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Members Absent: Banaugh, Berger (out of town), Heliker, (out of town), McGiffert (out of town), Sharkey (out of town), Wheeler, and Whiteman (class).

Ex-officio members present: President Richard C. Bowers, Academic Vice President James Talbot, Dr. Philip T. Bain.

1. The minutes of October 20, 1975, were corrected to reflect Heliker as present. Erickson asked if Huff's remarks made at the October meeting pertaining to the Master's Degree in School Psychology be included in the minutes. Huff had pointed out that we were voting on the merits of the proposal and not the funding. The minutes were approved as corrected.

2. Announcements by Chairman Lowe:

A. The following policy statement concerning Store charge accounts was passed by the Associated Students' Store Board of Directors at their October 20th meeting:

"1. All accounts are due within 30 days of receipt of statement.
2. Any accounts that are 90 days past due will be posted. No further charges will be allowed until the billing is paid.
3. Accounts that are 120 days overdue will be permanently closed and turned in for collection."

B. Governor Thomas L. Judge will be in Missoula on Friday, January 16, and has requested a faculty forum at 3:00 P.M. on that day. The Senate will sponsor an open faculty forum.

C. The Appeals Committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Mark Behan, Botany, has convened for the purpose of hearing cases of length of service determination.

3. Committee Reports:

A. Graduate Council. Perrin, member of the Graduate Council, stated the purpose of the proposal was that some research be required of all candidates for
graduate degrees, not necessarily a research paper but rather some concern for research. Various objections and questions were raised of the proposal: clarification of statement necessary; if some programs currently do not have research component, why isn't Council reviewing those departments; statement too vague; must departments offering advanced degrees identify existing programs as research; an absence of the definition of what research means; amend proposal by stating "research of equivalent creative effort". Ullrich moved to return to committee to rework proposal so that it has meaning. Fisher seconded. The motion to return to committee passed (26,6).

4. Old Business:

A. Election of a third member to the Faculty Council. Lowe appointed Ken Brett, currently serving as alternate member be elected as the regular third member. Nominations for alternate were Steensland and Reinhardt. Reinhardt declined and Steensland was unanimously elected.

B. PAPFA. The six revisions brought to the Senate as a seconded motion from the Executive Committee on PAPFA were all passed by the Senate. Porter suggested an editorial change under "For Clarification, 2." to enclose "School, or College" in parentheses. The change was accepted. Huff stated the revisions would be effective immediately.

5. New Business:

A. Formula for Recovery of Merit. Academic Vice President Talbot presented his proposal on the formula for recovery of merit. Discussion followed, some opposition was expressed, and this matter will be discussed again at the next Senate meeting. Huff suggested objections be submitted in writing to Talbot.

B. "State of the University Address" by President Richard C. Bowers.

"There are three things that I would like to do in this State of the University message: (1) to bring information concerning the current status of activities to the faculty, (2) to make a few suggestions regarding the directions I feel the University should be going in, and (3) to speculate somewhat about the future of the University of Montana.

Current status of some activities. With the change in administration in the business area of the University, we are undergoing a period of change. We are involved with the other state universities and colleges in the development of uniform accounting procedures. We have been required, as of September 30, to deposit all our funds in the State Treasury. We have undertaken a clearer separation of the University of Montana Foundation from the University which will have impact on our research grants administration because from now on grants and contracts will come directly to the University rather than the Foundation. The Fiscal Affairs division is in the process of examining all their procedures and asking why they are doing certain things the way they are and are trying to develop procedures which would better serve the University. All of these things are being attempted while at the same time we are having to keep up with the day to day activities of the University. It is recognized that as a result of this, many problems have come up. We ask your patience in this and we would earnestly solicit your help in giving us information as to what problem
you are encountering so that we will be able to address these problems as they arise. We won't always know they exist until they are brought to our attention.

I would like to comment briefly on the budget outlook for 1976-77. We are, of course, uncertain as to what the budget will be and I can't add much to what was said at the faculty meeting at the beginning of the quarter. At that time I said we hoped our enrollment might be up because this might provide us with some relief. The enrollment is 8,826, up about 3% above last year. In view of the fact that our projected budget income and fees was based on a 2% decrease, our income should be up considerably. We are in the process of calculating our increase, not only for this quarter, but projections for the winter and spring quarter, so that we will not be able to calculate an absolute value. How can we use those additional dollars? At the present time, we are not requesting the use of these additional funds because there is in the Supreme Court the case that was brought by the Board of Regents against the Governor to decide whether or not the Board of Regents can spend that money without requesting a budget amendment of the Legislative Finance Committee. If this case is decided in favor of the Regents, then we will approach the Board. If not, we will need to go through both the Board of Regents and the Legislative Finance Committee seeking a budget amendment. To review numbers, if we assume that the University of Montana will receive from the remaining unallocated funds that reside with the Regents at this time, $400,000, a figure based on enrollments, this would mean we would have an increase in budget for next year of $340,000 over the current year's budget. If one assumes a 5 1/2% over-all salary increase for both classified and non-classified staff and faculty, this will require $800,000. If one uses a figure of about $330,000 for inflationary increases in other costs, which includes a large increase in utilities' costs, one comes up with a need for $1,130,000. With only a $340,000 increase this means we could be short by approximately $800,000. The earlier figure of $700,000 assumed a 5% average increase of salaries. It's possible, if it proves possible to carry over the increased income from this year, and if our enrollment is maintained next year, we might make up such a deficit. I am not certain when we will know about this but certainly nothing will be done until the Supreme Court case decision is made.

