

J. Ballengee

1] order of business

(2) J.B. announcements

- (1) executive session case
- (2) vote early in morning - roll call
- (3) Wolfe, Hal Clarke, Al Philpott problems
- (4) Michael Allan & Bruce Potter
- (5) communications plans
 - (i) news conference / news release / statement
 - (ii) letter to alumni
 - (iii) alumni magazine
 - (iv) trustee kits

- (b) Films - reminder of media interest in VA.
- (c) Berry South report
- (d) Edgan Shannon report
- (e) further discussion of alumni attitudes <regional contacts>
- (f) campus life committee - further reflections
- (g) roll call vote - (Hal Clarke hook up)
- (h) Al Philpott call
- (i) consideration of the vote : strength your position
- (j) consideration of materials explaining the vote

2] Questions/Answers

- (a) ten-year cycle
- (b) campus committee / executive committee
- (c) 1350-1500 = tenth year target
- (d) 500 women = tenth year target
- (e) keeping president's recommendation/vote undisclosed
- (f) transfer policy

3] STAFF Participation

4] Executive session for the vote (?)

5] Chris / Edgar at news conference (?)

6] How to deal with the 2:1 problem with base 24

- (a) giving people a chance to vote again
- (b) taking a weak majority as a vote for delay
- (c) problem of the by-laws

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY
LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

July 12, 1984

Dear Jim:

I write to record a few thoughts I have re the meeting. Some we have talked about and others may be new.

- (1) The Philpott family have been divided on Al's participation. Son Jim called to tell me that he argued against Al's voting, stating that no one could be certain how he might have considered the issue were he able to. He told me the letter reflects Helen and son Ben's view, not his father's. He could only be certain that his father would never retreat from his support of W&L, regardless of the outcome.

Helen called to ask if he could vote by phone. I told her I knew you would approve this in parallel with arrangements for Hal Clarke. So they will spare him the strain of the trip and we will call him on Saturday just to have his vote recorded.

- (2) In talking with Kopie about his transportation, I revisited the question of how he would suggest we proceed if a straightforward roll-call vote produced a 16-9 or 15-10 majority in favor. I expressed reservations about establishing, beforehand, a plan to call for a second vote with predetermined switching. Let me just reiterate my reservations:
 - (a) We ought to debate with each other what a 16-9 vote means. Some may believe we should go forward with it. Others who voted no may say they want to join the majority. Still others may believe that it is not good enough and argue that it is a vote for delay. I think it would be well to have this openly on the table once the vote is recorded. I do not think we should try to decide it, or anything bearing upon it, prior to an actual vote being taken.
 - (b) Taking a second vote may not produce anything useful. Four positive voters could agree beforehand to switch, thus defeating the motion. But others in the negative might silently decide to join the "majority" and we would be back to square one. In any event, your opinion, which I applaud, that we tell the public in general terms what actually transpired, would argue that we candidly report that a majority favored the motion but it wasn't, in our judgment, substantial enough to warrant a significant policy change (it just now occurs to me that what you and Kopie might have been trying to anticipate is a problem with the by-laws which make clear that a majority constitutes the action of the Board unless otherwise provided for i.e., 13-12 must be permitted to stand unless we vote again and change it.

I guess I would suggest that we simply thresh this out, if that is the result, and then decide, together, what we should do. I certainly would have us vote again in that case in open acknowledgment that we would vote to turn it down.).

- (c) A chance to interpret a close vote as a vote to delay may not be entirely bad and should be provided for. This reflects my view that a delay vote, while bad, may be better than an artificially resounding defeat. The latter may simply hamper a future Board's action (or a future President's) when necessity dictates the wisdom of change.

* * * * *

So much for all that. If I go on, I may end up only confusing myself even more. I do think it important that we go into the vote without prejudging what degree of significance we will attach to various numbers.

As for the substance of the meeting itself, I think we can happily begin by showing the two films. They lead very nicely into the Board's decision-making responsibility and each is evenly balanced.

After that, I'm not very sure, as I indicated earlier. I do think the South Committee report will probably need to be discussed and it may be that alumni attitudes could stand some further discussion. I'm especially concerned about the perception (true or distorted) that we are on the edge of an alumni revolt. Letters like Reid's readily give that impression and I don't believe it is true. Total giving this year (though there were some disappointments) gives no indication of an incipient revolt.

There may also be value in reviewing each committee's May findings, but that may be redundant. Your sense of that would be better than mine.

At one stage I thought there might be value in discussing, early on, the pros and cons of delay. Perhaps that ought to come only after a vote is taken and we discover that it is an option we are forced to consider. Given all I've written above, I think it follows that we ought not clutter up the voting on the issue by engaging in any form of "what ifs."

* * * * *

I can think of nothing else at this point. I sat down this morning to formulate answers to Jeff Hanna's questions from the press. I attach only the answers I came up with to questions prompted by a pro-coeducation news conference. I'm not going to bother thinking in different terms should we be in there defending the status quo. I think that ought to be easy enough.

Sincerely,

John

Attachment