I. Call Meeting to Order

II. Last Week's Minutes

III. Appointments
   A. Faculty Athletics
   B. Curriculum Committee

IV. Officer's Reports
   A. President's Report
      1. Board of Regents Meeting
      2. Mandatory Athletic Fee Rally
   B. Vice President's Report
   C. Business Manager's Report
      1. Line Item Changes
      2. Charter Flight
      3. Tax Help Program

V. Committee Reports
   A. Legal Services
   B. Law School Activity Fee Committee

VI. Old Business
   A. Special Allocations
      1. May Campus Outreach
      2. Silvertip Skydivers
      3. Montanans for Solar Initiative
      4. Progressive Student Union
   B. Legal Services Typewriter

VII. New Business
   A. Program Council By-Laws
   B. Resolution R76-13 - Central Board in the Dorms
   C. Resolution R76-17 - Smoking during Central Board Meetings

VIII. Meeting Adjourned
The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. in the Montana Rooms by President Dave Hill.

Last Week's Minutes. One correction was made by Bjornson. On page 2 under Big Sky Conference, item #4, should read "favor the need for need-based scholarships." Minutes accepted with change.

APPOINTMENTS

Faculty Athletic Committee. MOVED BY POMEROY, SECONDED, TO RATIFY THE APPOINTMENT OF ERIC ANDERSON TO THE FACULTY ATHLETIC COMMITTEE. MOTION CARRIED. Alexander made note of the fact that the committee name has been changed to University Athletic Committee.

Curriculum Committee. MOVED AND SECONDED TO RATIFY THE APPOINTMENT OF KATHY SCHWANKE TO THIS COMMITTEE. MOTION CARRIED.

Elections Committee. MOVED AND SECONDED TO APPOINT JIN LEEK AS CHAIRMAN OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE. MOTION CARRIED.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Board of Regents. The upcoming meeting of the Board of Regents will be held on Sunday and Monday, December 12 and 13. This meeting should be one of the most important of the year and all CB members and other interested students are urged to attend.

Mandatory Athletic Fee Rally. The student government will be sponsoring a rally on the Mandatory Athletic Fee on Friday, December 10, in the U. C. Hall at noon. All who are interested in expressing their opinion as members of student government or their own personal opinions are urged to attend. Also, CB members should be available to answer questions from the other students.

VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

MSL. The first issue of the Outreach for this year has been sent out. There will be a meeting of the MSL Steering Committee in Helena following the Board of Regents meeting this coming weekend. Of the 500 survey polls sent out by the Legislative Committee, 87 have been returned so far.

BUSINESS MANAGER'S REPORT


Line Item Changes. The Day Care Center, Acct. #904-9, would like the following changes made: increase other income by $1,500, decrease secretary salary by $300, increase overtime by $300; increase student hourly by $1,500.

Tax Help Clinic. There has been some trouble in setting up this tax clinic in that it won't be as extensive as planned. The Accountant will not be able to actually help students prepare their tax returns. $73
will be needed to purchase manuals and that money will be taken from Office Supplies and put into Publications for that purpose. This purchase will also include government pamphlets. Tax tables will be run in the Kaimin and in flyers to help students.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Legal Services. This committee approved a 7-day vacation leave for Bruce Barrett during the Christmas break.

Law School Activity Fee Committee. A letter was received from the Law Students Association which stated that they accepted the proposal for the Law Students to pay an activity fee. Besides paying the fee, the law school students would help out with the ASU! Legal Services Program when needed. MOTION MADE AND SECONDED TO ACCEPT THE REPORT OF THE LAW SCHOOL ACTIVITY FEE COMMITTEE. MOTION CARRIED.

OLD BUSINESS

Special Allocation - May Campus Outreach. SHORT MOVED TO TABLE THE SPECIAL REQUEST FOR THIS GROUP. SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

Special Allocation - Silvertip Skydivers. The Silvertip Skydivers requested funds to travel to Florida to attend and participate in NCAA qualifying meet. The team has had very outstanding showings over the past several years and this is another important event for them. Their request was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food for 6 for 12 days @$4.50/day each</td>
<td>$324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging - tents and one night in a motel</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation - 5,500 mi. x .03/mi.</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry fees</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump tickets</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION MADE AND SECONDED TO GRANT THE ABOVE SPECIAL ALLOCATION. The Missoula Mavericks are going to donate some money also for the team to attend the event and the rest will be coming out of the pockets of the members.

OLIPHANT MOVED AN AMENDMENT TO ELIMINATE THE ENTRY FEES AND JUMP TICKETS AND MAKE THE TOTAL SPECIAL ALLOCATION $784. SECONDED BY MACDONALD.

