

MINUTES OF A RETREAT (SPECIAL MEETING)
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BOARD OF REGENTS
DECEMBER 8-9, 1985

A retreat (special meeting) of the Board of Regents of The University of Oklahoma was held in the Regents' Room of the Kerr Conference Center, Poteau, Oklahoma, beginning on Sunday, December 8, 1985, at 4:00 p.m.

Notice of the time, date, and place of this meeting was submitted to the Secretary of State as required by Enrolled House Bill 1416 (1977 Oklahoma Legislature).

The following Regents were present: Regent John M. Imel, presiding; Regents Thomas Elwood Kemp, Charles F. Sarratt, Ronald H. White, M.D., and Sarah C. Hogan.

Absent: Regents Julian J. Rothbaum and Tom McCurdy.

Also present were President Frank E. Horton and Barbara H. Tuttle, Executive Secretary of the Board of Regents. A guest at a part of the meeting was Dr. Joseph K. Kauffman, Professor of Educational Administration at The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The first item on the agenda was listed as biographical background and the goals of each Regent. Since this was an item suggested by Regent Kemp, Regent Imel asked him exactly what he had in mind. Regent Kemp said he really thought it would be a good idea for each Regent and the President to indicate what his/her ideas are of the way the Board ought to be and what it should do and how they should view their positions and responsibilities. After a brief discussion, however, it was generally agreed that including brief biographical information also would be interesting and helpful.

Regents Imel and Kemp presented biographical information. Following Regent Kemp's presentation, he commented the main thing he didn't like about the practice of law was that he doesn't like controversy. He said he has felt badly about the controversy that has been on this Board and he has been disturbed by it quite a bit. Regent Kemp said he is deeply hopeful that the Board can work out its problems whether these are personal things the Board is in conflict over or honest differences of opinion. Surely, he said, the Regents can sit down with matters and work them out.

Regent Kemp said he has always been for things being done right - following the law, following the rules, staying inside the law. He said it seems to him that we need to follow procedures. We need to listen to our own experts in the University. Too many people want to do something besides what they are qualified for. He said there is always too much of that and in business you never see that; they have experts advising them all along the way. Regent Kemp said there is a vast pool in the University, brilliant people, but we don't really seem to listen to them.

18742

With regard to following the policies in the Regents' Policy Manual: "We don't come close to following these various things. We don't follow them. We just completely disregard them and this causes problems and it is hard for me to adjust without a set of rules because I live by the rules because it is the best way to get by". Regent Kemp said he would like to see this Board study matters and come up with an opinion. He said it is not good to be a rubber stamp for the administration and it is not good to oppose the administration all the time. But the Regents need to have a studied idea of what they stand for and then come out and do it. He said the presidency carries a moral respect and a lot of people will join a president on any board without paying any attention and if you have any ideas nobody will listen. He said there is a feeling at this University of people wanting to disregard the Board.

Regent Kemp reminded the Regents that this Board was created in 1944 by a Constitutional amendment, a strong Constitutional amendment, wanting a strong Board to stay away from politics. Regent Kemp spoke to the power of the Board and the way the courts have looked at this since 1944. He presented the following from an Oklahoma Supreme Court decision of November 20, 1984 in the case of McGaha vs. the Board of Regents:

"Traditionally, education has been held to be a governmental function. The Board of Regents serves as the governing body of The University of Oklahoma and acts as an arm of State government. The Board performs a purely governmental function when it exercises its statutory and constitutional duties. The members of the Board are constitutionally created officers and they must be free to exercise administrative discretion. Such officials are generally immunized from suit if they exercise discretion and good faith and not in a willful and wanton manner."

Mr. Kemp said the autonomy of the Board of Regents was recognized by the people of this State in 1944 as being a desirable prerequisite to maintaining a University free from external political pressures and influences. Since the date that the Board became a Constitutional State agency, there have been continued assaults on the Regents' power of government. These intrusive attempts have been largely repelled by the judiciary which has stated that the power of government in the University is vested in the Board of Regents. The McGaha decision helps to underscore the independence of the Board and the exercise of its power of government.

Regent Kemp also quoted this paragraph from the statutes:

"The Board of Regents of The University of Oklahoma shall have the supervision, management, and control of The University of Oklahoma and all of its integral parts and shall have the following additional duties."

He also cited the following from various sections of the By-laws of the Board of Regents:

"The Board of Regents has full responsibility and authority to the extent specified by law for the control and the administration of the University. Its functions are legislative to the extent of establishing all general policies affecting the University, the general policies and purposes of the separate schools and colleges, their relation one to another, and the prescribing of such rules and regulations as may bring these policies into effect."

"The officers of the Board shall consist of a Chairman/Chairwoman, a Vice Chairman/Vice Chairwoman, and an Executive Secretary."

"The Chairman/Chairwoman of the Board shall preside at all its meetings but shall have full right of discussion and voting.

He/she shall approve, on behalf of the Board of Regents, the general orders of the Board and approve emergency appointments as they may from time to time arise.

He/she shall sign all diplomas.

He/she shall submit to the Board such recommendations and information as he/she shall consider proper concerning the business of the University.

He/she shall appoint all committees not specifically named by the vote creating them."

Regent Kemp stated these are all of the duties of the Chairman of the Board. He reminded the Regents that he has said all along that the Chairman of the Board doesn't have any extra authority; this is a small Board and there is no additional authority in a Chairman of the Board. Regent Kemp said that each one of the presidents that he has served under has felt that there was some kind of special power of the Chairman and elected to do more business with the Chairman of the Board than with the rest of the Regents. He said any powers that they take in addition to what is listed are just powers that they take on their own.

Regent Kemp also read the following from the By-Laws regarding the duties of the Executive Secretary:

"The Executive Secretary of the Board shall keep an accurate record of the proceedings of the Board and shall have the care of all communications and reports made to the Board.

"He/she shall notify the President of the University of all votes, orders, or resolutions of the Board relating to the management and control of the University or to the teachers and employees therein.

"He/she shall be the custodian of the official seal of the Regents."

Regent Kemp said this is more or less the extent of the duties of the Executive Secretary as defined by the Board of Regents. He said he has felt in the law one of the strongest things that he has observed is an accurate record in any proceedings. If you don't have an accurate record, you can't succeed in law cases. He said he believes strongly in an accurate record and he has felt that the Board has taken the minutes too lightly.