I would like to comment briefly on the recruitment activities for some of the administrative offices. The Academic Vice Presidential Search Committee has been reconvened. It is essentially the same committee as last year; Dean Wambach, Dean Solberg, Dr. Perrin, Dr. Silverman, Dr. Blackmer, Donna Booth, two students Diana Marshall and Kermit Hummel. The committee is active now. Will also renew our search for a Management Information Director and there is a search started for the Dean of Education, necessitated by Dean Rummel's retirement at the end of this academic year. The Arts and Sciences College is in the process of searching for an Associate Dean, and currently screening applicants. In addition, we will shortly launch a search for Dr. Patricia Douglas's replacement. Her position this year is really two-fold; serving both as Director of Continuing Education and Summer Sessions, and as Assistant to the President, and we will have a search for her replacement as Director of Continuing Education and Summer Sessions. Upon consultation with the Deans and others, it has been decided to designate that position a deanship and so it will be seeking a Dean of Continuing Education.

Program Reviews. I would like to comment both on the University reviews and the System reviews, the University reviews being independent of the System reviews. The University is carrying out, through the Academic Vice President's Office, a review of academic programs. Currently, the collection of statistical data is nearly complete and
early next quarter, the Academic Vice President's Office will be in contact with the various departments to discuss the qualitative aspects of the review. In addition, the University System is embarking on a review of programs. During the current year, the only ones that will be reviewed, as I understand it, are professional education programs and PhD programs that are offered at more than one institution. At a recent meeting of the System Academic Vice Presidents, an understanding was reached with the Commissioner's Office that before these reviews are initiated a statement of the purpose of the review will be made and also possible actions that might result in the review will be stated. Thus the purpose and possible actions which might result will be known prior to the review taking place. In terms of programs, and the Senate is of course aware of these, the Master of Public Administration is under study by an inter-university committee composed of members of Montana State and the University's Political Science departments and attempts are being made to develop a cooperative program. In addition, you have approved a Masters Degree in Rural Planning which is being considered by the curriculum committee of the Board of Regents. The Masters of Art in School Psychology, approved both by this body and by the Board of Regents, must await a decision as to whether funds will be available before it is initiated.

I would like to comment very briefly about the Law School accreditation. As most of you know, the Board of Regents met two weeks ago on this campus with the Consultant for the American Bar Association's Legal Education Section who was here to go over with the University a possible response to certain concerns which the American Bar Association still had concerning our Law School situation. At this meeting with the Board of Regents, he pointed out and discussed some of these concerns. In July, Dean Sullivan and I received a letter from the ABA, detailing these continuing concerns, and were requested to reply in detail to these concerns by December 1, which we will do. Those replies were discussed with the Consultant. There were 12 concerns that were listed at that time. I think, although the Consultant cannot speak for the Legal Education Section, he was quite satisfied with at least 7 of our replies to the 12 concerns. So there remains perhaps 5 areas of continuing concern. They are primarily in the area of Law School salaries and the autonomy of the Law School. Our situation with salaries in the Law School is that in terms of other law schools, as in the case of other disciplines at the University of Montana, we are paying low average salaries. I think it is that fact which the ABA is concerned about. On the other hand when we compare the difference between the average Law School faculty salary here and at other institutions in the Rocky Mountain Region, the same situation exists in that on the average, law school salaries are about 25-30% higher in the Rocky Mountain Region than non law school salaries. And that's just about what our situation is at the University of Montana. The University's problem is that we have low salaries across the board. We have presented this data to the ABA. In terms of autonomy, I think in many cases this is a matter of semantics. What the ABA is concerned with, in my opinion, is that curricula, admissions process, etc., are determined by the Law School faculty and that in any review of matters outside the Law School that there exists safeguards against capricious action. By working with the Executive Committee of the Senate, I think this matter can be worked out.

Certainly I would comment here that at least from the Mansfield Lecture Committee's point of view, the recent series was highly successful and we look forward to another Mansfield lecturer this spring, Archibald Cox. We will shortly be sending out requests for suggestions for Mansfield lecturers next year. The committee is interested in suggestions from faculty, students, and other members of the University community.

I would like to turn now to some suggested directions - things I think we should turn our attention to. First I would comment that, as in my comments last year, I
continue to be concerned about our lack of distribution requirements and the grade escalations that have occurred over the last several years. I know the distribution requirements are being considered by appropriate committees and individuals and so I will not comment further about that item here.