MITCHELL MOVED TO CHANGE THE FOOD ALLOTMENT TO $3/DAY PER PERSON. SECONDED BY POMEROY. MOTION CARRIED.

Main motion now for $686.

BERG OFFERED A SUBSTITUTE MOTION FOR $0 SECONDED BY MITCHELL. He felt that this would not be of any benefit to anyone but the six members of the team who would be participating. MOTION FAILED.

MAIN MOTION FOR $686 CARRIED.

Montanans for Solar Initiative. BERG MOVED FOR A SPECIAL ALLOCATION OF $450 FOR THE MONTANANS FOR SOLAR INITIATIVE. SECONDED BY HJARTARSON.
This would be used for printing and postage. Berg proposed that this money be granted on the condition that it be used only for getting the initiative on the ballot and not be used at all for trying to get people to vote for the initiative. The Student Action Center has already given this group access to a hot line to be used in their efforts. A total of 15,000-16,000 signatures are needed in order to get it on the ballot. Leik suggested that the group should try to work through the legislature first and if it doesn't work there, then try again to get it on the ballot.

BERG OFFERED AN AMENDMENT TO FREEZE $125 UNTIL THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION IS OVER TO SEE IF IT WILL PASS IN THIS LEGISLATURE. Motion dies for lack of a second.

Discussion followed concerning the relationship of the Public Service Commission to this matter, and Short mentioned what has happened previously when contributions were made to political-type organizations.

MANSFIELD MOVED PREVIOUS QUESTION; SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION FOR $450 FAILED in roll call vote, as follows: Yes - Berg, Hjartarson, Holmquist, MacDonald, Waugh, Short; No - Alexander, Bjornson, Fitzgerald, Floyd, Gursky, Huntington, Johnson, Leik, Mansfield, Mitchell, Oliphant, Pomroy. Failed 6-12.

Progressive Student Union. BERG MOVED FOR A SPECIAL ALLOCATION OF $1,022 FOR THE PROGRESSIVE STUDENT UNION; SECONDED. This money would be used for a lecture/movie series, which would be presented during winter quarter, concerned with tracing the historical and economic aspects of Montana's energy and environmental problems and bringing together the various campus and community organizations which are active in this effort. KUFM has expressed interest in airing this program series. MOTION FAILED in roll call vote, as follows: Yes - Berg, Fitzgerald, Floyd, Gursky, Hjartarson, Leik, MacDonald, Waugh, Short; No - Alexander, Bjornson, Holmquist, Huntington, Johnson, Mansfield, Mitchell, Oliphant, Pomroy. Tied 9-9, unbroken by President Hill. Therefore, MOTION FAILED.

Typewriter. SHORT MOVED TO BUY A NEW TYPEWRITER, IBM CORRECTING SELECTRIC, FOR THE ASUM RECEPTIONIST AND MOVE THE RED SELECTRIC CURRENTLY AT THAT DESK TO THE LEGAL SERVICES OFFICE; SECONDED BY GURSKY. MOTION CARRIED.

KUFM. SHORT MOVED TO DONATE $750 TO KUFM; SECONDED. As KUFM is a communication effort for UM, ASUM should help the radio station in providing the excellent alternative programming that it broadcasts. MOTION CARRIED.

NEW BUSINESS

Christmas Party. Resolution R76-16. MOTION MADE AND SECONDED TO REMOVE THIS SUBJECT FROM TABLE. MOTION CARRIED. Mark Parker and Tom Waller presented once again the following resolution, R76-16:

WHEREAS the ties that bind people, communities, societies and nations are spiritual; and
WHEREAS such spiritual bindings are exemplified by Christmas and celebration thereof, and

WHEREAS the University of Montana and the Associated Students have in the past been negligent in their recognition of Christmas spirit, and

WHEREAS we cannot discount the importance of special groups, in doing so this board should not overlook projects which will be of benefit to all,

BE IT RESOLVED that ASUM allocate $1,000 to the Social/Recreation department of Program Council for the revitalization of Christmas spirit on the University of Montana campus.

FITZGERALD MOVED TO GRANT THEM $50; SECONDED BY MITCHELL. Parker and Walier described what they would be using the money they requested for and they stated it would cover lights, food, a Christmas tree, advertising and a Santa. SHORT MOVED FOR A SUBSTITUTE MOTION OF $100. SECONDED BY BJORNSON.

FITZGERALD MOVED FOR PREVIOUS MOTION; SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION FOR $100 FAILED.

Berg thought this event should be paid for by the Special Events account of Program Council.

FITZGERALD MOVED FOR PREVIOUS MOTION; SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION FOR $50 FAILED. Discussion followed.

GURSKY MOVED FOR PREVIOUS MOTION; SECONDED. MOTION FAILED.

