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Ex-officio members present: President Richard C. Bowers, Academic Vice President Arnold W. Bolle, Director of Admissions and Records Philip T. Bain.

1. The minutes of January 20, 1977, were approved as distributed.

2. Announcements:
   A. The Faculty Senate meeting next month will be held March 10 due to conflicts with final week on the regularly scheduled time.
   B. Chairman Walsh introduced four new Senators: John Dayries, Joel Meier, Philip Catalfomo, and Erling Oelz.
   C. Walsh reported that Board of Regents Chairman Ted James will not be able to attend the February Senate meeting but will attempt to be here for the March meeting.
   D. Regarding the invitation to Educational Committee Chairpersons of the House and Senate to meet with the Faculty Senate, President Bowers has offered to extend such an invitation and the matter is still pending.

3. Old Business:
   A. The draft of the Mission Statement has been withdrawn from today's agenda by the Policy Committee. The Committee intends to report shortly and may request a special Senate meeting.

4. New Business:
   A. Seconded motion from Executive Committee concerning report from Alcoholic Beverage Feasibility Committee report. Walsh read the resolution. Remarks were made by Fisher, Rettenmayer, Von Kuster, Hart, Hill, O'Donnell. Field moved amendment to resolution: "The Executive Committee endorses administrative exploration of a potential alcoholic beverage service program on campus . . ." Fisher seconded. Dayries and Chessin spoke to the amendment. The amendment failed (12,19). Silverman moved amendment deleting "Executive Committee of the Senate" and replacing with "Faculty Senate", and deleting 'use' and replacing with "the availability". His motion was seconded and the amendment passed. The resolution as amended passed
the Senate and now reads:

"The Faculty Senate endorses the availability of alcoholic beverages on campus subject to reasonable restrictions such as: limitation of service to University Center, beer and wine only, and during the hours between 11:00 A.M. - 2:00 P.M. and 5:00 - 11:00 P.M."

B. President Bowers' State of the University Address will be included with the March Faculty Senate minutes.

C. Randall Snyder, President, Interfraternity Council, spoke to the Senate to inform them of the status of the Greek system, what plans they had, and asked for assistance and support from the faculty.

5. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Philip T. Bain
(TO BE APPENDED TO FACULTY SENATE MINUTES DATED FEBRUARY 17, 1977)

I. New Business:

B. President Richard C. Bowers' State of the University address:

"I would like to address a number of things which I think are concerns on the campus and have been occupying our time. I think the most critical of these is the question of the Academic Vice Presidency. It's critical because it's difficult for anybody in an acting position to have the continuity that I think is necessary in a leadership position. We were all very disappointed that the committee's recommendation, which had strong endorsement around campus and certainly from me, was turned down. Our options now are to either invite some of the other people to the campus from the pool developed this year or we can, according to affirmative action regulations as Kathleen Holden interprets them, look at anybody from the previous two years' pool. I have received and acted upon an additional recommendation from the committee but do not wish to make any further comment on that. I would like to indicate to you that I intend to fill that position on a regular basis next Fall. I think that this is critical to the campus and we do need the kind of continuity that a regular appointment will bring. I am not fully sure why we have not been able to attract the candidates to whom we have made offers to the campus. Clearly there probably is more than one reason in each case. Economics is probably one thing that pervades each case and I would, in order to give you the full information that I have from Allan Spitz who did turn down our offer, quote from the letter which he sent to me. 'Ultimately I decided against coming because at the most personal level I did not think that the sum of the opportunity, the authority, the location, the potential to learn, or the economics represented enough of an improvement over my current status to justify the enormous dislocations generally associated with such a move. I may regret my decision for serious or spurious reasons but perhaps fortunately I will never learn whether I made the right one.' These are the reasons he gave and I have no further information. I will be meeting with the committee next week to decide what further we may be doing and I hope that we can resolve the issue as quickly as possible.

I think that over the years I have been here I have spent a great deal more time than I would have liked on athletics. Nonetheless, I should report on the basketball issue and will make the following comments. We first learned of a possible infraction of NCAA regulations through a letter of inquiry from NCAA in which it asked some specific questions. The Athletic Department, with my knowledge, replied to those specific questions. The NCAA ruling in response to that was that Lee Johnson was ineligible. The infraction was of a somewhat technical nature and certainly we did not believe it was a wilful infraction. Consequently when we received the Big Sky ruling I think most people regarded it as extremely and unduly severe given the nature of the infraction. At that time I announced we were going to appeal that decision. However, last weekend we became aware of some other possible infractions of Big Sky rules as well as another NCAA rule. We initiated immediately a fact-finding investigation so that we would have full knowledge of the situation and I have now convened a committee consisting of some members of the University Athletic Committee and the Faculty Senate. I have asked this four-member committee to examine all the issues and facts and I hope that they will report to me on Monday or Tuesday of next week. I want to make clear that we have not come to any conclusions and will, throughout the process, protect the rights of all individuals. Further, I would state that we certainly do not want this to indicate any diminution of the University's support of the basketball program itself. We simply must be clear that, and have an absolute insistence that, our athletic program is completely above board and above suspicion. I think that's what all of you want and is certainly what I want. When allegations are made, we
think we have to look into them very seriously. We also want to make clear to the community that we are doing so and that we will do so in the future. We are taking a very careful look at that and I hope we will be able to report to the community there were no wilfull infractions in this whole matter.

