Michigan, and Lake Superior State College, had their own Public Safety Department with at least some officers who did carry arms. The other four campuses, where arms were not evident, had entered into contract with outside Police Agencies in the event that armed officers were needed. He stressed he would like to underscore the point that the reason SVSC had chosen the direction it did initially was on the assumption that if it had its own force, who understood both the academic environment and the people living within it, that the risks of error and misuse would be less. That

might be an incorrect assumption, he said, but it was a difficult decision that they made some years ago...that was, to have their own people on campus, who knew the campus and knew the people on the campus, in order to minimize the chances of somebody having to come in from the outside and perhaps aggravate a bad situation. If that assumption were being challenged, he concluded, perhaps they should have some further discussion on that, at least at the administrative level. If not, he thought that their decision was, that it was a fair assumption at the time they made the decision, and he thought at this point in time, it was better to stick with it, than to contracting with the City Police and its efficient community system, for that kind of service.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Kendall called for a vote.

Motion unanimously carried.

Chairman Kendall thanked Dr. Rayfield for his attendance and presentation, and Dr. Rayfield thanked him in return.

9. Recommendation for the Reaffirmation of the College Mission Statement as Adopted 3/12/79

Dr. Ryder advised that "clean" copies of the College Mission Statement had been distributed to replace the "draft" copies which had been mailed to the Board members. He pointed out that it was no different than the one adopted 3/12/79, but the copies mailed were inadvertantly copies of the "draft" rather than the "final" writing.

Dr. Ryder explained that the reason this item was on the Agenda today was that under the new Board Operating Policies, there was a provision that spoke about annual evaluation of the Mission Statement and the Goals and Objectives of the College...that was supposed to be done at this meeting in January.

Insofar as the Goals and Objectives were concerned, Dr. Ryder observed that that didn't fit with SVSC's planning process, which would be in force for the total institution by next summer. Last year, he recalled, in the planning process, they involved only the academic units, athletics and student life. This year, it would include all units within the institution...academic, administrative etc. So, by next year, they would be able to bring at this time the Goals and Objectives to recommend to the Board, and then, the procedure would be to have an annual evaluation, which would take place in 1982-83.

What the Board could do now, Dr. Ryder suggested, was to look again at the Mission Statement which was adopted on March 12, 1979 (see Attachment) for which he was recommending no change at this point. By next year, he stressed. he was not saying that there wouldn't be a recommendation for change. But to evaluate it today was, in effect, a partial compliance with the full intent of the provision in the Board Operating Policies.

Dr. Gilmore indicated he had made some notations for change in his copy of the Mission Statement which he would like to discuss.

Mr. Curtiss observed that that would be for next year and indicated he was not sure that they ought to try to modify the Mission Statement now. The other Board members agreed.

Chairman Kendall called for a motion.

BM-617 It was moved and supported that the Saginaw Valley State College Board of Control reaffirm the Mission Statement as adopted on March 12, 1979.

Mr. Kendall asked if there were any further discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

Motion carried, with Dr. Gilmore dissenting.

COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT

Adopted 3/12/79 BC

Rep. 9/9/74 Statement

Board Motion 536

Page 1 of 4

Saginaw Valley State College was founded as a private liberal arts college to serve the Saginaw Valley. Now a four-year state institution, SVSC continues primarily to meet a regional need for education, while actively recruiting students from throughout the whole state of Michigan.

In response to demonstrated needs, professional programs have been developed within the College and have changed its early character. Now receiving high priority, these professional programs are not undertaken in isolation from the liberal arts, rather in a belief that liberal arts is the tradition in which professional programs must be firmly based.

Goals of the College may be grouped in four broad categories.

1. To provide a campus where students may experience personal and intellectual growth.

The College aids the growth of students by providing opportunities for:

- a. acquiring accurate and pleasing use of language as the essential condition of all reflection, self-expression, and communication with others.
- b. understanding numeration and performing rapid and accurate simple computation.
- c. "seeing things as they are, going right to the point, disentangling a skein of thought, detecting what is sophistical, and discarding what is irrelevant."
(John Henry, Cardinal Newman, The Idea of a University).
- d. acquiring a general understanding of society and of the place of the individual within it.
- e. Engaging in problem solving and conducting scientific inquiry so that one is able to use analysis and synthesis in novel situations.

COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT

Adopted 3/12/79 BC

Rep. 9/9/74 Statement

Board Motion 536

Page 2 of 4

- F. emulating the scholarly life in its emphasis on the right and obligation to pursue truth and the responsibility to respect divergence of thought.
- g. "training in mature and responsible evaluation and decision making in the controversial areas of science, social policy, morality, art and religion" (Theodore Greene, Liberal Education Reexamined, 1943).
- h. exhibiting synoptic comprehension; that is, escape from multiple provincialisms which inhibit the attainment of larger and more inclusive perspectives.
- i. demonstrating respect for human diversity realizing that "vestiges of religious prejudice, handicaps to women, and most important, discrimination on the basis of race are morally wrong, economically wasteful, and in many respects dangerous" (President's Commission on National Goals, Goals for Americans, 1960).
- j. training in chosen professions which is well founded in liberal arts disciplines as well as career focused skills.
- k. participating in co-curricular activities--athletics, arts, and cultural events.
- l. developing a general view of our cultural heritage in the humanities and in the social and natural sciences.
- m. acquiring proficiency for graduate programs and professional schools.
- n. developing self-discipline, a sense of personal worth and purpose, an enthusiasm for learning and life, and the skills and attitudes needed to nurture effective interpersonal relationships.

COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT

Adopted 3/12/79 BC

Rep. 9/9/74 Statement

Board Motion 536

Page 3 of 4

2. To encourage research and pure learning; to support intellectual and artistic creativity.

The College encourages research and pure learning and supports intellectual and artistic creativity by:

- a. attracting a faculty committed to academic inquiry and expansion of human knowledge.
- b. developing balanced and adequate library facilities.
- c. acquiring research grade facilities such as adequate laboratories and their instrumentation, study areas, and data retrieval systems.
- d. acquiring professional grade fine arts facilities such as studios and instruments.
- e. affording faculty the means to attend professional conventions and to communicate in other ways with academic colleagues.

3. To offer education which, properly applied, advances human capability in society at large.

The College encourages non-political constructive evaluation of society by:

- a. recognizing that "any society can atrophy and decline. The capacity of a society to assure its own self-renewal is a critical test of it. Higher education has a part to play in the passing of this test by the United States" (The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Purpose and the Performance of Higher Education in the United States Approaching the Year 2000, June 1973).

COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT

Adopted 3/12/79 BC

Rep. 9/9/74 Statement

Board Motion 536

Page 4 of 4

- b. tolerating people of different philosophies, convictions, and values.
- c. supporting participation in activities aspiring to improve community life.

IV. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

10. Personnel Report

Dr. Ryder distributed copies of the Personnel Report of January 11, 1982 and observed he didn't really think there was any need for him to comment.

Mr. Curtiss asked if the position in Physical Education was a replacement or a new position.

Dr. Ryder responded that it was a replacement for Ingrid Kupprat, and that the other positions listed were all replacements.

Mr. Curtiss asked who in Secondary Teaching had left.

Dr. Yien, noting it wasn't exactly in that area, said that John del Regato had left last August...he had gone to Evansville.

Mrs. Arbury indicated she was sorry about his leaving...she thought he was fine.

V. OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

11. Three-Hole Punching of the Minutes

Mr. Curtiss stated that he realized the budgetary constraints that were evidenced at the College, but he wondered if that extended to "not punching the Minutes"...some of them kept the Minutes and it was convenient to have them punched.

Dr. Ryder noted that that happened when Opal was on vacation and he was involved in the whole process...there were copies in the office that were punched which he would have one of the administrators bring over in the afternoon.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to transact, Chairman Kendall adjourned the meeting at 11:53 a.m.

January 11, 1982

1982- 29

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kendall--Chairman

Richard H. Gilmore--Vice Chairman
(In absence of Secretary)

JMR
omc

Opat M. Colvin
Opat M. Colvin--Recording Secretary

SAGINAW VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICES
OPERATING BUDGET
SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
1981-82

	HOUSING		FOOD SERVICE		BUDGET 80-81	BUDGET 81-82	BUDGET 80-81	BUDGET 81-82
	BUDGET 80-81	ACTUAL 80-81	BUDGET 80-81	ACTUAL 80-81				
REVENUES:								
Contract	\$381,722	\$393,849.98	\$384,380	\$555,997.54	\$535,920	\$576,571	\$917,642	
Other	28,711	21,758.00	15,000	1,394.43	205,000	1,850	233,711	
Late Payment Charges	-0-	2,775.00	2,500	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	
Laundry	-0-	6,579.00	6,000	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	
Snackbar & Casual Meals	-0-	-0-	-0-	86,744.34	-0-	92,000	-0-	
ARA Facility Rental	-0-	-0-	-0-	27,246.27	-0-	26,000	-0-	
Total Revenues	<u>\$410,433</u>	<u>\$424,961.98</u>	<u>\$407,880</u>	<u>\$671,382.58</u>	<u>\$740,920</u>	<u>\$696,421</u>	<u>\$1,151,353</u>	
EXPENDITURES:								
Operating								
Salaries	\$81,710	\$87,073.72	\$92,794	\$74,961.25	\$68,650	\$75,416	\$150,360	
Fringes	14,623	14,689.47	20,135	6,954.55	6,921	7,988	21,544	
Equipment	23,740	8,026.79	6,968	8,408.35	7,000	-0-	30,740	
Operating & Misc.	98,660	105,021.29	113,000	33,622.40	46,330	45,000	144,990	
ARA	-0-	-0-	-0-	547,800.63	515,000	571,000	515,000	
Utilities	84,932	80,069.79	116,500	29,488.56	32,850	42,000	117,782	
Insurance	4,794	4,794.00	4,610	2,734.00	2,740	2,850	7,534	
Less Internal Charges								
Conferences	-0-	-0-	(18,000) ^a	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	
Other	-0-	-0-	-0-	(95,351.42)	-0-	(100,000)	-0-	
Total Expenditures	<u>\$308,459</u>	<u>\$299,675.06</u>	<u>\$336,007</u>	<u>\$608,618.32</u>	<u>\$679,491</u>	<u>\$644,254</u>	<u>\$987,950</u>	
OPERATING INCOME	<u>\$101,974</u>	<u>\$125,286.92</u>	<u>\$71,873</u>	<u>\$62,764.26</u>	<u>\$61,429</u>	<u>\$52,167</u>	<u>\$163,403</u>	

^a Includes \$9,000 of revenues pertaining to 1980-81

JAW:pkz
12/18/81

TOTAL		
ACTUAL	BUDGET	
80-81	81-82	
\$ 949,847.52	\$ 960,951	
23,152.43	16,850	
2,775.00	2,500	
6,579.00	6,000	
86,744.34	92,000	
27,246.27	26,000	
<u>\$1,096,344.56</u>	<u>\$1,104,301</u>	
\$ 162,034.97	\$ 168,210	
21,644.02	28,123	
16,435.14	6,968	
138,643.69	158,000	
547,800.63	571,000	
109,558.35	158,500	
7,528.00	7,460	
-0-	(18,000)	
(95,351.42)	(100,000)	
<u>\$ 908,293.38</u>	<u>\$ 980,261</u>	
\$ 188,051.18	\$ 124,040	