WAUGH MOVED FOR $600 TO BE USED FOR FOOD AND ADVERTISING AND NON-ELECTRIC DECORATIONS; SECONDED BY OLIPHANT. MOTION FAILED.

BJORNSON MOVED AN AMDENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION FOR $100 WHICH WOULD BE MATCHED BY PROGRAM COUNCIL. SECONDED. DISCUSSION.

MANSFIELD MOVED FOR PREVIOUS MOTION, SECONDED BY GURSKY. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION FOR $100 WITH MATCHING PC FUNDS FAILED.

MAIN MOTION FOR $1,000 FAILED 15-3 in roll call vote, as follows.

Mandatory Athletic Fee Petitions. So far there have been 2,234 signatures turned in on the petition drive against the mandatory athletic fee. Northern, Tech, and Eastern are also doing well on their petition drives. Western's and State's results are not yet known. Those who still have petitions out should do their best to fill them up and get them in as soon as possible.

P. C. By-Laws. The following changes were proposed in the PC By-Laws:
Article II. Membership and Organization.

Section 2. The Program Council Director.

A. The Program Council Director shall be appointed by the incoming President and confirmed by the new Central Board by a majority vote within two weeks after the Spring elections. The new appointee shall become the director-elect at the same time the new Central Board comes into power. The new Director shall take office May 16. An Area Coordinator shall not be in excess of one year. The Program Council Director may be removed from office only by a 2/3 vote of Central Board.

Article II.

Section 4. The Area Coordinators. The Area Coordinators shall be appointed by the Program Council Director. The length of term of office of an Area Coordinator shall not be in excess of one year in any one given area. Any Area Coordinator may be removed from office for not fulfilling his assigned responsibilities as defined in the By-Laws and the written responsibilities given to him at the beginning of his term of office by the Program Council Director. An Area Coordinator may appeal his dismissal to the Program Council Committee in this instance chaired by the ASUM Vice-President. The salary for each Area Coordinator shall be determined by the PC Director and approved by Central Board.

MOVED AND SECONDED TO ACCEPT THE CHANGES.

SHORT CALLED FOR SEPARATION INTO TWO PARTS. Article II, Section 2 - MOTION CARRIED. Article II, Section 4 - MOTION FAILED.

Resolution R76-13. MOVED AND SECONDED TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS the Central Board of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM) acts as the representative governmental body of the students of the University of Montana, and

WHEREAS the duty of government is and ought to be to serve it constituents, and

WHEREAS U. M. students should have more of an opportunity to see the ASUM Central Board in actual meetings and operation; and as the U. M. students, both on and off campus residents, may be willing to participate with and evaluate their elected representatives composing the Central Board, and

WHEREAS the Residence Halls on the University of Montana campus are of a ready nature to accommodate a regular meeting of the Central Board and the student residents of the halls and resident halls staff are willing to cooperate, and

WHEREAS holding periodic Central Board meetings in areas of more proximity to living quarters of U. M. students in general would make Central Board meetings more available to U. M. students,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Central Board of the Associated Students of the University of Montana meet in a lobby of a U. M. Residence Hall having a lobby for the second regular Wednesday
Central Board meeting of each calendar month. The designation of each succeeding Residence Hall where such meetings should be held will be submitted by motion by a Central Board member for approval during the meeting in the present residence hall.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the time, date and place of each meeting shall be posted in the U. C. ad the designated residence hall and advertised in the Kaimin for the benefit of all U. M. students. The remainder of meetings for the ASUM Central Board should remain in the Montana Rooms of the U. M. University Center. "Cabinet" shall follow all meetings of the Central Board.

Submitted by: Cary Holmquist and Greg Oliphant
Date: December 3, 1976
Action Taken:

Dr. Wicks stated that this was tried when Christianson was ASUM President and it didn't work; it was found that 1/3 to 1/2 of the people who usually come to the CB meetings in the Montana Rooms came to the meetings in the dorms. Pomeroy said it didn't work when tried in Bozeman and Short said that often the students who live in the dorms do not like their lobbies and lounges being used in this way by people living outside the dorms.

MITCHELL MOVED PREVIOUS MOTION, SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

MAIN MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION FAILED.

Resolution R76-17. MOVED AND SECONDED TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

WHEREAS smoke emitted into the atmosphere from cigarettes, cigars, and pipes interferes with the normal life-sustaining breathing of several Central Board members and much of the audience at ASUM Central Board meetings, and

WHEREAS the heat, ignition and fire involved with smoking presents a fire hazard, and

WHEREAS Central Board meetings are generally held in the Montana Rooms in the UM University Center, which have an insufficient ventilation system for expelling noxious fumes and smoke, and

WHEREAS the rights of smokers also are acknowledged, and

WHEREAS a spirit of compromise is wished to provide the pleasure and comfort of all concerned,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Central Board members who smoke during Central Board meetings in said meeting rooms be asked to sit in chairs at the table nearest open doors and nearest the audience seating.