Regent Imel commented on the need for the proceedings of the Board to be summarized and then it is up to the Regents to read the summary and make changes, corrections, amendments, if necessary. Regent Imel said a complete recording of the proceedings is maintained and a transcription can be provided at any time. He suggested if any Regent feels that more detail is required in the minutes, they should feel free to suggest it. He said no Regent should feel reticent about any matter. "If you don't understand something, ask a question. If you feel an issue should be enlarged upon, lay it out on the table and see how everybody feels about it."

Regent Kemp expressed his concerns about the minutes of the special meeting held on November 25 regarding his discussion of the procedure used in the sale of land to Hitachi. After a discussion, it was agreed the complete transcription from the November 25 meeting of the discussion about the procedure used for the sale of land to Hitachi should be prepared for possible inclusion in the minutes.

Regent Kemp cited differences between the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the OU Board. He said the State Regents are a coordinating Board and only have four or five general areas of concern as follows:

1. Prescribe standards of higher education applicable to each institution.
2. Determine the functions and courses of study in each of the institutions.
3. Grant degrees and other forms of academic recognition.
4. Recommend to the State Legislature the budget allocations to each institution.
5. Recommend to the Legislature proposed fees for all such institutions and any such fees shall be effective only within the limits prescribed by the Legislature after taking due cognizance of expressed legislative intent.
6. Allocate funds to each institution according to its needs and functions from appropriations made by the Legislature.

Mr. Kemp said they have a very, very limited role and he thought Dr. Horton might think they have a stronger role in the governance of The University of Oklahoma. Regent Kemp said he sees so much attention paid to the State Regents; in fact, too much attention.

Regent Kemp said he thinks the Board of Regents on basic issues has got to be notified - they want to be, they should be, they have the duty and the responsibility. He said the ordinary running of the University and the day-to-day affairs of the institution should be left to the President but he thinks the President can tell when something is touch and go and should be discussed with the Board. He cited some examples, such as the Henry Bellmon matter, making TV contracts, etc. Dr. Horton indicated he understands all that Mr. Kemp is saying and doesn't disagree, but he does not believe it is always clear what should be discussed with individual Regents and the different matters in which they are particularly interested. Regent Kemp commented it is better to err on the side of taking it to the Board than to ignore the Board.

Regent Kemp quoted the following:

"The Board of Regents of The University of Oklahoma is responsible for governing the University. The University President only has that authority delegated to him by the Board and his actions are subject to review by the Board."

Regent Kemp said he is only citing the law now - the application and how it is done is another story; there is a lot of leeway. He suggested the President "come up with some solutions and give us an up or down on it. I want to see it worked out among us, sit down and discuss it, what has to be done".

Regent Kemp commented on the Hitachi situation and the fact that he believes it will be a problem. He does not think they have the authority to do it that way at all. He cited a constitutional provision that no alien or any person who is not a citizen of the United States shall acquire title to or own land in the State of Oklahoma. In response to Regent Imel's comment that Hitachi has set up a subsidiary, an Oklahoma corporation, Regent Kemp stated there is also a provision that you can't do indirectly what you can't do directly. Regent Kemp believes from a legal standpoint there is a problem. He said the Regents should have been involved in this earlier because the University can get into problems and the Board will be responsible for it. Regent Kemp also called attention to the Regents' policy "not to sell any property now owned by the University in view of the fact that the Board is interested in acquiring additional land".

There was a lengthy discussion regarding this policy. It was generally agreed that this Board is not bound by this policy or any other Board policy; that any policy can be changed by the Board or the Board can make exceptions to the policy. Regent Kemp was concerned, however, that the administration ignored the policy - the Board can ignore it anytime it wants to but the administration should not.

Regent Kemp stated he wants to establish cooperation among the Regents, respect for each other, follow the rules, and discuss with each other the problems.

Regent Sarratt presented biographical information, following which he indicated some goals as follows:

1. For the Board to be in harmony - he doesn't like controversy.
2. He feels the individual Board members have various experiences which can be beneficial for the University.
3. He would like the various Board members to listen to each other and they should be listened to by the administration, that Board members study University matters a lot more than people on the campus think.
4. Judgment is only as good as the information. Regent Sarratt does not believe the information the Board is receiving is adequate enough to make the decisions. He urged additional information in order for the Board to make the right decisions.
5. Trust. He urged trust on both sides.

Regent White presented biographical information about himself. He said among concerns of the Regents are making the right decisions and being able to contribute. He agreed with Regent Sarratt that people need to listen and just not to listen, but to hear. He stressed that Board members do have something to contribute and the Board can be used as a sounding board for advice. He suggested the President's office should consult with the Regents on a continuing basis and ask for input and then formulate a decision. Regent White said all the goals can be thrown out the window if the Board can't work together. He believes one of the most crucial things the Board has to face right now is not being able to agree on enough things. He said there is nothing wrong with healthy disagreement, but respect must go along with that disagreement. Among his goals he listed:

1. For the University to be in the top 20 or 25 state universities in the country.
2. To see the general education requirements of the University put into effect.
3. To have a strong commitment to research and the tools that it will require, which for the Library would require a concentrated effort now to increase periodicals. The concentrated effort could be either a media blitz or an alumni blitz to see that the periodicals are brought up to what is necessary for the research.

Regent White said that in order for all of this to come about it will be necessary for the Board and the President to finally go forward and urge a change in the funding structure of higher education in the State of Oklahoma. He agreed also that the President should run the University.

Regent Hogan distributed a written résumé. She also distributed the following information on her goals:

1. To be accredited by the Association of American Universities.
2. To identify the areas of education where we are strong and develop those programs into departments/colleges which would be recognized as superior both nationally and internationally.
3. To increase faculty salaries to the national level.
4. To initiate a five- and ten-year Endowment Campaign with a defined goal for each year.
5. To identify businesses that will benefit economically by being located in close proximity to the Health Sciences Center and the Norman Campus to further develop a partnership between the University and the economy of the State.
6. To recruit outstanding professors in targeted areas, outstanding graduate students, and increase substantially the number of merit scholars.
7. To have an on-going plan for State-wide recognition and appreciation of professors and programs with one special day set aside for added emphasis.
8. To build and complete the Family Medicine Center with an adjunct student center at the Health Sciences Center.
9. To build and complete a Research Tower at Health Sciences Center with recruitment of nationally recognized doctors to fit into the research program.
10. To continue to involve our alumni in every way possible not only for fiscal support but as users of the continuing education programs.
11. To add significantly each year to the number of volumes in our libraries and to raise the level of current serials from 78th nationally into the forties.