I think that we are making some progress, and must continue to do so, in paying increased attention to personnel evaluations and development and here I include, not only faculty evaluations, which I think the recent changes in the PAPFA document tried to address, but also to administration and staff evaluations. I was going to comment that from the perspective of the Academic Vice President and the President, we are encouraged by some of the changes in PAPFA, but after hearing Dean Solberg comment about the reams of paper that I have not seen yet, I'm not sure that I should say anything. I do want to comment, however, that having clear statements of criteria for promotion and tenure is a marked improvement. Adherence to specified criteria is a very important part of any personnel evaluation process.

We ought to make some type of formal recognition, both by load assignments and reward system, that all faculty do not do and should not do the same things to the same degree. All faculty are not necessarily publishing and doing research to the same degree. Perhaps we need to devise methods for variable teaching loads, variable research loads and variable public service loads. A system is needed which recognizes these differences - rewards people for what they do - rewards excellence in any of these areas, and allows the University to perform well all three functions which it has the responsibility to do. I hope that by the change of the title of the position responsible for Continuing Education, that this will be emphasized. We should, I believe, continue to put increased emphasis on Continuing Education activities, and provide as well as we can, given limited resources, educational opportunities for off-campus students as well as on-campus students. We are trying to get state appropriations for this kind of activity. As you probably all know, at the present time we work under the very difficult situation where these activities have to be supported entirely by the fees that are paid by Continuing Education students. We will continue to seek this as part of the regular State appropriations. This Fall, in trying to take a first step in opening up the University more than it has been to students regardless of age, we have allowed extension students to register in regular classes. I think, in a sense, we are losing money by doing this because these students don't count in our enrollment for budgeting purposes but it is the first step in trying to open up our offerings to all of the citizens in this area that can benefit from our regular course offerings. I think in this regard, it would behoove us to look at whether or not we might be able to offer our courses at times convenient to these students - in particular offering some courses or a section of a course in the evening. I know many departments are already doing this, and I applaud them for it.

We are looking at our summer session to try to do the same thing - to provide better opportunities for people who can come to the University for short periods of time. And this summer in particular, we hope to increase, through special programs, the cultural activities available to our students during the summer.

There is one thing that I feel very strongly about and that is that we must begin to be much more aggressive in satisfying the needs of the State. I think that over the past several years we have lost a number of opportunities to other State universities because, rightly or wrongly, we have appeared negative or non-enthusiastic to those making decisions about where certain programs should be placed. The University of Montana is the most comprehensive university in the State and I hope that it can remain that way. But if we sit on our hands, finding reasons why we shouldn't do things, we'll not long be the most comprehensive university in the State of Montana.
Finally I would say that we have to do a better job in informing people and prospective students what is good about this University and I think there is much that is good about it. And we have to inform them what programs we have to offer. This is a job for all of us. We have, for example, been looking at where our students come from within the State. We find marked differences between the percentages of high school graduates from one city to another that come to the University. We have embarked on a program of trying to visit especially those cities where the percentage of students entering the University are low, trying to find out why - whether we are not doing something we should be, whether we are not providing information to these students, or whether we have done something in the past they still remember and which turns students off. Any way that you can help us in this we would certainly appreciate. Our intent is not to embark on a hard sell recruiting program but rather to make sure prospective students know what we have to offer at the University of Montana and know that we are doing a good job.

Speculation about the future of any university, of course, is difficult. I am not sure right now what we can expect in the way of growth. Last year most people felt we had stabilized, but this year we saw a spurt in enrollment that was not expected and that occurred nationally. We can still take as valid the supposition that there will not be nearly as much growth in the remaining period of the '70s as there was in the '60s. So I think we still face a situation of having to improve our programs and do new things in the face of nearly static enrollments. That's perhaps the most difficult thing that universities have to face today. In periods of growth, new dollars are available simply because of that growth and it is a rather simple matter to put such new dollars into the kinds of things we believe are good new programs. But today there is very little in the way of new dollars so that when we recognize new programs that should be initiated - things we should do that we haven't been doing - we have a great deal of difficulty initiating them simply because the money is not available. This requires then, unless we are going to become static, that we continually examine what we are doing and be prepared to eliminate those things we no longer should be doing in order to fund new programs or activities which we should initiate.

One of the things that bothers Academic Vice President Talbot and me a great deal is the fact that because of budgetary constraints over the last 4 or 5 years, our personnel budget as a percent of the total budget, has steadily increased and this year it is 83.5% of our total budget. I don't think there is any magic figure for the percent the personnel budget should be but in most institutions that are engaged in considerable research and other non-classroom kinds of activities, the personnel budget will be someplace in the area of 60-75%. We are quite high in this regard, and this is the reason, of course, that we are not supporting adequately our library and do not have sufficient funds for equipment, etc. I am not indicating that we have too many employees or that they are paid too much. The fact of the matter is that our low budget is satisfied primarily by cutting out things other than personnel. I think that as a goal, we ought to say that some of these non-personnel items should have high priority and set as a goal the restitution of adequate budgets for such things as equipment, library acquisitions, etc. Otherwise I think the institution runs extreme danger of getting hopelessly out of date and not having adequate facilities to serve the students and the faculty.

There is a great future for the University of Montana. I think we have to be more aggressive - more aggressive in a time when there isn't much money, but I think it can be done, and I earnestly solicit your help in trying to do this."

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

-6- Philip T. Bain