Submitted by: Dave Bjornson and Cary Holmquist
Date: December 3, 1976
Action Taken:
MOTION CARRIED with slight wording change as noted above.

MOVED AND SECONDED TO ADJOURN MEETING. Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Pat Hill
ASUN Secretary


Absent: Skillern

Excused: Narra, Mott.
WHEREAS the Central Board of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM) acts as the representative governmental body of the students of the University of Montana, and

WHEREAS the duty of government is and ought to be to serve its constituents, and

WHEREAS U.M. students should have more of an opportunity to see the ASUM Central Board in actual meetings and operation, and as the U.M. students, both on and off campus residents, may be willing to participate with and evaluate their elected representatives composing the Central Board, and

WHEREAS the Residence Halls on the University of Montana campus are of a ready nature to accommodate a regular meeting of the Central Board and the student residents of the halls and resident halls staff are willing to cooperate, and

WHEREAS holding periodic Central Board meetings in areas of more proximity to living quarters of U.M. students in general, would make Central Board meetings more available to U.M. students, and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Central Board of the Associated Students of the University of Montana meet in a lobby of a U.M. Residence Hall having a lobby for the second regular Wednesday Central Board meeting of each calendar month. The designation of each succeeding Residence Hall where such meetings should be held will be submitted by motion by a Central Board member for approval during the meeting in the present residence hall.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the time, date and place of each meeting shall be posted in the U.C. and the designated residence hall and advertised in the Kaimin for the benefit of all U.M. students. The remainder of meetings for the ASUM Central Board should remain in the Montana Rooms of the U.M. University Center. "Cabinet" shall follow all meetings of the Central Board.

Submitted by: Cary Holmquist and Greg Oliphant
Date: December 8, 1976
Action Taken: Resolution Failed
RESOLUTION R-76-17

WHEREAS smoke emitted into the atmosphere from cigarettes, cigars, and pipes interferes with the normal life-sustaining breathing of several Central Board members and much of the audience at ASUM Central Board meetings, and

WHEREAS the heat, ignition and fire involved with smoking presents a fire hazard, and

WHEREAS Central Board meetings are generally held in the Montana Rooms in the U.M. University Center, which have an insufficient ventilation system for expelling noxious fumes and smoke, and

WHEREAS the rights of smokers also are acknowledged, and

WHEREAS a spirit of compromise is wished to provide the pleasure and comfort of all concerned,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Central Board members who smoke during Central Board meetings in said meeting rooms be seated in chairs at the table nearest open doors and nearest the audience seating.

Submitted by: Dave Bjornson and Cary Holmquist
Date: December 3, 1976
Action Taken: Resolution passed.
WHEREAS the ties that bind people, communities, societies and nations are spiritual;
and WHEREAS such spiritual bindings are exemplified by the Christmas celebration thereof;
and WHEREAS the University of Montana and the Associated Students thereof have in the past been negligent in their recognition of Christmas spirit;
and WHEREAS we cannot discount the importance of special groups; in doing so the board should not overlook projects which will be of benefit to all;

be it Resolved that ASUM allocate $1000.00 to the Social/Recreation Department of Program Council for the celebration of Christmas in 1976 on the U of M Campus

revitalization of Christmas spirit on the University of Montana campus.

be it resolved that ASUM endorse the spirit of Christmas now and Christmas.

Presented by Mark Parker & Tom Walker
Date: Dec. 8, 1976
Action Taken: Resolution Failed
On Thursday, December 2, representatives of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM) and of the University of Montana School of Law (Law School) met to negotiate the payment of an activity fee to ASUM by the law students. At that meeting it was agreed as follows:

That each law student shall pay a mandatory activity fee to ASUM in the amount of Five Dollars ($5) per semester (Ten Dollars [$10] per year).

In addition, the law students shall attempt to provide assistance to the ASUM Legal Services program. This assistance shall take the form of providing voluntary legal research assistance, by interested law students, to the Legal Services attorney, and also assisting ASUM in pursuing the feasibility of incorporating the ASUM Legal Services program into the third-year law school Legal Aid program.

In consideration for the above, ASUM agrees to accord to all law students full privileges and use of a certain limited number of ASUM funded activities, such as Campus Recreation - use of all Field House and Field House Annex facilities, and participation in the intramural program; Program Council - receipt of student discount on all Program Council events; the Montana Kaimin; Grizzly Pool; and Day Care facilities.

It was further agreed that the Student Bar Association (SBA) of the law school shall contact the Board of Regents and request that implementation of this agreement be considered at the next Board of Regents meeting. In addition, the SBA will put this agreement to a vote of the law students at the next SBA meeting, and will subsequently provide ASUM with a final list of activities in which the law students desire participation.