12. To complete phase three of the Music Building.
13. To build a Museum for the Stovall.

President Horton also participated by providing biographical information. He then presented his short-term goals as President, summarized as follows:

1. A new budgeting process in order to have the proper amount of control in terms of budget allocations and expenditures.
2. A position control system in order to control the number of positions throughout the institution.
3. A capital planning process.
4. Developing relations with the staff.
5. Staff - developing what his expectations are as far as when a staff member should come to him with a particular issue and when they can go ahead.
6. The disbursement of Foundation funds: implementing an approval process for the disbursement of Foundation funds including what the requirements will be in terms of receipts and identification of business purposes of expenditures.
7. The implementation of an Office of Business and Industrial Cooperation. He said he will begin searching for a director soon but that it will be an internal search. He does not view this as a full-time position but wants to put somebody there who will remain part-time in their own department.
8. Developing the international area.
9. The 3.5% savings in this year's budget that has been requested by the Governor has now been identified at the Norman Campus and at the Health Sciences Center. Since the Governor has now requested additional savings, he will be discussing with the staff on Wednesday whether the institution can go to the 4.5% savings for this year. He said because of the deployment of resources in the fall, no matter what you call this, it is still a cut.

Dr. Joseph K. Kauffman arrived.

Regent Sarratt talked about the desirability of developing an advisory committee to help in the development of the Energy Center. Dr. Horton agreed he would like to have an advisory committee for the Energy Center to work with the Director. Mr. Sarratt suggested such a group should be involved in the selection of the new Director also. Dr. Horton said he is thinking about the following for a search committee for the new Director: Dr. Jischke, Dean Stehli, Dr. Mankin, and a faculty member nominated by the Senate. He said he can bring in somebody else also. He expects the search to be limited to someone already on the campus. Regent Sarratt suggested more people on the search committee from the outside; that the committee not be overloaded with inside people. He also indicated he is opposed to the search being limited to someone currently on the campus. This matter was discussed at some length with Mr. Sarratt strongly urging that the search committee include more than one outsider. He said they are going to bring a lot with them, in knowledge and in opening a lot of doors in other places.

In response to questions from the Regents about his rationale for appointing the Director from within the University, Dr. Horton said he thinks it is important at this point and there are several faculty members already on the campus who are very well qualified. He said we have to bring the faculty in or else there is no Energy Center: we don't have the faculty research capability. He believes the people on the campus have viewed the Energy Center with a great deal of skepticism: they haven't felt that it has brought the programs together, that it has had a research mission, that a program that makes sense in a University context given the purpose of the Energy Center has been brought together. Dr. Horton said he thinks it will be very useful and supportive of the Energy Center concept to get the faculty behind that Energy Center concept. He thinks it desirable to identify somebody with certain kinds of research and academic credentials as well as the entrepreneurial capability for that position and that it is possible to find the two different types in the same person. He believes the faculty will get behind the Energy Center better if someone is selected from within.

Regent Kemp then raised questions about why the President is deciding on this. Why not the Board? He suggested the entire rationale should be presented to the Board and let a decision be made by the full Board because this is a very important decision. Questions were raised about the job description of the Energy Center Director at which point Dr. Kauffman interjected that the first thing that should be asked are what are the goals of the Energy Center and who is going to decide what they are. He said that has to be consonant with how you select a Director. The Regents asked Dr. Horton to comment on what the duties have been and what he thinks the duties should be. Dr. Horton said in the past primarily the duties were fund-raising but there was some ancillary work in putting together an energy conference last summer and he did interface with international people who came to the campus and who were interested in energy - he made sure they got around to the various departments and programs in which they were interested, etc. Dr. Horton stated he thinks the position in the future should be:

1. Some fund-raising,
2. To build a relationship with energy related firms: find out what their research interests and needs are and probably their continuing education needs,
3. Development of research programs that are multi-disciplinary in nature (there are eight to 10 disciplines involved, primarily energy related research), and
4. To develop a contractual base for that research including extramural funding from both the private sector and from the federal government to fund research activities.

Dr. Horton had commented earlier that he did not believe this position should be at the level of executive officer and the pros and cons were discussed. Dr. Horton said he would not change the reporting lines until the new Provost comes in but he believes the individual should be told up front that he will be reporting to the Provost.

Regent Kemp suggested this is a very important position and that the individual should be selected the same as the President was selected; that is, three or four people would be recommended to the Board and the Board would take the final action. During the discussion, Dr. Horton indicated he does not have anybody in mind within the University but he knows of at least ten people on the faculty that he thinks would have some of the qualifications, that have the kind of credentials and the capacity to work both sides of the aisle inside the University and out.

There was further discussion about the outside people for the search committee for this position and it was generally agreed that John Houchin, Brian O'Brien, Howard Kauffman, and Murray Gullatt should be contacted to determine if they would be willing to participate in the search committee. There was general agreement among the Regents also that if this search committee looks at the criteria and agrees that limiting the search to within the University is satisfactory, then the Regents will agree to go along with that. At the request of the Regents, Dr. Horton agreed to put together a job description for this position.

Regent Sarratt requested an inventory of everything the University owns, including people. This matter was discussed at some length, following which it was agreed there will be a report presented at the Regents' meeting on Thursday of the inventory procedures on both campuses of the University along with information on the total number of employees. Dr. Horton also agreed to provide a list of the vacancies on each campus as soon as possible. He does not think this could be prepared by Thursday. He also indicated that an inventory of all land owned by the University would be submitted to the Regents immediately.

There was a discussion about the cuts or "savings" for this year's budget. Regent Imel asked whether it would be possible for more cuts to come from the non-academic area than the academic area. President Horton said the cuts this year are not across-the-board, that about 2% of the 3.5% savings is in the non-academic area and 1.5% in the academic area. The problem, though, is that the academic area is such a large portion of the budget compared to the non-academic area. He called attention to the fact the academic budget includes support staff for the faculty. The budget that is in the Provost's area on the Norman Campus is about 75% of the Norman budget. All of the rest of the vice presidents together have about 25% of the budget. Dr. Horton said it is a lot tougher for the vice presidents to come up with their percentage than it is for the Provost because most of the money is in the Provost's area.

Dr. White called attention to the fact that two or three years ago at one of the enrichment sessions prior to a Regents' meeting, one of the department heads talked to the Regents about how they arrived at their merit pay raises. Dr. White said this was very interesting and that it might be worthwhile to have the deans in at different meetings throughout the year to explain how they assign merit pay raises, teaching loads, promotions, etc.

The meeting recessed at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting reconvened on December 9, 1985 at 8:15 a.m. in the same location.

President Horton formally introduced Dr. Joseph K. Kauffman and thanked him for taking time out of his busy schedule to join the Regents at this retreat.

