

1978

## Board of Regents Meeting Materials, August 30, 1978

Eastern Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.emich.edu/regentsminutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Eastern Michigan University, "Board of Regents Meeting Materials, August 30, 1978" (1978). *Board of Regents Meeting Materials*. 370. <http://commons.emich.edu/regentsminutes/370>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Board of Regents Meeting Materials by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact [lib-ir@emich.edu](mailto:lib-ir@emich.edu).

Index of August 30, 1978, Special Meeting of the Board of Regents

	Page
.1977 M Presidential Screening Process . . . . .	12
.1976 M Presidential Selection Criteria . . . . .	8

BOARD OF REGENTS  
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

- Official Minutes of Special Meeting of August 30, 1978

Board members present:

Richard N. Robb, Chairman  
Linda D. Bernard, Timothy J. Dyer, Dolores A. Kinzel, Edward J.  
McCormick, Beth W. Milford, Carleton K. Rush and John F. Ullrich

Administration present:

Vice-President Gary Hawks

Chairman Robb called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.

Chairman Robb stated this special meeting of the Board had been called for one purpose, and that was to discuss the Ad Hoc Committee Report on the proposed criteria, procedures and advertisements to be used in the event it becomes necessary for the Board to elect a new President after the general election.

Chairman Robb stated he had received a letter from Dr. Walter Gessert, chairperson of the Faculty Assembly; Judith Johnson the President of AAUP and Judy Keenan, President of the Student Body. He asked the Board members if they too had received copies of these letters. All members of the Board acknowledged they had received copies of the letters referred to by Dr. Robb.

Chairman Robb said the Board would begin their deliberations by referring to the proposed criteria that had been suggested by the Ad Hoc Committee. He asked if anyone would like to offer any comments.

Regent Bernard said she had contacted Secretary Hawks and had suggested some modifications to the criteria. She asked Secretary Hawks if he would pass out the criteria as revised with her suggestions which was dated "Draft 8-29-78" which he did.

Regent Bernard proceeded to explain her suggested modifications to the criteria. She noted that paragraph #6 should be broken down into two paragraphs. The first paragraph would include the first sentence only. The second paragraph would include all the sentences that were underscored. She then went on to explain in detail the reasons for submitting these proposed revisions.

Regent Kinzel asked Regent Bernard, referring to the underlined section of paragraph #6, how she would react if the candidates had never had the opportunity to demonstrate any kind of a commitment to the principles of affirmative action and equal opportunity.

Regent Bernard responded that in her opinion any person the Board would be seriously considering will have had some experience and would have had some opportunity to demonstrate in some way a commitment to affirmative action.

Regent Milford said she agreed with Regent Bernard. She said if the Board is going to get a topnotch person that person will have certainly had some experience and background which would show evidence of a commitment to affirmative action.

Regent Ullrich said he too agreed with Regent Bernard. He said the person being considered should definitely have had some experiences whereby a commitment to affirmative action and equal opportunity would be quite apparent if evident at all.

Regent Dyer said he too agreed the candidates being considered should have some track record in this field. He also said he felt in paragraph #2 where it states candidates should show leadership abilities, that the only way the Board can weigh that is for the individual being considered to have had some administrative experience. He felt the leadership abilities and administrative experiences will have given the candidates the opportunity to have shown some position and belief in this area.

Regent Ullrich said he agreed with Dr. Dyer. Any serious candidate should have at least had the opportunity to develop programs which the Board could look at to see intent. He said even if a program has not had a formal evaluation, if it has been in process for 2, 3, or 4 years, the Board could get a feeling for a demonstrated effort.

Chairman Robb asked if any other members of the Board had any comments or suggestions they would like to make on the proposed criteria.

Regent McCormick asked Regent Bernard to explain her suggested addition to the first paragraph which states "as defined by the Board of Regents." He asked Regent Bernard just exactly what does that add to that criteria? He said it was his intent, and the committee's intent, to keep the criteria as brief as possible so that there were not a lot of words. He continued that he had no objection to the addition, but he did not know what it really added.