It was further agreed that ASUM will provide refunds to the law students who paid the sum of $22.50 at the beginning of the 1976-77 academic year. In addition, ASUM will provide each law student with Identification Card validation identical to the validation which other ASUM activity fee-paying students receive.

12/13/76
Listed below is a budget and a few basic arguments or reasons why we feel justified in requesting money for our team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 days food for 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.50 x 6 x 12 =</td>
<td>$324.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging - tents and one night in a motel</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation - 5,500 mi. x .08/mi.</td>
<td>440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry fees</td>
<td>260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump tickets</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,362.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U of M Silvertip Skydivers represent the University in national competition, are the defending Relative Work National Champions, support the school by giving demonstrations, and jump into football games, the fall activity fair, and the Library Kegger.

12/1/76
Exsisting Section of PC By-Laws

Article II. Membership and Organization.

Section 2. The Program Council Director.

A. The Program Council Director shall be appointed by the incoming President and confirmed by the new Central Board. He shall be appointed immediately after the ASUM Spring elections and will take office on May 16. The length of term of office of the Director shall not be in excess of one year. The Program Council Director may be removed from office only by a 2/3 vote of Central Board.

Change To Read as Follows:

Article II. Membership and Organization

Section 2. The Program Council Director.

A. The Program Council Director shall be appointed by the incoming President and confirmed by the new Central Board by a majority vote within two weeks after the Spring elections. The new appointee shall become the director-elect at the same time the new Central Board comes into power. The new Director shall take office May 16. The length of term of office of the Director shall not be in excess of one year. The Program Council Director may be removed from office only by a 2/3 vote of Central Board.

Existing Section of PC By-Laws

Article II.

Section 4. The Area Coordinators. The Area Coordinators shall be appointed by the Program Council Director and confirmed by Central Board. The length of the term of office of an Area Coordinator shall not be in excess of one year in any one given area. Any Area Coordinator may be removed from office for not fulfilling his assigned responsibilities as defined in the By-Laws and the written responsibilities given to him at the beginning of his term of office by the Program Council Director. An Area Coordinator may appeal his dismissal to the Program Council Committee in this instance chaired by the ASUM Vice-President. The salary for each Area Coordinator shall be determined by the PC Director and approved by Central Board.

Change to Read As Follows:

Article II.

Section 4. The Area Coordinators. The Area Coordinators shall be appointed by the Program Council Director. (The remainder of the paragraph remains the same.)
SPECIAL ALLOCATION REQUEST

Progressive Student Union
December 3, 1976

The Progressive Student Union has prepared a lecture/movie series to be presented winter quarter. Our special budget request is for $1,022. Besides tracing the historical and economic aspects of Montana's energy and environmental problems, the series will try to bring together the various campus and community organizations active in the environmental area to discuss the contemporary situation and what is to be done.

The first lecture will present the history of Montana's "boom and bust" economy with particular emphasis on the benefits and limitations of corporate power. Very few people know what the roots of the environmental movement are; the second lecture will fill that gap. The third event will be a panel discussion by local environmental groups. A debate will bring together a conservative and an environmentalist to fight it out over the sources of, and solutions to, Montana's environmental/energy problems, particularly coal development. Two movies are also planned: one will be a combined movie and lecture about community organizing, the second movie presentation will tentatively include "Public Poison," a movie about the effects of pollution and general toxicity on the environment. Proceeding it will be a twenty minute short on strip mining in Montana called "Thar's Coal in Them Thar Hills."

The overview provided by this series is not available in the university community today. Campus and environmental/energy related groups are characterized by fragmentation, specialization and lack of an historical perspective which limits their effectiveness. Our program offers a context for criticism and evaluation as well as a stimulus for cooperation and planning among individuals and groups who otherwise would not be in communication with each other.

REQUEST
1) Lecture on Montana History
2) Lecture on the Root of the Environmental Movement
3) Panel Presentation by Local Environmental Groups
4) Debate
5) Film
6) Movie and Lecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adv./Publicity</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$137</td>
<td>$137</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                      $1,202
Postage                    10
Office Supplies             10
Adv./Publicity (200)

**TOTAL REQUEST** $1,022 (OVER)
1  $100 - fees for 2 speakers
    - round trip from Butte
    - lodging
    - meals
    $135

2  $50 - fee
    - round trip from Billings
    - lodging
    - meals
    $157

3  $12 - microphone
    - U. C. Ballroom
    $62

4  Program Council funding from Special Programs
The controversy over the role and function of Intercollegiate Athletics in the Montana University System has once again come to the forefront. Numerous studies have been conducted and reports made by both students and the Board of Regents, yet the controversy continues. The problem is multi-faceted and often confusing; because of this, the Student Advisory Council of the Montana University System has put forth this position paper clarifying their stand on Intercollegiate Athletics and the justification for this position.