The tuition increase came, although not unexpected I guess to many, quickly and perhaps without thorough enough discussion on the campuses. The increase for out-of-state residents is $400 and the increase of the resident fee is approximately $36 per year. This corresponds to about a 35% increase in what the non-resident students pay and that in turn corresponds approximately to the cost of living increase that has occurred since the last raise in tuition. We are back about where we were in terms of spending capability four years ago on the non-resident tuition. The decision was made not to raise the in-state tuition nearly as much and that increase amounts to about 12%. This will not recover the entire cost of living increase that has occurred over the last four years. In fact the Board was reluctant to raise the resident fee at all. In terms of the comments about these extra fees being needed for athletics, they simply do not apply to the University of Montana. In other action, the Board of Regents made a very strong statement that student fees on the other campuses ought not be used for the support of athletics. This is what is currently the case at the University of Montana. On the other campuses, if student fees are no longer part of the athletic budget, the difference will have to be made up by allocating additional funds from the general funds on each campus. So what they have asked in terms of intercollegiate athletics is just what has been true for several years at the University of Montana.

I'd like to announce, although this may have been in the newspaper earlier, that a decision has been made to combine a position of Director of Development for the campus with the Executive Director position of the Montana Foundation. This does not mean creation of a new position because the current Executive Director of the Foundation is retiring this year. The Executive Director of the Foundation has had no involvement in fund raising in other areas of the campus and we have decided that we should create a Director of Development position who would not only be the Executive Director of the Foundation but also coordinate all of the fund raising on the campus. Before we did this, we had on campus the Vice President for Development and Public Relations from the University of Michigan, an individual much respected in this field. He has reported to us with a series of recommendations including this one. I think that I should comment here that for the kind of university the University of Montana is, and the kind of constituency we have, we ought to be able to increase very greatly our private fund raising. I think that I am as optimistic here as anywhere else in terms of increasing the resources available to the University. So this is a very high priority item as far as I am concerned. We will be searching for a person who has a good record, understands a university, and has been involved in university or related fund raising programs.

I think that over the past several years the University has made some improvements in administrative functions to better serve the faculty and students. I hope that's true. We still need to make more improvements and I would indicate that further changes will occur in these areas. We continue to need your input and hope that when we do make improvements, you'll let us know. Also let us know where more improvements are needed as we are very concerned that we do whatever we can to provide the kind of services the campus needs in its teaching and research and public service activities.

I should comment briefly on the integration of Western Montana College and the University of Montana. This was a mandate from the Board of Regents and a committee has been
charged with the responsibility for developing recommendations, particularly in academic programming, better services, and better options to the student, both at Western Montana and the University of Montana. I think ultimately if we provide better services to the student, this must result in credit to the University. As a result, we are strongly supporting this effort and I think that it's important that we be successful. The committee, which consists now of five members from each campus, has put in a great deal of effort and is to be commended. We have integrated programs here with Western in Microbiology, the pre-medical program, and Pharmacy. This means students can start at a smaller institution, transfer here without any loss of credits, and finish on a normal sequence if they have done satisfactorily in their work on both campuses. In the same sense, we are in the discussion stages for Chemistry, History, Forestry, Mathematics and Physical Education. The committee has examined a great number of possible new programs. One of the Board's objectives for the integration, I think, is to make fuller use of the Western Montana campus which has a capacity of about 1500 students and now has an enrollment of only about 800. In order to do this, it has to be more than the single purpose institution it is now. We are looking at some interesting programs, programs which are not duplicates of others in the University system. Any new program will of course have to be approved by the appropriate committees on both campuses.