After some discussion by the Board, it was agreed to delete the suggested addition to the first paragraph.

Regent Ullrich said he would like to suggest some changes to the proposed criteria being considered by the Board. He suggested the first paragraph be modified to read in part, "candidates should have an understanding of and respect for, and a firm commitment, etc., etc.," adding the words 'of' and 'for'. He said he felt this added more to the paragraph and made it read better. All Board members agreed to make that modification.

Regent Ullrich said he also felt something should be said in the criteria about teaching. And after some discussion it was agreed the second sentence in paragraph #4 would be added to the first paragraph and would be revised to state "they should have an appreciation of, and support for, faculty teaching and research." All Board members agreed.

Chairman Robb asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Regent Ullrich said he would like to continue with paragraph #2. He felt there should be further modification and offered language for the Board to consider.

After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that the second sentence in paragraph #2 would be revised to read "They should have extensive administrative experience with the demonstrated capability to manage a large and complex organization involving both human relations and business affairs." All members of the Board agreed this would be a proper change to make.

There was further extended discussion on several other sections of the proposed criteria.

Regent Dyer read to the Board the criteria that was used at the University of Wisconsin. He said he just wanted to point out there were only four items mentioned in their criteria. He said they were very brief and very broad. He personally felt the Board should be as brief and broad as possible in the writing of and the interpretation of the criteria.

Chairman Robb asked if there were any further comments the Board members would like to make.

Regent Ullrich suggested the word "an" be deleted from paragraph #3. The Board agreed.

Chairman Robb asked if there were any other comments.

Regent Ullrich said he would like to make another comment. He said in paragraph #4 it states in part, "educational background." He asked what the committee really meant by educational background.

A very extended discussion on this paragraph followed. Regent McCormick said he felt we were really nit-picking with the words and we really should get the job done and get it over with. He said he felt it was ridiculous to be talking about the words. He said in his opinion the intent of what was being written was more important than the actual words.

Regent Kinzel asked Regent McCormick if the Board wasn't really here to give thorough consideration and discussion to this criteria.

Regent Rush said he agreed with Regent Kinzel. It was his understanding the purpose of this meeting was to give all members the opportunity to discuss and make changes to the proposed criteria.

Regent Robb said he agreed. However, he said, he felt very strongly that the Board should keep the criteria general and as brief as possible. He said he gets a general tone for the criteria as it is written now. He doesn't want it to get so binding that it will come back to haunt the Board. He said he felt the Board should allow themselves a little more latitude.

Regent Bernard said in her opinion the Board should not restrict itself by the suggestion that the candidate be a person with background and experience in higher education. She said she thought that would be ridiculous. She said that President Brickley didn't have any real experience in higher education and if that would have

been a requirement the last time he wouldn't have been able to be President.

Regent Kinzel said that President Brickley had had some experience teaching in higher education.

Regent Dyer said that was true, but it was a very limited experience, and not the experience that one would conclude was required from the language that had been suggested.

Regent Rush said he supported Regent Ullrich and feels very strongly that there should be some mention of some sort of meaningful experience in higher education. He said President Brickley had had some experience in higher education and that is all he is asking for.

Regent McCormick said he wanted to make it very clear that Jim Brickley was not picked as President of Eastern Michigan University because of his experience in higher education. He said that may have been an excuse, but it was not a reason for picking him.

Regent Milford said she felt the Board should not place too much emphasis on the higher education business. She said this institution is in the business of handling remedial reading, two-year programs, the pyramid group on campus, and we are talking about day care centers. It is not all higher education we are dealing with, it is all levels of education. If people have had good experiences in any level of education that should be good enough and the Board should not limit themselves to an individual that has had experience in higher education.