It seems reasonable to say that the controversy over funding originated at UM, stemming from 1970-1971 when the Regents gave control of the student athletic fee to the students. Beginning in spring of 1971, Central Board of ASU allocated money to Intercollegiate Athletics from student activity fees. In that year, CB allocated $165,000 to Men's Intercollegiate Athletics, over half of the total activity fees. In spring of 1972 that allocation was reduced to $125,000 and the following year to $95,000. In the spring of 1974, CB reduced the allocation to zero, a precedent which has continued to the present. This action has obviously cut substantially into the Athletic Department's budget; this reduction has been made up from UM's general fund.

This action has also apparently moved the Regents to study options concerning the funding of Intercollegiate Athletics within the University System. Among the options they are currently considering are increased funds from the state legislature specifically for athletics, and a mandatory student fee earmarked for athletics. Increased legislative allocation is the less controversial, but it is also doubtful. There could be detrimental effects, also, in that increased legislative funds for athletics may serve to decrease the allocation the University system may have received without the specified funds.

A mandatory fee also has serious implications, which will be discussed at length later in this paper. One thing that must be realized, however, is that, like the state, students in general do not have access to unlimited funds. From both the state's standpoint and the students' standpoint, the University is costly enough already, additional increases may prove unfeasible. That is, college may be pricing itself out of existence.

One must keep in mind that all funding for the University system is in fact quite limited (admittedly, it is a fact hard for anyone involved in higher education to forget). Rather than looking to increased funding to support escalated programs, it is important to turn instead to methods of general cost reduction. Cost reduction in a university can be divided into four basic options: (1) Reduce faculty and staff salaries; (2) reduce expenditures for supplies and non-personnel items; (3) require more work for the same pay, thereby reducing the number of employees; and (4) do fewer things. In his "Statement on FY 1976-77 Budget," UM President Richard Bowers delineated these four options, rejecting 1-3 as follows:
(1) University currently ranks ninth of the ten Rocky Mountain universities in faculty salaries. In addition, the salaries in the Rocky Mountain region rank among the lowest in the country. Reducing the salaries would make it increasingly difficult to attract quality faculty to the University.

(2) Dollar increases here have already fallen behind the rate of inflation, thus purchasing power for such things as library acquisition, equipment and supplies has substantially decreased. This has had serious deleterious effects on our academic programs. Further cuts mean "continual erosion of the quality of our programs," according to Bowers.

(3) The current student-faculty ratio is 18:1. An increase in this ratio would bring increases in class size, less time for individual student attention and less time for research and public service on the part of professors.

Thus we are faced with the choice: do we eliminate some programs or do we degrade all? In the absence of unlimited funding this choice clearly must be faced.

Most University programs can be categorized as either (a) academic, academic-related, and related support services, or (b) non-academic, non-related. Just where one draws the line as to what is and is not "academic-related" is admittedly difficult; let us define for our purposes an academic-related program as one that if eliminated would directly be to the detriment of some academic program. By support services we mean residence halls, food service, counselling and advising, health service, etc. The consensus among students, faculty and administration seems to be that in no way should (a) suffer at the expense of (b). While belt-tightening is possible and perhaps necessary in academic programs and support services, the amount is negligible compared to the rising cost of education. Substantial cuts in any of these areas would ultimately serve to downgrade the quality of academics.

Given that a university is a place specifically designed for the pursuit of academic excellence, the above priority of (a) over (b) seems natural. One might well want to broaden the conception of "university," however, to include athletics, which clearly seems to fall under (b). Such a move would draw strength from one of the foundations of our western tradition, i.e. the Greek ideal of sound mind/sound body. Granted, but being consistent with this ideal forces one to shift emphasis from spectator sports to participatory sports. At the university level, Intercollegiate Athletics provides participation for a very few, reducing the bulk of the student body to spectators. Intramural competition, on the other hand, offers participation to a large number of students. Thus the Greek ideal, necessitating participation, clearly favors the latter alternative.

Fortunately this alternative also proves to be the more economically feasible of the two. At the University of Montana, Intramurals are run by Campus Recreation. Campus Recreation has an operating budget
of about $90,000 - $100,000 per year, 60-75% of which goes to intramural sports. (This includes both men's and women's intramurals.) Additional monies are generated from small registration fees. The costs involved in intercollegiate athletics are substantially greater. For example, when one considers general fund direct budget outlays and coaches' salaries, the cost is in the neighborhood of one-half million dollars (after one subtracts Century Club donations, gate receipts and revenue). Also, roughly 4,300 different individuals participate in intramurals each year. Many people compete in more than one sport, bringing the participant use to approximately 10,000. The UM example is no aberration. Generally speaking, funding for intramurals amounts to a fraction of the cost of intercollegiate athletics at the Montana University System units.