Dr. Kauffman said he does not pretend to know anything about the University or its problems and that he will speak briefly in general terms and then he said he would like to be responsive to the concerns of the Regents and the President and have whatever discussion they want to have.

Dr. Kauffman discussed the American system of lay governing boards. He said it is a unique system and governing boards are as good as the people that comprise them. He said there is no formal kind of organization or way for the Regents to act or organize. They have to do it themselves and in some ways that's something we ought to celebrate - the freedom to be different and do things the way we think would be best - and that obviously is a challenge. Dr. Kauffman said there are lots of things written about the functions and responsibilities of governing boards, just as there are about presidents. John Nason, who did a book for the Association of Governing Boards, lists 13 responsibilities of boards. Dr. Kauffman said he is not going to recite all of these but he focused attention on three responsibilities or expectations of a board. He believes these three things are the ones that relate most clearly to the discussion today. One, that governing board members are responsible for the

long-range welfare of the University. They are the guardians of the mission and the purpose of the University. Although the Regents delegate many of their responsibilities to be carried out by others, particularly by the President, they have the power of review or the power of approval of major decisions and that is a very important power which really can never be delegated.

The second is that boards act both as a buffer between the campus and society and a bridge between the campus and society. Regents protect the University from improper interference from outside but also are a force inside for constructive change and adaptation to the needs of society. In both of these roles, boards are seen as guarding the public interest.

The third is that the Board provides for the governance of the University. Even though the Board doesn't govern the University in detail, it does appoint and remove the President, and other officers as well, and approve the administrative structure of the University. Boards also recognize faculty, staff, student, and alumni organizations and without that recognition those organizations are not allowed to participate in governance.

Dr. Kauffman said whatever other responsibilities the governing board has, the selection of the President is the first priority. A board cannot function without its own chief executive officer and, along with the appointment, the maintenance of effective relations with the President is of number one importance. Developing the relationship that will enable the President to be effective is absolutely crucial, and replacing a President when the Board believes that person does not best serve the institution is another responsibility the Board cannot delegate.

Dr. Kauffman said the President's authority is derived from the Regents. "The extent to which your President is seen as operating within a broad delegation of authority will determine how the President is viewed by faculty, by staff, by students, by the general public. The extent to which you give that person a broad delegation of authority, if it's seen as narrow, not worthy of being trusted with very much, lack of confidence in that person's judgment, etc., that will affect the way that person is seen by all the various constituent groups, including the public, and you will not be able to have as effective a President as you might have liked. So it's very important that you understand how the President is viewed by the publics with whom the President has to deal. And it is very much related to the extent to which you give a broad delegation of authority.

Now, obviously, whenever authority is delegated it's constrained by at least these two factors: it's constrained by the fact that such authority will be utilized within board approved policies and guidelines. It's not the President going off on his own and doing whatever he thinks. The President operates within broad policies and guidelines that have been approved by the Board. And, the second factor is that the more significant actions of the President are subject to the board's review so that even though the President acts or has to act in urgent situations, the matters will come to you - will either be reported to you or brought to you for action or formal approval. And you always have the opportunity to review how the President is carrying out that delegated authority given from the board."

Professor Kauffman presented the following additional comments:

"Ideally the expectations of the Board and the President are compatible with one another. Conflict, particularly constant conflict, is easily observable it constrains proper actions, and it's ultimately harmful to the University. The only way you can avoid this, it seems to me, is candid communication and continuous efforts to maintain an effective relationship. This kind of a retreat is a wonderful thing and I hope you will do it at least once a year in order to clear the air in a mutually beneficial way. In another little publication, John Nason said the relationship is a paradoxical one. The President is the agent of the Board, its employee hired to carry out its policy mandates, and yet at the same time the Board looks or ought to look to the President for leadership. You can't really function very effectively without a President who knows what is going on, suggesting to you what you ought to be approving. And at the same time the President is your employee and under you, and if you have a President who waits to be told what you want him to do you won't know enough about what you want that person to do. And if everyone is protecting their prerogatives, you don't have a very good situation. So you have to have a good enough relationship where you are not afraid to speak candidly and not afraid to take risks and so on. The faculty, the staff, the students, and the public look to the President to lead the institution, not to hide behind the fact, 'Well, the Board did not ask me to do that.' You have to assume leadership and you have to assume that the President will identify problems and make the key public policy recommendations to the Board for their consideration. They may not always approve what the President recommends but they ought to expect recommendations from the President.

"When you hire a President you look for leadership qualities, you check out a candidate, you want to be sure they have sound judgment, discretion, good character, highly successful experience in their previous administrative role and obviously then if you find such a person and select them, you should give them plenty of elbow room and as few constraints as possible because there are already more constraints than one can humanly accept in being a president. In the Clark Kerr report, 'Presidents Make a Difference', one of the thrusts is that the presidency is becoming too short a term for the long-range view, long-range health of our universities; four and one-half, five-year kind of period. And that one of the reasons for this is the increasing constraints on a president, making it difficult to on the one hand assume responsibility and accountability for being the leader and on the other, have all the forces which keep you from being able to make a decision or make anything final or deal with matters in your own best judgment because of these constraints.

"I'd like to also suggest that you try to look at the board/president relationship from the president's point of view as well as from your own point of view. He's a professional, making a career out of being an educator and educational leader. Obviously, when you select someone to be a president that puts them at the top of their professional career and in their professional career, security where they are before you bring them here. You select someone who is doing so well they could stay where they are indefinitely and yet you bring that person into a new situation, probably the only new person for the next few

months at least, and they must prove themselves all over again. They must be vulnerable right off the start. There are not many professionals who move to the height of their career and become vulnerable all over again and insecure and so on. And, this is something that many boards forget, the new president is often totally dependent for his success upon his relationship with a group of part-time volunteer laypersons who may not give them the time of day. Or, conversely, may all come to his office every day and want to sit around and talk with him. It depends, those are the two extremes: being abandoned or have everybody coming in who wants to see what came in the mail and tell you how to answer your letters. So, the Board insensitivity to the fact that this highly successful professional that they have selected is now pretty much going to be measured as successful in his career by the relationship that's developed with that new Board. That's a terribly important thing to understand and there aren't many professions in which people put themselves in that kind of position. That relationship then is crucial and the Board Chairperson/President relationship is crucial as well. So the quality of the relationship is important to the president's success, the University's welfare.