Regent Ullrich said he felt very strongly they should change paragraph #4 and state something about a strong background in education. Maybe, he said, they could just delete the words "strong educational background" and just put "strong background in education".

Chairman Robb said if we were to have used that terminology in the past, Jim Brickley would not have been selected. To him, he said, a strong background in education would mean that the individual had to have had a strong background and experience in education. He said that was not what the Board was looking for; they were looking for a leader at the time, and not an educator.

Regent Bernard said she too felt that if the Board could find the "right person" with a bachelor or master's degree, we ought to hire them. The Board should not be limited to hiring a person with a Ph.D., or someone who had specialized in higher education.

Regent McCormick then explained some of the history of what had happened on the last two occasions he has been involved in hiring a President. He said he felt the Board was spending far too much time on this criteria! It was really not that important as the individual Board members will have the opportunity to review the credentials and visit with the candidates as they make their trips to the campus. He said they are spending far too much time on this and we should get on with the other business.

Regent Kinzel asked what is the purpose of this meeting if we are not here to discuss and make changes.

Chairman Robb said again that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed criteria. However, he too wanted to caution the Board that he felt they could over emphasize the criteria.

Regent Ullrich said he did not feel the Board could over emphasize the criteria and he personally would use the criteria as a check list as he was considering candidates.

Regent McCormick said he does not want to get too restrictive. He said that in no way has any Board member ever gone down the criteria and used it as a check list to be sure an individual qualified in all areas. They use the criteria in a very broad way to have some general thoughts about the type of person they were looking for, but he said again, he felt they were just being too restrictive and spending too much time on this.

Regent McCormick continued that in his own mind when they were considering the candidates for the position this last time around, he didn't know if he was going to vote for President Brickley or not because he personally felt they needed someone with a stronger educational background. However, he said, Jim Brickley has proven that you don't need to be a person with a strong educational background to do the job.

Both Regents Rush and Ullrich said they felt something should be stated about higher education. After much discussion it was agreed by all members of the Board that paragraph #4 would be changed to read "Candidates should have acceptable academic qualifications with an earned doctorate preferred."

Chairman Robb asked if there were any further comments.

Regent Ullrich said he felt the word "excellent" in paragraph #5 was somewhat redundant. The Board members agreed the word 'excellent' should be deleted from paragraph #5.

Chairman Robb asked if there were any other comments.

Regent Ullrich said he felt something should be mentioned about the individual being innovative, in the last paragraph. After some discussion it was agreed the last paragraph would be changed to read "Candidates should be innovative and goal oriented with the demonstrated ability to transform goals into effective programs." It was agreed also to delete the last four words suggested by Regent Bernard.

Chairman Robb asked if there were any other comments.

Regent Ullrich said he once again wanted to see some mention of the words 'higher education experience' or something to that effect, added to the criteria since it is a higher education institution.

Regent Rush suggested that the sentence "higher education experience at some level of involvement is preferred" be added to paragraph #2, supported by Regents Ullrich and Kinzel, but opposed by other members of the Board.

Regent Dyer made several comments and quoted from a well known philosopher from the book by Aristotle, and indicated he felt it was not necessary and should not be a requirement that the individual have higher educational experience.

Chairman Robb then asked the Board if they had any other comments or suggestions. Hearing none, he asked Secretary Hawks, if he would read the Criteria back as he understood it.

Secretary Hawks then read the following:

Presidential Selection Criteria

Candidates should have an understanding of, respect for, and a firm commitment to the principal purposes of higher education. They should have an appreciation of and support for faculty teaching and research.

Candidates should have proven leadership abilities. They should have extensive and administrative experience with the demonstrated capability to manage a large and complex organization involving both human relations and business affairs.

Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of governmental organization and processes, and the ability to work effectively with governmental and community leaders.

Candidates should have acceptable academic qualifications with an earned doctorate preferred.

Candidates should have the ability to develop and maintain rapport with students, faculty, staff and alumni.

