

## Nederlander/Lindemer

### +Major Issue

- +Very concerned about the deterioration
  - +in the quality and behavior of the Board
  - +in recent years
- +Far from being supportive and helpful, we now
  - +find ourselves in the mode of protecting
  - +the University from its own Board
  - +(and this is also the clear perception of
  - +faculty, staff, and alumni)
- +We believe the Board is doing serious damage
  - +to the University
  - +...demoralizing faculty and staff
  - +...embarrassing the University
  - +...wearing out leadership
    - +(Shapiro, Fleming, now JJD)
    - +during a period of unusual challenge when
    - +we really need their support

### +History

- +Trace beginnings of problems to several key incidents:
  - +1. Reagan coattail effect in 1984 elections:
    - +i) Elected two Republican Regents (Smith and Neilsen)
      - +whom nobody--including the Republicans--felt
      - +had a chance--and hence were not taken seriously
    - +ii) Bumped Nederlander, only real leader on the Board, off
  - +2. Disintegration during key searches
    - +Athletic Director
      - +First Deane Baker, then Veronica Smith held Board
      - +hostage
    - +President
      - +Paul Brown push Tom Roach aside
      - +Deane Baker sold out Board during end game
  - +3. Failure of "Dump Baker" effort in 1988 election
    - +Baker-Nielsen hostility
    - +Baker-Power hostility
  - +4. Open meetings act:
    - +i) Made it more difficult to attract "statesmen"
      - +to run for Board
    - +ii) Made it more difficult for Board and EOs
      - +to have candid dialogues
    - +iii) Have made Board meetings public spectacles
      - +...and allowed some Regents (particularly
      - +Baker) to hold rest of Board hostage

### +Related Problems

- +Board continues to be more regulatory than supportive...
  - +...rarely do Regents ask what they can do to help
  - +...rather this is a "gotcha" board
- +Board continues to be far too preoccupied with
  - +micromanagement and inadequately involved in
  - +strategy and planning efforts
- +EOs spend excessive time on keeping Board from
  - +seriously embarrassing or disadvantaging the
  - +University
- +Continue to have communication problems--both
  - +because of open meetings laws and sensitivity
  - +to personality and political conflicts among Board members
- +The EOs continue to have little confidence that the Board will
  - +back them on difficult matters when push comes to shove
  - +(a concern shared by HTS and RWF)
- +The continues to be inadequate involvement by Board in its
  - +support of University in either political or public arena.

+Evaluation of Board Members

+General Observations

- +No one on board has any real influence or clout
  - +in political or fund-raising arena
- +With the exception of Power, no one on Board has
  - +any real experience in board membership, so
  - +they really don't know how to behave (although
  - +they think they do)
- +To many, membership on the Board has become their entire life
  - +(Baker, Smith, Brown,...Roach in part)

+Tom Roach

- +Hardest working
- +Cares the most about the University
- +But gets lost in the forest for the trees
- +Sometimes gets badly out of touch with academic nature of UM
  - +...Fusfield incident
  - +...MSA incident

+Paul Brown

- +Geographical separation
- +Pet interests (intercollegiate athletics)
  - +...Minnesota AD, Big Ten Commissioner
  - +...Bo, Mo, Penn State
- +Unwillingness to assume leadership...
  - +...HTS effort
  - +...JJD effort
  - +...Will not stand up to Deane
- +Cannot depend upon to deliver
  - +...Campus safety issue
  - +...Tuition battles

+Nellie Varner

- +Perceptive
- +Understands University and her role
- +Overloaded in her personal and professional responsibilities

+Jim Waters

- +Excessive absentee rate (now over 50%)
- +Rarely participates in Board activities
- +Essentially gives Paul Brown a "double vote"

+

+  
+  
+  
+

+Deane Baker

- +Outlandish behavior, but no one on Board will stand up to him
- +Viciously attacks staff in situations when they cannot defend themselves
- +Strong animosity toward women and minorities
- +Obsession with sexual matters
- +Cannot be trusted
- +Extraordinary ability to rationalize personal misbehavior (almost messianic)

+Neal Nielsen:

- +immature
- +plays games
- +vindictive and boorish
- +adopts "prosecutor" stance

+Veronica Smith

- +Clear in over her head intellectually
- +Doesn't have the foggiest idea about what being a Board member is all about
- +Manipulated by husband (and by radical students, on occasion)
- +Vindictive and temperamental

+Bill Friday's assessment of Board members

- +Possibilities:

- +Varner
- +Roach
- +Brown
- +Power (perhaps)
- +Beyond hope:
  - +Baker
  - +Neilsen
  - +Smith
- +Note: Waters did not attend
- +Other assessments
  - +HTS
  - +Bob Fleming
  - +Joe Stroud
  - +Republican leadership (Engler...)
    - +(embarrassed by all three Republican Regents)
- +
  - +
    - +
      - +
        - +working knowledge necessary to manage a complex institution such as UM.
        - +ii) The University--and the environment in which it finds itself--is changing very rapidly, and attempts to simply extrapolate the experience of the past can lead to serious mistakes.
        - +iii) It may well be that the unrealistic sense of confidence in the working knowlege of those with many years of Board experience has contributed to th Board's tendency to get too involved in the micromanagement of the University in recent years--at the expense of its involvement in key policy and strategic issues.
- +
  - +
    - +
      - +
        - +
          - +
            - +
              - +
                - +
                  - +
                    - +
                      - +
                        - +
 +Efforts we have made...
                          - +JJD
                            - +Monthly written reports
                            - +Personal phone calls every month
                            - +Individual visits
                          - +EOs
                            - +FWW, RLK all do the same
                          - +“Informal meetings”
                            - +Thursday luncheons
                            - +Thursday dinners
                            - +Friday breakfasts
                            - +Regent/EO Retreats
                          - +Special efforts
                            - +Bill Friday Retreat
                            - +Bay Valley Retreat
                            - +(Note: We now believe it is too dangerous to have these any more...)
            - +In the end
              - +Working closely with political leadership to make certain they nominate good Regents candidates
              - +1990:
                - +Expect two Democrats...
                  - +...but have worked hard to get two good Republicans, just in case (McFee and Esch)
              - +1992:
                - +Republicans have promised that we will get two new strong candidates (particularly since this will

+be a Republican year)  
+Possibilities: Lousma, McDivitt, Wilhite, Ullrich, Laro