"One of the common expressions about all of this is that the Board should concern itself only with policy matters and not get into administration. And we have all sorts of discussions about what's policy and what's administration and so on. I want to comment on that. I don't like the dichotomy that's created between policy and administration as though one could easily build a wall around each and have everyone recognize that one is policy and one is administration. Let me just say a few words about that. It should be clear that the governing board's responsible for setting and approving policy. No one argues with that. And the President is delegated the authority and responsibility for carrying out the approved policies of the Board. Obviously, there will be some unanticipated matters that won't be covered and the President will have to act on the assumption that the Board will support him when he brings that back to the Board; that he had to act and there wasn't really a policy and this is what I did and is that OK? The President may have to create some interim policy arrangement and then ask the Board to make that a formal policy. I want to emphasize my belief that there is what I call reciprocity here. The Board should not promulgate policy without obtaining the advice of its President. I don't think Boards should go off in a room somewhere and come back and say to the President, 'Well, here's the policy we decided on. You go carry it out.' The Board should expect the President's recommendations and advice when it creates policy. And it would be most unusual for the President to give such advice to a Board without some consultation on his part with the faculty or the staff or the students who are going to be affected by that policy. Sometimes we forget that colleges and universities, in addition to being educational institutions, are really political communities, maybe miniature political communities, although many of them are the size of pretty good towns and cities. But they are political communities and the President has to deal with the constituent groups. And after enough political, by political I mean that in the best sense of the term, not pejorative, has to deal with those constituents and their representatives much as the mayor of a city or any other official to get their cooperation. It's awfully difficult to implement a policy if the people that have to live with it consider it illegitimate, or that they had nothing to say about it. Even though they may agree with it, they may be offended by the way the policy was created and that they weren't

respected enough to be able to at least comment on it, etc. So, when the President gives you advice or when you want to act rapidly you should keep in mind that the President needs an opportunity to consult with the appropriate people on campus who are going to be either affected by the policy or are going to have to carry it out. The President is in a kind of 'mayor role'. There is a lot that has to be done by persuasion and leadership and you can't just say well, 'I can't help it, we all have to do it because the Board said so'. The President is going to be seen as weak if he hasn't provided that bridge that enables some consultation. Similarly, when a President is about to undertake any major administrative action, in my opinion, the President would be wise to seek the advice of key Board members. Especially the Board Chair. Even though it's an administrative matter, it seems to me if it's going to be a significant administrative matter or if you are going to read about it in the papers, the President ought to seek the advice of key Board members. Above all, the Board Chairperson and the University President must establish excellent communication and keep one another informed because both are expected to be knowledgeable about the actions of the other.

"Well in my view an effective President must have a strong Board. And I'm going to say something that may seem contradictory here, but I don't think it is. I think a strong President and an effective President must have a strong Board that makes clear its right to review on all major policy matters affecting the University. Fiscal matters, quality and standards matters, faculty tenure, etc. I think the authority of the President is enhanced by a Board that insists on its right to review such major matters, although it should be clear the Board should expect the President's recommendation before acting. Now I say that may seem contradictory, but my own experience is that if the President is seen as the only one who cares about fiscal responsibility, about academic standards, about quality, etc. that it is fairly easy to gang up on the President and try to run over him because who do you think you are, the Board wouldn't mind if we did this, the public wouldn't mind, etc., you're the only one, its not your money, or whatever, etc. I think to be a strong President you need and I'll say the threat, I don't mean the threat in quotes though, the threat of 'I'll have to take that up with the Board, you know, I can't decide that on my own. That's a matter that the Board will have to deliberate, etc.' Without having a strong Board insisting on its right to review, right to approve significant matters, it seems to me the President is weakened rather than strengthened. So I believe that an effective President should have a strong Board, making clear that it expects to review and approve policy matters and I add to that that the Board would act only after receiving the President's advice and recommendation.

"I want to make clear that it's in the Board's interest to have a President seen as effective with the Board, as having the respect of the Board. That's terribly important for the constituent groups and the public to see that the President has the respect of the Board and it's terribly important for the Board to be seen as conducting its 'right to review' in a rational manner, rather than capricious or arbitrary manner. And this means when matters come to the Board there's Presidential advice; they don't have to accept it but they expect it. The Board follows due process, they are willing to listen to duly authorized governance bodies - faculty, students, whoever - who wish to address the Board

on the matter, that this is seen as rational and predictable, not necessarily in the outcome but in the way in which matters will be considered. Because if there's a lot of turbulence seen in the conduct of the Board business, automatically it will be assumed that the President does not know how to deal with the Board. If you don't know what's going to happen at a Board meeting and it's different every time and something comes off the wall and something gets voted without the President even being asked what he thinks, the assumption will be that, sure the Board is kind of, well they are all part-time unpaid people and you can't really blame them, the President can't seem to get them to work together."

Professor Kauffman addressed the need to create an effective environment for presidential leadership. He also talked a bit about the desirability of a board self-evaluation periodically. He indicated the Association of Governing Boards has developed self-study guidelines and criteria to assist boards in doing this. Professor Kauffman then related the board self-evaluation to the fact that the board is also concerned with evaluating the President. He thinks it is wise for there to be an annual informal session with the President to go over the year's events in a mutually beneficial way; that is, in a coaching or counseling way in which the Board has an opportunity to communicate to the President its thoughts on presidential performance and the President has the opportunity as well to comment on things he wishes the board would do to help. He said there does need to be some mutual understanding about the board's expectations on priorities of effort - the agenda of the President. The President should have a chance to share with the board his concerns about how things are going and how he wishes the board could be more helpful in certain areas.

Regent Imel then summarized very briefly for Professor Kauffman the background of the various Board members, the fact that the two senior Board members are absent because of illness and a bit about the most recent search process. He commented that as the discussion continues there are probably some issues that are lingering on the minds of the Regents that are not Frank Horton issues but are hang-ups from the previous administration that have caused a great deal of concern to one or more Regents.

Regent Imel brought up the internal audit system at the University and asked Professor Kauffman to address that issue. He said under the previous administration the auditor was controlled pretty much by the President. The President annually approved the audit plan but it was never presented to the Board and there was never any particular interest in the audits except that they were conducted. He said in recent months the Board has taken greater interest because of some issues that have come up and the Board wants a stronger audit program.