Candidates should have personal integrity.

Candidates shall have demonstrated a firm commitment to the principles of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity. They should have an appreciation for the unique problems of minorities and women as well as the ability to communicate effectively with both groups in the development of solutions to these problems and the establishment of progressive goals designed to effectively eliminate the vestiges of past discrimination because of race or sex.

Candidate should have a commitment and demonstrated ability to search for and obtain institutional financial support.

Candidates should be inovative and goal oriented with the demonstrated ability to transform goals into effective programs.

.1976 M PRESIDENTIAL SELECTION CRITERIA

After Secretary Hawks read the Presidential Selection Criteria, it was moved by Regent Dyer and seconded by Regent Ullrich that the Presidential Selection Criteria read by Secretary Hawks be approved by the Board.

Motion carried.

Regent Rush asked to be recorded as voting 'no' on this motion.

Chairman Robb complimented Regent McCormick, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, and the members of the committee, for the hard work they put into preparing the materials for their report which the Board is considering. He said he felt the committee work was excellent and the changes suggested by the Board at this meeting did not really change the general concept of what was presented. He said the changes made at this meeting were more or less word changes. He said again the committee did an excellent job and wanted to thank them.

Chairman Robb suggested the Board now move to the procedural issues. He said the committee's report is numbered by sections and he proceeded to read section #1 which is the makeup of the screening committee. He asked if there were any comments. He once again referred to the three letters the Board members had received today and yesterday.

Regent Kinzel said she agreed the alumni should be involved, but she had some trouble in giving them the same representation that students and faculty have. She said she thought possibly the faculty and students had more of a vested interest than the alumni and asked the other Board members what they felt.

Regent McCormick said it was very difficult in the past for students and faculty to get people present at some of the meetings and to get something done. The more people involved, the more difficult it is to get something done. He said he felt the alumni should have equal voice in the selection of a President.

Regent Dyer said he was very surprised by some of the comments which were erroneously made in the communications received by the Board. He said the makeup of the committee is exactly as it was the last time except instead of having three people from the various groups there were two this time. There were three alumni on the committee the last time. He felt with all the work the University is trying to do in the area of development and alumni relations (there are over 55,000 alumni) they certainly represent the largest special interest group and should have an equal voice on the committee. We rarely hear from the alumni of EMU except in the time of trouble. He thought the newer members of the Board would like to know that it was really the alumni that got President Elliott fired in 1963. They were very vocal at that time. They are a group that should be considered equally, particularly when the University is asking them to give funds to the institution.

Regent McCormick said he agreed with Regent Dyer completely. President Elliott had actually been fired in 1963 by the old State Board of Education. When the Board of Regents first came into being in January, 1964, their first action was to hire him back for a one year period of time; permitting him to resign and also permitting the Board to have someone as the head of the institution until such time as they could find a new President. He too felt strongly that the alumni group should have equal representation on the committee.

Regent Rush said he saw no problem with that makeup because the Board may chose an alumnus who is also a member of a faculty.

Regent Dyer said he felt very strongly, after listening to the various groups that appeared before the Ad Hoc Committee, that one alumnus selected should be a person who might also represent the community. He or she should be someone who would be a well known person in the community that could also speak in behalf of the community. They should be someone who had been very helpful and dynamic in supporting this institution.

Regent McCormick said he felt it was ridiculous to think that the faculty should have more representation than other groups. He feels very uncomfortable with the fact that the workers are in effect "picking their own boss". He said in no business would this happen. He said the Board represents the public and all the people of the State of Michigan, and the faculty represents their own personal interest.

Regent Ullrich said he felt the committee makeup as proposed gave good balance for all the groups. No one group should be a dominate group in his opinion. He said we really don't want these people to feel they represent any particular interest group anyway and they should feel they represent the total university.