I have been preoccupied with the Legislature and have mixed thoughts to present to you. Clearly, we have been given a great deal of opportunity to present our case. The Education Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has been extremely generous in their time. We have met with them now for periods of from 2 to 4 hours on each of 10 occasions over the last several weeks. The members have listened to us, have come to understand many of our problems and how a university operates, and have had a great number of their questions answered - although not always to their satisfaction. The Long-Range Building Subcommittee of the Finance and Claims Committee, which makes recommendations on long-range building projects, has visited the campus. Several members spent most of a day here and I believe this was extremely productive since the Chairman has indicated to us that the building needs at the University of Montana are of the highest priority. So from this point of view, we are having, I think, a successful experience. But this has to be tempered with the fact that the economy of the State is not as all of us would like due to a number of factors, and I think the Legislature will have difficulty in distributing a small increased income. I am not quite sure how something which has been a good relationship will bear fruit in terms of dollars. All six units have been meeting together with the Subcommittee on Education to discuss such things as building fees, use of building fees, chargeback systems and other technical matters. They have asked us to make presentations on our program improvement requests, student-to-faculty ratios, and related matters. Now they will begin meeting individually with the campuses to discuss the base budgets. At this time, the Subcommittee is working from 1975-76 rather than the 1976-77 base budgets. Fiscal 75-76 bare budgets were used by the Executive Budget Office and the Legislative Fiscal Analyst in developing budget recommendations for State agencies, with one exception, and that is that the Executive Budget accepted University System 1976-77 budgets as a base. That was done in all agencies of the State of Montana by the Governor and by the fiscal analyst. In the Governor's case, he simply accepted our 1976-77 base and then added on to that. In this sense, the Executive Budget gave an advantage to the University system that no other agency had. What the committee is now doing is negotiating with us to determine what they feel is a fair 1976-77 base. We are going to have to justify all additions and increases in our budget that cannot be classified as strictly inflationary increases. If the supplemental appropriation is passed, and I'm optimistic about that, that would give us in this year's budget the additional $145 thousand which is being held in escrow. Assuming that this is passed, then we will have to justify every increase over...
what the subcommittee will classify as inflationary. For example, if we get the supplementary budget appropriation there will be a fairly substantial amount of additional money added to the library for book acquisitions. This is above the inflationary increase in cost of books. They will classify that a program improvement addition to our base and we will have to justify each of these to the committee. Once our base budget is established for 1976-77, then we will need to justify increases. These increases, as you know, not only include inflationary increases such as salary but also requests which have been designated as program improvements. We have already discussed these with the committee but will have other opportunities to do so. I suppose the thing that concerns the committee the most and certainly concerns us also, is how much our enrollment decrease will impact us. We have discussed at some length student-to-faculty ratios and I think at least some of the committee members recognize that to talk simply about a 19-1, 18-1, or 20-1 student-to-faculty ratio is very imprecise because it does not take into account the level of instruction, type of instruction, type of program or the mix of programs offered at each unit. As you know, the fiscal analyst, in the original recommendation, recommended a 20-1 student-to-faculty ratio. This would, if implemented, correspond to approximately a 45 faculty member decrease according to our current projections. This is probably our most critical matter and all I can say is that we will do our utmost to continue in our discussions of justifying our student-to-faculty ratio as it now exists. I've been very encouraged in this whole process and I think others have been also because we have generated some trust that perhaps was not there before. I think that this has simply been a matter of time as we have come to understand one another better. I think that certain legislators do have a much greater understanding of our problems and certainly we hope this will have an immediate impact on the consideration of our budget. I also hope that if we can maintain this, it will have a positive impact for future sessions as well. I do view the whole legislative matter with somewhat mixed feelings at this time and should comment on what believe are two major legislative concerns about the University system. Each unit does things in different ways and this is very frustrating to the committee. We have different series of accounts and designate accounts by different names. Chargebacks for computer use are made at Montana State University but not at the University of Montana. The committee would like to see a much more uniform practice among the units since it's difficult to make comparisons without uniformity. This is a system-wide problem which we will try to solve. The other concern is the fact that they see over the past years that money has been appropriated on the basis of presentations of need for library acquisitions or equipment, and it finds its way through union negotiations or some other process, into the personnel budget. The committee wants assurances that, for instance if they appropriate the half million dollars we have asked in library acquisitions, that indeed a half million dollars additional is used for library acquisitions.

Reiterating, I think the most critical thing on the campus is to fill the Academic Vice President position on a regular basis and we have every intention of doing so this year. It is also critical, as we look ahead, that in addition to working as hard as we can to increase our resources through legislative appropriations and private sources, that internally we begin developing processes for shifting resources when necessary. I think we cannot count absolutely on getting adequate funding for new programs that might be advisable and that might serve the student better. So, unless we think we should continue to do everything as we now are, and I don't think that's a very viable thing, we must develop internal flexibilities that we don't now have. I hope that by working with the faculty, we can develop such mechanisms. They have to be long-term mechanisms, taking into account our obligations to students and to faculty. We ought not make abrupt shifts in resources to accommodate what may be temporary shifts in enrollment. At the same we have to take account of the changing needs of society, and the changing needs of our students.
and I think this is one of the most important things facing all of higher education. I am optimistic that we can accomplish this.

The job of obtaining additional resources is primarily my job and the task of doing internally those things which will improve the quality of our programs, the options available to the students and the quality of our services to society is the responsibility of the entire campus."

A brief question and answer period followed.