Professor Kauffman said he does not pose as a financial expert but he has been responsible for institutions and so he does have views about the internal audit process. He believes that all administrative offices should report to the President; that the Board should not have any other administrative officer reporting to it, including the financial officer. The President is responsible for the fiscal integrity of the institution and has to see to it that

it is handled properly, and he has to have a financial or business officer under him. Professor Kauffman said he believes it is a sign of lack of confidence in the President if there is a fiscal operating officer reporting directly to the Board instead of to the President - you in effect have two kinds of presidents. He said this doesn't mean that the Board can't have a financial vice president making reports to them at a meeting, etc., but it is clear to that person that he or she works under the supervision of the President and the President is never off the hook about the fiscal integrity of the institution. With regard to the audit function, Professor Kauffman believes that the auditing function has to be insulated somewhat from the controller function. He said if the audits go directly to the Board and the President does not know about them, it undermines the President. On the other hand, he believes that it is crucial that the Board have some channel by which audit reports can come to it when the auditor believes there are matters that should concern the Board. They should not be able to be stopped by the administration - no one in the University should be able to tell the auditor don't bring that to the Board. He emphasized that the Board must insist that the auditor have access to the Board, a direct channel to the Board. At the same time, however, the draft audit reports should be seen by the President. He should be able to comment on it, find out what is happening before the Board begins to ask questions. Professor Kauffman also indicated that anything that comes under the Board's responsibility should be audited.

President Horton said that in looking at previous policies of how the internal auditor was operating, one of the problems he saw immediately was that the auditor didn't have the authority to ensure that the responses from the various areas would be forthcoming. He said he has instituted an internal policy now with an established time line in which the various areas must respond. The only person with the authority to approve a delay in response is the President. The only way a delay can be approved is if some problem is identified in terms of data collection or something of that sort. President Horton indicated he has developed a draft internal audit policy that he will be sending out to the Board members that can be discussed at a future meeting, probably the January meeting.

Professor Kauffman reiterated that everything should be subject to audit; nothing should be off limits. There ought to be an audit schedule with possibly some accounts audited more frequently than others. All audits should be submitted to the Board, not only those the auditor thinks the Board should see, but all audits. The auditor should present the audit reports to the President before they are final so the President is not caught by surprise at the next Board meeting. Decisions regarding the auditor's employment or termination should be joint decisions. There was a brief discussion of how the Board should proceed in the event actual criminal conduct in the handling of funds is involved. There was also a discussion of the Board's right to audit Foundation funds. Professor Kauffman said he is not a lawyer and not an accountant, but he believes that the Board of the Foundation has the first responsibility when it accepts the money in the Foundation. He said if any of the money is expended on behalf of The University of Oklahoma, then this Board is involved and when any money is expended for the University, it seems to him that it would be subject to review by this Board. If any employee of the University spends any of that money, then that employee is serving under this Board's purview and not the Foundation Board's purview. Professor Kauffman expressed the view that any expenditure from any source by University of Oklahoma employees is subject to audit.

In response to a question from Regent Sarratt, Professor Kauffman said he does not think anything should be kept secret from the Board. If it is a matter that cannot be discussed in open session, it would seem that the President one-on-one would acquaint each Board member privately with matters that ought to be a concern of the Board. He said, obviously, if the Board wants the President to come to them with confidential matters that concern the institution, he has to be assured that it is not going any further.

Regent Sarratt talked about developing a plan of major issues that might be anticipated and discussing these with the Board in advance, not necessarily for action. He suggested educating the Board about issues the University faces that might not require action at this time but might require action sometime in the future and the Board needs to be informed.

Regent White brought up a point that has been discussed by the Regents over the last several months and was discussed with the Coopers & Lybrand representatives when they did the Management Study: the question of who is employed by the Board of Regents and how does the Board relate to the President's staff. He commented that the Regents are totally dependent in making decisions upon the information they receive and it is the feeling of some Board members that the Regents may not at all times get accurate information. He raised a question about the Board employing a financial advisor to decipher the information for the Regents that is presented by the President's staff and present it to the Board in a form that would be in the Board's best interests and to have someone who would gather information for the Regents on items that are occurring prior to a meeting. Regent White asked Dr. Kauffman if he sees this type of job in other universities across the country and asked for his thoughts on the advantages or disadvantages of such a position. He also asked his thoughts on the type of staff the Board needs.

Professor Kauffman said he does not know of any university where there is a separate Board staff dealing independently with the Board as opposed to the President and the administration dealing with the Board. "The point is the President is your executive officer. It is not on the other side. And the minute you lose confidence in the President, you have to find someone else. You can't really create a staff to tell you whether the President is telling you the truth or not. If you are unable to have confidence in the President and the President's ability to attract and supervise a good administration, then you have to find another President. There is no way you can develop a whole other category of professionals. Then you would wonder whether those professionals have been co-opted by the President and the others, and you would have to find someone else to examine their recommendations, and so on. I just do not see any way - first of all universities do not have anyone but the President reporting to them other than the auditors. You in effect would have two presidents or three presidents if you start having people independently reporting to you."

Professor Kauffman said the Board must deal with the fact they must have a President they can trust and when they lose that trust, they have to find someone else. He suggested they shouldn't try to build a whole thing

around it as a defense against a President in whom they have lost confidence. He said he does not see how a President can tolerate having a Board with someone on the administration reporting directly to that Board. He does not see how a President can be responsible as a chief executive officer if there is somebody else second guessing him all the time. Professor Kauffman said the Board should make clear what their expectations are and this was the reason he was talking about the annual evaluations and periodically meeting with the President so that both will have an opportunity to convey disappointments, expectations, hopes, criticism, and straighten things out. He said the President's office serves the Board and the Regents should make clear to the President what they expect him to provide, that they are getting executive summaries, highlights, that it is in a form the Board can understand. Professor Kauffman said if an additional person to report to the Board is employed, the Board is selling the President short and undermining the whole University. He said the Board must insist that things be fixed; that strengthens the President's ability to get everybody's attention inside the University to do what needs to be done.

Regent White brought up the question of the Executive Secretary position and the fact that the person in that position works closely with the President's office and with the Regents and the question has been raised to whom does she owe allegiance on certain issues. Professor Kauffman said she should not ever be put in the position of feeling that she's got to choose between loyalty to the President or the Board. He said there should be no conflict between the President and the Board as though they are on opposing sides. They are both management. The President is the Board's agent.

There was a brief discussion about placing items on the agenda and Professor Kauffman agreed that the President of the University and the Board members should be able to place items on the agenda for discussion. There was a discussion of the role of the Chairman of the Board with Regent Kemp expressing the opinion that the Chairman has specified duties but not any authority. Professor Kauffman said traditionally the President of the University in consultation with the Chairman of the Board would set the agenda for a Regents' meeting. Nevertheless, traditionally any Board member that wants something added has that prerogative. Professor Kauffman said the Executive Secretary is the appointee of the Board. He or she has to work very closely with the President and the President's office. In terms of loyalty, no matter what, that person has to feel that he/she can come to Board members with matters which the Executive Secretary thinks ought to be brought to them. "Now, if I were doing it, I would say they should come to the President and say I think this is a matter which should be brought to the Board Chair, or whatever, and let him decide whether or not to call the Board members, and if the President disagrees and you still feel you are right, you should go to the Board Chair because you are their appointee. You should never feel that the President has told you to shut up and you have no recourse, that you have to just be quiet. You have an obligation to the Board when you disagree with the President to tell the Chair. You are their employee, but in practice day after day you are working with the President's staff in a harmonious relationship."