Regent McCormick said he agreed one hundred percent with Regent Ullrich. He said he brought this point out in the public hearings held by the Ad Hoc Committee. All people serving on the committee should be serving the interest of the university and not the group that recommended them.

Regent Dyer said he wanted to point out something in the letter received from Professor Gessert. He said the letter is filled with errors. There were 16 non-faculty members on the committee that screened for President Brickley and not four as reported in Professor Gessert's letter. He proceeded to read from the official minutes of the Board of Regent's meeting held on April 17, 1974, when they adopted the procedures used the last time the Board went through the selection process.

Chairman Robb said he was very concerned with Professor Gessert's communication also. He knew there were errors in the letter as he was personally involved the last time around in the selection process. He said he will answer his letter and comment on the many errors in the statement of fact contained in that letter. He will send a copy of his reply to all members of the Board. He is also going to comment in his reply on the attachment to the letter. He felt it would be very easy to show that the members of the North Central Evaluation Committee were all faculty members and thus they had a vested interest in supporting their colleagues. There was not one lay person that participated in that process which he personally felt was an error.

After some further discussion it was agreed by all members that the committee makeup as noted in #1 under the draft being considered by the committee was o.k. as is.

Chairman Robb then read paragraph #2.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the second line in paragraph #2, after "interest groups", the words, "including all members of the alumni board" should be inserted.

Chairman Robb then read paragraph #3.

Regent Bernard said she wanted to refer to Judy Keenan's letter again. She said she generally agrees with Judy that the various interest groups should be able to pick their own people.

Regent Dyer said the President of the Student Body doesn't always represent the student body as much as many of us would like to think. There are many other organizations on campus and therefore all organizations should have an opportunity to nominate someone and the Ad Hoc Committee should then make a recommendation to the total Board as to who they feel is most qualified to serve.

Regent Kinzel said she felt Regent Bernard had made a very strong point and if the student body wants to pick the student representative, she felt they should. If the faculty wanted to pick their person, they should also.

Regent Rush said there are many diverse groups such as student government, RHA, family housing organizations, many fraternities and sororities, and many, many more. Student government does not necessarily in effect represent all these groups. In his opinion, all groups should have an opportunity to make nominations.

After some discussion it was agreed by the Board members that the selections shall be weighed by placing greater emphasis on more representative groups.

Chairman Robb then read paragraph #4.

Regent McCormick said he did not want to push to be the Chairman of the Screening Committee. All Board members thought it would be very important for Regent McCormick, with his broad background and experience to serve as chairman of the committee and declined his offer to let another Board member serve in that capacity.

Paragraph #4 was approved as presented.

After some discussion of paragraph #5, it was agreed to insert the words "for the position of the President" after the word 'advertising', and change the date to August 31, 1978.

Chairman Robb read paragraph #6.

After some discussion it was agreed the final candidates brought to the campus by the Board to be interviewed would be interviewed also by the members of the Screening Committee.

After further discussion it was agreed that paragraph #6a would be revised to add a new sentence which would state "applications shall be received no later than November 20, 1978." Paragraph 6b was agreed to be retained as is. It was agreed that 6c would become Item #7. It was also agreed that 6d was proper as stated, but would become 6c, and it was also agreed that 6e would be modified to read

"The Presidential Screening Committee shall report its findings to the Board of Regents no later than Wednesday, November 29, 1978." and would become 6d.

It was agreed then that 6f would be modified only to make it in conformance with the other changes that had been made and would become #8, rather than 6f. It would read as follows: "The Board of Regents shall determine which candidates they wish to interview, notwithstanding the conditions as outlined in #7, and invite the same to visit the campus."

Regent Ullrich said he had some concern that the date should be extended so that those who may want to apply after the results of the election are known will have the opportunity to do so.

Chairman Robb said he agreed, but he felt anyone that was really interested in the job of President would watch the national news directed toward the State of Michigan and certainly would be able to tell if the position was in fact vacated. He didn't see any need to readvertise the position at that point.