Let us briefly recap the argument: The University System is involved in a budget crunch and cannot expect unlimited funding from the state or students. Faced with a necessary reduction of costs, the units must choose between general degradation of all programs or elimination of some. In a university, a priority must be placed on academic programs and related services as opposed to non-academic, unrelated services. In a situation of limited funding, escalation of non-academic, unrelated university activities may come at the expense of academic departments or related support services. Given the above-mentioned priority, such an event should not occur; it is important to insure that whenever additional funds are given to a non-academic, unrelated activity (specifically in this case intercollegiate athletics) there is not a resulting decrease in money that would have otherwise gone to academic programs. This is especially crucial in the existing situation of the Montana University System, where units currently face severe budgetary limitations. The decision against additional funding to intercollegiate athletics is one of economic necessity. Regardless of specific figures, with a limited budget any money put into athletics is money which could have been used to preserve the quality of academic programs.

One proposal being considered by the Board of Regents which would not call for a reduction of costs is a mandatory student fee earmarked for athletics. It has been suggested that this fee be in the neighborhood of $40 per year. Such a fee would have serious implications. While this amount seems negligible compared with the total cost of a college education, it is quite probable that this additional fee will prevent some students from going to college (while the number of students so affected is probably undocumentable, it is unreasonable to assume that no students will be so affected). As for those who attend college anyway, the $40 is an additional hardship. If the $40 is transferred from another existing fee, something else will suffer. If the $40 comes out of tuition, the effect on academics would be disastrous. If the student activity fee were to be reduced programs currently funded by student governments would suffer. Also, the latter such move would constitute telling student governments how to spend almost all of its student money. For example, in the case of ASUM, $40 of an annual $45 per student, or 89.9 percent. Such action, in a strong sense, undermines the viability of representative democracy. Montana student governments on the whole consist of
responsible individuals elected by the student body to represent them. The student governments at each of the units are currently funding intercollegiate athletics at a level reflective of the concerns of their constituencies. A mandatory fee would criticize and overrule such democratic action, clearly opting for some other form of governmental decision-making process.

Ultimately one must also address the question of who is served by Intercollegiate Athletics. The motivation behind the vote of the last three student governments at UM has been a desire to either eliminate the program or tone it down (hoping to at least have the effect of stabilizing it). The votes have in part been efforts against continued escalation of the program, such as the possible move to Division I-A of the NCAA (a move which would probably help prove the Peter Principle, which states that everything naturally progresses to its own level of incompetence). Such a move seems more to reflect the wishes of alumni and the community, who are attracted by the increased prestige of Division I-A (not to mention larger crowds, with more people doing business in town, and the improved sports facilities required). If the breakdown of support for escalation of Intercollegiate is as clear cut as it seems, why should the students foot the bill? They have expressed their feelings on the matter. It would seem more just to allow the community to vote on a special tax earmarked for University Athletics. If members of the community do have a vested interest in the program, the responsibility should fall on their shoulders. If only the few individuals in public booster groups choose to support University Athletics, then they should bear the responsibility.
ADDENDUM: Brief responses to arguments often raised against eliminating Intercollegiate Athletics; Marshall Cook's report.

A number of trite, unfounded arguments appear on both sides of the controversy over funding of Intercollegiate Athletics. We have tried to avoid those in the preceding paper, putting forth the position of Student Advisory Council as carefully and cogently as possible. We would like at this point to offer responses to common arguments against eliminating Intercollegiate Athletics.

1.) Elimination of Intercollegiate Athletics would result in a lower enrollment.

The corresponding drop in enrollment would probably be negligible—this is undocumentable on both sides and this criticism can thus be thrown out on this weakness alone.

2.) Winning teams bring more funds from the legislature.

History does not bear witness to this claim. UM sported a winning team in 1969-70 and went to the Camelia Bowl. There were legislative cuts in these years.

3.) Alumni contributions will drop.

This claim is also undocumentable, as well as being foolish to argue. Consider alumni and parents who earmark their monetary contributions to academics, with the stipulation that no part of it go to athletics.

4.) The state has a responsibility to provide "honor programs" (i.e., high level competition) for talented athletes.

Here we must return to one of the fundamental arguments of the paper--the priority of academics over athletics. Also, if college football is seen as merely a training ground for the pros, an extensive farm club network, then the NFL should subsidize Intercollegiate Football, the NBA and ABA Intercollegiate Basketball, etc.