Regent Sarratt raised a question about a person in an interim position being a candidate for the permanent position; specifically, in the presidency. Professor Kauffman said he has a paragraph on that in his book on the selection of presidents and it is his opinion that the person serving as acting president should not be a candidate for the position. He believes it is poor policy, it usually scares off some candidates who decide the matter is probably all fixed and there is no sense in their pursuing the position, and the person in the acting position worries about the advice they receive. He said the Board should always choose someone who clearly is not a candidate for the position.

There was then a discussion of the same thing at the vice presidential level, the dean level, or the director of an office level. Professor Kauffman said at the lower levels he views this very differently because you are talking about maintaining the function and not a national search and all of that. With regard to the deanship of major colleges, he said, first the faculty leadership must be consulted and he would always try to find a senior person who is respected, who is clearly not going to be concerned with anything but keeping the place going for six months until someone else comes in, and would try to avoid the bright, young, rising star who is going to be seeking that position. He said the minute you insert a temporary person who is a candidate, perhaps the leading candidate, everyone gets very cynical about whether it is really a legitimate search and it undermines everything. He said if you are dealing with financial aids or admissions or a similar area, and you really have no one else but the number two person there to keep the place running, then you go with that.

The Regents and President Horton expressed appreciation to Professor Kauffman for his willingness to come and present information to the Board and to discuss various issues of interest to them. Professor Kauffman retired from the meeting.

A discussion of a policy on interim officers being candidates for permanent positions continued. President Horton said the policy he would like to follow, if the Board is in agreement, is that in the main he would not appoint people into deanships or vice presidential positions who are going to be candidates. He thinks, on the other hand, from time to time there is going to be a situation where somebody emerges as the person we probably should put in that position because the college can't tolerate anybody else in that acting position and he will report to the Board that this is an exception to the general policy. He believes it should be understood that generally he will avoid placing an interim officer in a position for which they might be a candidate. But he believes if there is an absolute restriction on it, we will end up violating our own policy somewhere. President Horton did agree that a definite policy for president and provosts on both campuses might be desirable. He suggested the following policy:

In the event a vacancy occurs in the positions of president or provost, the position will be filled by a person who will not be eligible to be a candidate for that position. The same would be true for positions of vice president and deans except unusual circumstances.

The exact terminology was discussed at some length and it was generally agreed that President Horton will work out the wording and bring a proposed policy to the January meeting.

President Horton said he would like to speak a little to the objectives of a University. He reminded the Regents that very often the issues that come to the Board are issues that are not close to the central purpose of the University and it is good just once in a while to reflect on the objectives of a major comprehensive public research university. He said in a very simplistic way, the three pieces of a major comprehensive public university are its instructional programs - undergraduate, graduate, and professional - its research programs and its public service programs. Dr. Horton said his assumption is the Regents want the best possible programs in all three of those areas, recognizing the limited resources. In that respect, there has to be some allocation and reallocation of resources based on the idea that we will try to maintain strength where we have it, and when resources are available, to increase the strengths of those to bring them all to excellence. He said this can't happen in the short run and if resources are never there, it may never happen across the board in those strong instructional programs, that everyone of them is excellent. Part of his work, he said, will be to constantly try to maintain and upgrade those programs where we have strength - it is too costly to develop strength, and to try to upgrade others to bring them into that circle of high quality programs.

Research programs are there for four reasons, he said, (1) to meet the needs of the discipline, (2) to meet the needs of the State - research programs that relate to State problems and needs, (3) national needs, and (4) international needs. Most research, he said, will fall into those four or some sub-set of those four. He said what will drive him in regard to the research is how we can increase the quality of the research and translate it into as useful a purpose as possible.

The third area is public service and we have public service to the community, to the State, to the nation, and international service. Public service, he said, takes many forms; such as, special educational programs and needs, not-for-credit workshops, programs that have a national focus in terms of providing expertise that we've developed and making it available to other people, and the same thing on the international scene.

Dr. Horton said he sees these three basic functions or objectives of the University as parallels. He does not see one as being more important than the other. President Horton said his goal will be to make those three areas the best we can make them with the resources available and to improve them over time recognizing our resource constraints and our resource issues. He said when he goes after resources, it will really be to support those primary activities.

Dr. Horton said these three basic areas of the University are operating all of the time but are seldom discussed with the Board because there are no actions to take. He said it is important that the Board show an interest in these areas when people do come forward. Dr. Horton encouraged the Regents to let the administration know at any time if they have an interest in a particular program, or facilities, or whatever, so the Regents can come in and visit with the right people and spend time seeing what they are doing, what's going on, etc.

There was a discussion of how to handle increasing enrollments at a time there are decreasing resources, with several suggestions presented. Dr. Horton said sometimes it is necessary to restrict enrollments in certain areas because it is not feasible to increase the number of students in particular classes. He said he believes it is important to maintain competitive salaries and we are not going to get the money to do that unless we work out some plans for restrictive enrollments. He explained his plan which will be put into effect in July for vacant position money to come back to the central administration. He also commented on the position control policy that has been instituted. Positions will be allocated the same as money has been allocated in the past. He said the money brought back to the central administration will be placed in a "savings account" or reserve and the administration will prioritize how the money will be used (non-recurring costs) if it is not needed for a short-fall. President Horton said there will be some unhappiness about this return of funds to the central administration and the new position controls.

The Regents were generally in agreement with President Horton's plan to retrieve the vacant position money and to institute a position control policy.

Regent Sarratt requested information on research programs on both campuses. During the discussion of providing this information, Regent Hogan called attention to a publication which she received during her orientation that was prepared by the Graduate College on Publications and Creative Activities of the faculty. It was agreed that this publication would be distributed to each Regent at the next Board meeting along with Dean Hoving's annual report on research programs of the faculty.

President Horton said he has also taken the position that there should not be interim raises unless there is a change in a job or a title. He said we have lost some people in the Student Health Center because they wanted increases and were able to move to other positions. He said circumstances might arise where he would agree that an exception should be made but he believes this would be a rare occurrence.