Regent Kinzel asked if any of the Board members had any comments to make about Judith Johnson's letter.

Several Board members responded to Judith Johnson's letter.

After some discussion, Secretary Hawks read the Presidential Screening Process as revised, and as follows:

### The Presidential Screening Process.

1. A Presidential Screening Committee, composed of the following members, shall be established:
  - Two Students
  - Two Faculty
  - Two Administrators
  - Two Alumni
  - One Nonacademic Staff
  - Three Regents
2. Announcements shall be made in FOCUS EMU and EASTERN ECHO, and letters of invitation sent to various interest groups including all members of the Alumni Board, asking for the submission of several names to the Board of Regents Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Criteria and Procedures. The person or group making a nomination should indicate briefly the qualifications and background of the people whose names have been submitted and the person's willingness to serve on the Presidential Screening Committee.

The Presidential Screening Process - continued

3. The Regents Ad Hoc Committee on Criteria and Procedures shall recommend to the Board the members of the Presidential Screening Committee for Board action on September 20, 1978.
4. The Chairman of the Board of Regents shall appoint the chairperson of the Board's Ad Hoc Committee to serve as Chairperson of the Presidential Screening Committee. He will also appoint the two (2) other Regent members to the Committee.
5. The University will begin advertising for the position of the President in accordance with University policy on August 31, 1978.
6. The duties of the Presidential Screening Committee are:
  - a. The Presidential Screening Committee shall review all of the applications. Applications shall be received no later than November 20, 1978.
  - b. The Presidential Screening Committee shall submit the names of the top seven (approximately) candidates to the Board of Regents. The names shall be submitted as a group of qualified candidates with no order of preference. The committee should indicate the strengths and weaknesses of each of the top seven (approximately) candidates.
  - c. The Chairperson of the Presidential Screening Committee shall call the first meeting and determine the working manner and style for the Presidential Screening Committee.
  - d. The Presidential Screening Committee shall report its findings to the Board of Regents no later than Wednesday, November 29, 1978.
7. The Board of Regents shall have at their disposal all applications for review and consideration in the event the top seven candidates submitted by the Presidential Screening Committee are found to be lacking in areas that the Regents believe are important to the welfare of the University.
8. The Board of Regents shall determine which candidates they wish to interview, notwithstanding the conditions as outlined in No. 7, and invite the same to visit the campus.

.1977 M 'PRESIDENTIAL SCREENING PROCESS

It was moved by Regent Milford and supported by Regent Ullrich that the Presidential Screening Process as read by Secretary Hawks be adopted.

Motion carried.

Chairman Robb then moved to the section on advertisements, which was section #4 in the packet of materials provided the Board.

There were some modifications suggested to the advertisement section. Secretary Hawks read those back as follows:

PRESIDENT

Eastern Michigan University  
Ypsilanti, Michigan

The Board of Regents of Eastern Michigan University invites nominations and applications for the anticipated January 1, 1979, vacancy of the Presidency\*.

Eastern Michigan University, located in Ypsilanti, is a state assisted regional institution with an on-campus enrollment of approximately 18,000 students. It offers a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs.

The President of Eastern Michigan University is the Chief Executive Officer and is responsible for all aspects of administration. The President is directly responsible to the Board of Regents and exercises very broad delegated powers within University policy.

Nominations and/or applications must be accompanied with a current resume'. To facilitate the work of the Committee, nominations, applications and resumes' are encouraged to be delivered by mid October, but must be received by no later than November 20, 1978. They should be addressed to:

Presidential Screening Committee  
Board of Regents  
Pierce Hall, Room 141  
Eastern Michigan University  
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

\* The President of Eastern Michigan University is a candidate for a state-wide public office. In anticipation of his possible election on November 7, 1978, this potential vacancy is being announced at this time to allow for an expeditious selection process in the event the position is vacated.