This fall the Student Advisory Council received several copies of a memo to Commissioner of Higher Education Larry Pettit from Marshall Cook, a member of Pettit's staff assigned to complete Edward Furlong's study of Intercollegiate Athletics in the Montana University System. While Mr. Cook's report clearly and cogently spelled out the alternatives to follow in this controversy, there were several statements in this memo that are quite disturbing from a student's standpoint. Among his twelve recommendations, Mr. Cook lists as one alternative:

"Eliminate football from the units that are at present competing in this sport". He goes on to comment: Granted, football is an expensive sport, but it is doubtful that the state and/or a unit will save in the long run. When one considers the amount of monies this sport generates in booster monies, gifts, alumni funds, and monies collected
by the business community during home games, one wonders if, indeed, the state and the units may not lose money.

As stated before, that the amount of alumni contributions and gifts drop is undocumentable. It is confusing here to not make the necessary distinctions between the unit and the community. Only with this distinction can it be discerned on whom the responsibility of funding lies. As stated in the position paper, if the business community stands to gain, then it should be responsible. Also, this comment seems to suggest that booster monies, gifts and alumni funds more than cover the cost of football, which is doubtful.

An underlying argument of Mr. Cook’s report is that the Montana Universities need the increased funding to remain competitive with other schools in the Big Sky Conference, particularly the Idaho schools where intercollegiate athletics receive substantially more funds. While the performance of Montana State University this year and in 1972 would cast serious doubt on this claim, even if it is true it raises several important considerations. Such justification seems to leave us open for continued escalation of our athletic programs. Any time another conference school were to increase its funding of Intercollegiate Athletics, to be consistent with the above line of reasoning the Montana schools would have to follow suit. The level of funding of Montana Intercollegiate Athletics should not be based on the level of funding at other schools in the conference, but rather on what the state and students can afford. Again, it implies a "remaining competitive at all costs" mentality which places a priority on athletics over academic and financial considerations.

At the end of his report, Mr. Cook included a few "Points to Ponder". One of these points quoted a Professor Petrowski of the University of Nebraska as having said "Although there is little or no evidence that big-time college football contributes to academic excellence, there is none which demonstrates that such programs are incompatible or detrimental to academic excellence". This is true, except in the case of a tight budget where funds which otherwise would have gone to academics are channeled into athletics.

Professor Petrowski continues, "A more appropriate manner of describing the relationship would be: Successful college football programs are found at every level of academic excellence, but there are more of them at the better universities". Here Professor Petrowski seems to sadly miss the point. He implies that there is a causal relationship between successful college football and academic excellence because so many good universities have good football teams. It seems clear that no such relationship exists, rather more good schools have good football teams because of a higher overall budget. If a university has more money to work with, it can afford to put substantial sums into both its academic programs and its athletics programs. Again, such a situation does not exist in Montana at this time. Here the decision is clear: channel additional University System funds into academic and academic-related programs or risk continual degradation of academic programs in the system.
When considering the economic impact of mandatory athletic fees, three things must be considered:

1.) Does the fee allow the student to express his/her preference?

2.) Does the fee result in a more efficient use of a scarce resource, i.e., student money?

3.) Does the fee affect the goal of equal educational opportunity?

1. Student's preferences are expressed through representative student government (student votes, polls, petitions). Through intensive budget hearings, the preferences of the students are placed in priorities. The student government then decides what quantities of services can be provided within the constraint of the budget, and provides them. A mandatory fee circumvents this entire process. It implies that the Regents know student preferences better than students themselves. A "Big Brother Knows Best" attitude is implied.

During the 1960's students were constantly urged to "work within the system". Now students are working within the system. The result? A mandatory fee which abrogates the trust of students to make their own decisions. A corruption of the representative process occurs when students are denied their freedom of choice and decision.

2. Paternalism of the above type always results in a misallocation of resources (i.e. student money). Student preferences are known and allocations of student money are in line with those expressed preferences. To allocate student money differently is to misallocate and use such money inefficiently. The mandatory fee does exactly that.

3. The state of Montana, as expressed in the 1972 Constitution, has the goal of: a.) maintaining a system of education which allows for development of the full educational potential of each person, and b.) guarantees equality of educational opportunity to each person of the state. When student costs of education are high, educational benefits are available only to those able to afford it. This is in contradiction with the goals of the State. Well-to-do students can afford to pay increasing fees, however, low and middle income families are faced with a widening gap between available student aid and higher educational costs. A mandatory athletic fee is a fee increase, and thus, this serves only to widen this gap which serves to further limit the educational opportunities for these low and middle income families.

In summary: a.) student preferences are ignored with the imposition of a mandatory fee and paternalism is substituted.

b.) Such a fee insures misallocation of student money.

c.) The fee serves to further impede attempts to implement equal educational opportunity.