President Horton distributed an outline of a Regents' Handbook to be developed as suggested in the Coopers & Lybrand Management Study. This outline had been distributed to the Regents by letter on November 5. He said a copy of this Handbook will be provided for each Regent and will be updated periodically. He explained that all of the items mentioned will be included in very, very summarized form, except for perhaps the statutory and constitutional provisions which might require more detail. It was agreed that these should be reviewed with Chief Legal Counsel Ward.

There was a brief discussion of the status of the audit of special funds. President Horton stated he has talked to Jack Mauer and the Foundation is going to employ Coopers & Lybrand to conduct the review, the completion of Phase II, Section F, with John Eckert's participation. The Foundation will pay for the report and it will be kept in confidence. Regent Imel stated that before there is any additional auditing of accounts, Phase II needs to be completed. He did say that hopefully the audit committee composed of Rick Corn,

Stan Ward, and John Eckert will be preparing the actual policy recommendations as called for in Phase V for consideration by the Regents. President Horton reminded the Board that he is in the process of establishing procedures to be used within the University on all disbursements from Foundation accounts. Dr. Horton said he will approve all expenditures of executive officers and the Provosts must approve all expenditures of the deans from the Foundation. The policy will include information on receipt requirements and all details of making expenditures. Regent Imel suggested this should be a Regents' policy rather than a Presidential policy.

Regent Imel brought up the reports that had been made to the Regents since last spring by the Chairman of the Board on the expenditures from the six Foundation accounts. The Chairman of the Board notified the Regents in October that the procedure would be changed and that the President would be reporting to the Board on a quarterly basis. Regent Imel suggested that President Horton make this report monthly rather than quarterly. It was the general consensus that the reports should be continued on a monthly basis from the President. Dr. Horton stated he will initiate these reports beginning at the end of December, with the December report to include all expenditures since the last report and thereafter, there would be a monthly report.

The meeting recessed at 12:35 p.m. for lunch.

The meeting reconvened at 1:45 p.m. in the same room.

At Regent Sarratt's request there was a discussion of endowed chairs. President Horton said he believes there are two major issues which have been brought up by the Board:

1. Will the University fill a partially funded chair or professorship?
2. In the case of fully endowed chairs and professorships, what E&G funds will be used as well as endowed funds?

President Horton commented on the difficulties encountered when people are appointed in endowed positions when the endowment is not sufficient to cover the salary. He said if the University is going to continue the existing practice, we have to go into it knowing that the endowed funds will not cover the salary and that there is no guarantee that the endowment will be completely funded.

With regard to the Bellmon chair specifically, President Horton said we can continue to try to raise funds to complete the endowment for the chair and next year, if the endowment is not completed, it can be changed to a professorship.

The general University policy on professorships and chairs was discussed. President Horton said the general policy is that \$300,000 is required to establish an endowed professorship and \$750,000 for an endowed chair. He said he understands the Regents are indicating they want to be informed clearly whether an endowment is complete or not in order to give the Regents an option when a person is appointed to the position and also, to the extent the endowment generates funding, it should be the first source of funds for the individual in the chair rather than E&G funds. Appointments to endowed positions not fully funded will be placed before the Board for discussion before being filled.

There was a discussion of the current policy of the Board on endowed professorships which was adopted in 1969. It was generally agreed this policy should be updated, that the amounts cited in all sections should be brought up to date, and that the portion of the policy reading "A named professorship in an area which would further the general objectives of the University but one less central to the University's immediate objectives requires a minimum of \$750,000" should be eliminated and a sentence describing an endowed chair should be inserted in its place.

President Horton agreed to review and clarify this policy.

President Horton indicated concern has been expressed to him by editors of some newspapers and some others regarding the fact that the University administration does not follow the same procedure on notification for special Regents' meetings as is done for the regular Regents' meetings. President Horton asked for some direction. The notification legally required was discussed and it was generally agreed by the Regents that what is legally required is sufficient and that the administration should continue the policy as it has been in the past.

There was a discussion of the Board policy regarding the sale of University property. President Horton stated that sometime soon there may be some discussions with EOSAT about the location for their plant. Dr. Horton said he would like to have them on the campus but he doesn't know now that they will be interested, but he said we have indicated to them we will be willing to assist in locating property for them in Norman.

Regent White commented that as long as he has been on the Board most Regents have not been in favor of selling land but he believes there may be exceptions, but those exceptions should be scrutinized very carefully by the Board. The Regents generally agreed that land contiguous to the University is very different than land that is away from the campus, even in other counties, such as the property in Osage County. The Regents were generally in agreement that land contiguous to the University property as such should not be sold. They were also in agreement that the current policy of the Board should not be amended because the Board can make exceptions to the policy whenever it is desirable to do so.

Regent Sarratt brought up the Norman Campus Faculty Senate Committee to improve relations with the legislature which he has read about in the newspapers. He expressed concern about these lobbying efforts by the faculty and about bringing the legislators to the campus in that fashion. Regent Kemp called attention to a policy of the Board which has been in effect for many years which states "Without the knowledge and approval of the President, no employee of the University should initiate or promote with individual members of the legislature or other State authorities any recommendation concerning general University policies or concerning his/her personal advancement, the advancement of his/her department, or the advancement of any other individual or department".

President Horton reported that the Faculty Senate brought several legislators to the campus. Hosts were Dr. Ron Peters, Dr. David Levy, and Dr. Penny Hopkins. They took them to see the Science and Public Policy program, to the Chemistry Department to view research that is under way, on a tour of the Library, to the College of Business Economics Division to learn about research under way on Oklahoma, to view Petroleum Engineering research, to the President's Office, and to the University Club. He said it was the faculty intention to bring them in to show them what some of the programs are doing. He said otherwise legislators don't have that opportunity. He said the institution does some of that too. President Horton expressed the opinion that it is a good experience for the legislators and they have been appreciative of the opportunity.

Regent Sarratt agreed that that kind of contact is good but he has concerns that the contact will escalate and turn into other types of discussions among the faculty and the legislators. Other Regents expressed similar concerns. Regent Hogan said she believes these faculty are trying to be helpful in a difficult time and she believes legislators need to be educated about education. Her feeling is this kind of contact could be very productive. The matter was discussed further with Regents expressing the feeling that these visits should be orchestrated or coordinated by a representative of the President's Office and that they should be watched very carefully. They asked President Horton to be cautious.

President Horton suggested that if a Regent sees something on an agenda when it is mailed to them that they have questions about, to give him a call so that he can be prepared to answer the questions at the meeting or get an answer before the Board meeting. He said this would be very helpful.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.



Barbara H. Tuttle

Executive Secretary of the Board of Regents