An Equal Opportunity Employer

The Board members agreed that the advertisement as read by Secretary Hawks would be proper.

Secretary Hawks informed the Board that Regent McCormick had invited all persons that appeared before the Ad Hoc Committee hearing to notify Secretary Hawks if they had any publications they felt the advertisement should appear in. He said Judy Keenan suggested three publications, namely; Ms., Ebony and Nuestro.

It was suggested that the ad be placed in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Equal Opportunity Forum, HEARS, Wall Street Journal, New York Times and Black Enterprise.

Secretary Hawks read to the Board from some of the suggested publications. He commented that he felt these particular publications would not be appropriate for the advertisement for a President. He said the advertisement might very well appear next to an advertisement for some kind of a T-shirt or some birth control device, or what have you, and it would not bring dignity to the position of the President.

The Board agreed these publications would not be used for the advertisement. It was also agreed that Regent Bernard would notify Secretary Hawks of some additional postings that may be sent to some of the black institutions.

Chairman Robb asked the Board how they felt about the Notice that had been prepared.

(see next page)

N O T I C E

President James H. Brickley has been granted a leave of absence by the Board of Regents to campaign for his election to the office of Lieutenant Governor of the State of Michigan. The Board of Regents has decided to begin the search process for a new President in the event the position is vacated.

The Board of Regents is going to name a twelve (12) person Presidential Screening Committee to begin the process of reviewing the credentials of applicants for the position of President of Eastern Michigan University.

The Screening Committee will be made up of:

2 - students
2 - faculty
1 - nonacademic
2 - alumni
2 - administrators
3 - Regents
<u>12</u> Total

Any individual or organization is invited to nominate people to serve on this committee. The names, addresses, telephone number, and the qualifications of the individual as well as a confirmation that the person being nominated to serve is willing to serve and devote the necessary time, should be mailed to the Ad Hoc Committee of the Board of Regents, Room 141 Pierce Hall. Nominations should be received no later than September 19, 1978.

Signed: Gary D. Hawks  
Secretary, Board of Regents

It was agreed by the Board that the only thing that should be changed on the Notices going out would be to change the date to September 19, 1978.

Chairman Robb then asked about the letter that would be sent to the various interest groups. He asked if anyone had any comments to make on that.

Members of:

Student Groups  
 Alumni Board of Directors  
 Women's Commission  
 Labor Groups  
 Faculty Assembly  
 Etc.

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

President Brickley has been granted a leave of absence by the Board of Regents to campaign for his election to the Office of Lieutenant Governor of the State of Michigan. The Board of Regents has decided to begin the search process for a new President in the event the position is vacated.

The Board of Regents is going to name a twelve (12) person Presidential Screening Committee to begin the process of reviewing the credentials of applicants for the position of President of Eastern Michigan University.

The Presidential Screening Committee will be made up of:

2	-	students
2	-	faculty
1	-	nonacademic
2	-	alumni
2	-	administrators
3	-	Regents
<u>12</u>		Total

This letter is an invitation for your organization to nominate persons to serve on this very important committee. The Ad Hoc Committee of the Board of Regents will select from persons nominated from the campus community, those persons who will serve on the Presidential Screening Committee. The names, addresses, telephone number, qualifications of the individual, and a confirmation that the person being nominated to serve is willing to serve and devote the necessary time, should be sent to the Ad Hoc Committee, Board of Regents, Room 141, Pierce Hall, Eastern Michigan University. Nominations should be received by September 19, 1978.

Very serious consideration will be given to all persons nominated.

Sincerely,

Gary D. Hawks  
 Secretary, Board of Regents

It was agreed this date should also be changed to be consistent to read September 19, 1978. It was also agreed by all Board members that the last paragraph of that letter should read "Very serious consideration will be given to all persons nominated."

Chairman Robb then asked if any of the Board members had any other comments to make about anything.

All the Board members agreed that the subject had been very thoroughly discussed and the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

 awks, Secretary