

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007

ASUM Student Government

11-11-1953

Documents from the November 11, 1953 meeting of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM)

University of Montana--Missoula. Associated Students

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

University of Montana--Missoula. Associated Students, "Documents from the November 11, 1953 meeting of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM)" (1953). *ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007*. 1392.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum/1392>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the ASUM Student Government at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

Central Board Minutes
November 11, 1953

Present: N. Anderson, Newlin, Baldwin, Abbott, Booth,
Dundas, Beck, Leibe, Walker, Brown, Johns, Foster, Jones,
DeForth, Gaughan, Ryan, Acher, Clow, Leuthold, Dugan,

The meeting was called to order by Kay Hudson. The minutes were read and the sentence "Therefore we couldn't take action." was stricken from paragraph 3, page three of the minutes.

Eyer reported that the Convocations committee will finance Dr. Koo. Eyer said that Outside Entertainment Committee and the Student Union Film Committee will work on the film series together. Expenses will be split evenly.

Van Meter introduced the three Student Union consultants, Charles Owens from University of Washington, Frank Noffke from Washington State College, and Dick Williams from the University of Oregon. Hudson introduced the Central Board Members.

Anderson arrived and took the chair. He suggested that we question the consultants.

DeForth asked how their unions are set up and what their Student Union fee is. Owens said that at the University of Washington they have a \$3,200,000. building. He said it is compulsory for all graduates and undergraduates to buy an ASUW card that costs \$25.50 a year. \$10.50 of this goes to the Student Union. He said it took them 25 years to build their Student Union.

Briggs asked if the plans for a Student Union with the Commons could be expanded in the future to give us the Ideal Union. Owens said the plans look favorable for adding units. He said the Ideal Union is one that serves the interests of the students, faculty, and staff of the University.

Williams said we have four possibilities: 1) to do nothing, 2) to remodel, 3) to hope for an Ideal Union, and 4) to build a Union on the Commons.

Williams said at the University of Oregon there is a student fee of \$51.00 per year. \$13.50 of this goes to athletics, \$7.50 to non-athletic activities, and \$30.00 to the Student Union. Of the \$30.00, \$24.00 goes to paying off the bond and \$6.00 to Student Union activities.

Noffke said they have a \$3,000,000. building at Washington State College. He said it took them 27 years to get their Union built. Each student pays \$36.00 a year to the Student Union. \$20.00 goes to paying of the bond and \$16.00 to Student Union activities.

Hoiness reported that the MSU Student Union fee is \$12.00 a year. Noffke said the assissment must be made according to the size of the student body. He said in a smaller school students must pay more for a good union.

Burnell asked the consultants if they favored a one or two wing union. Williams said they favored one wing built on the east end of the Commons. He said there's plenty of room there, a lot 200 x 175 feet, and that the Union could be seen from many points on campus. He said in the Hare report of 1947 the proposed location was the most desirable.

Noffke suggested that we plan the total Union structure of all the units. Then he said we could decide what will be put in each unit when we build it.

Briggs asked if it would be desirable or permissable to split the space of the Union now. Noffke said just one wing would be better. However, he said the split union would be better than none. Williams said if it is built as one wing it'll give us larger and more adaptable rooms.

Baldwin asked if splitting the Union between two buildings would affect the unity of student government. Williams answered that the activities most important to the Student Union and student government should be in the new building. He said the old building should be renamed. Owen said that activities such as the Sentinel that only concerns the staff could be kept in the old building.

Noffke said that from the figures on the Hare survey there will be enough room in the New Union to have the nucleus of activities there.

Briggs asked if we should build units on both sides in the future. He said the Commons may want the benefit of a building on each side of it. Owen said we could but it would probably be better to have just one wing.

Owens said there is \$200,000. worth of equipment in the Commons that will also be used by the Student Union. He said that because of the Commons, it would be impossible for the students to have a food service in a separate building.

Beck asked if the students would get as much out of the new building as they would if they remodeled the old building. Hoiness said that it would cost more to remodel this building than to build a new one.

Noffke said their Student Union offices are all in one large room. He said it saves space and money. Small meetings can be held there.

Williams read the facilities the consultants suggested for our first unit. They are a Coke Store, Lounge, lobby, student office space, work rooms, meeting rooms that can be used as dining rooms, an art gallery in the corridor and administrative office space. There will be a Ball Room, kitchen and rest rooms in the Commons that can be used by the Union. They also suggested that we consider having a piano practice room, music listening room, check room, and browsing room. They suggested that we excavate the basement and put the games and bowling there.

Burnell asked if the architecture of the building would allow us to excavate. Williams said they just recommended that we investigate the possibility. Williams said that game rooms weren't put on the first list because they're not that important to Student Union program. He said a Post Office could be put in the old building but that it would take too much space in a new building.

Burnell asked if there would be a problem of management. Williams said there wouldn't be if we get two good people as managers. Owens said that all three of their unions have special food directors.

Williams read the following recommendations of the three consultants:

1. The adjoining of the Student Union and Commons is not only acceptable but desirable.
2. Facilities to be located in one wing on the east side of the Commons. We recognize further study is needed to determine available and adequate space on the east side.
3. In our opinion it would be a mistake to have to separate the Student Union building. We recognize that certain facilities such as the Bookstore must temporarily remain in the present structure. Consideration should be given to renaming the old structure.
4. Adequate parking space must be provided near the Union and Commons, preferably in the area to the west.
5. The total Union structure must be planned prior to financial plans for the east wing in order to provide a sound total program at MSU.

6. Serious consideration should be given to the excavation of a basement level area under the proposed east wing for such things as game facilities, bowling, table tennis, billiards.

Van Duser asked what the staff organization is at their schools. Noffke said he has one assistant director, an accountant, bookkeeper, cashier. He also has supervisors of the various units and a night manager.

Williams said he has a program director, recreational director, four office staff, and four student directors.

Hoiness suggested that we put off the Student Union vote so we can give the students more facts.

Acher said the new building could be developed into a good building. He said the students think they're getting a poor substitute for a Student Union.

Briggs said we don't have enough time to educate the students. He said it's a technical question and the students shouldn't have a vote.

Wunderlich said the students want a vote. He said we need a vote because it would educate the students, give the building general support, and the president doesn't want to act until he has an indication from the student body. He suggested that we ask the president to go ahead on the Student Union Executive Board and Central Board's affirmative vote. In the meantime we could have a campaign and balloting.

Dugan said he thought we should ask the president for another week and then have a vote. He said anything the president does before a vote will be wasted if the vote is negative.

Anderson said that McFarland wants to know by Friday, November 13.

Hoiness said he didn't feel there should be a vote until all the details are known. Anderson said if the vote is affirmative Central Board can still turn it down.

Newlin said we can educate the students on the feasibility of the Union. He said they don't need to know all the details.

Hoiness moved that we have no student vote on the proposed Student Union in the Commons. It was seconded and defeated by a vote of 8 to 2.

Newlin moved that Anderson consult with McFarland to try to get the student vote moved to Friday, November 20. It was seconded and passed.

Williams said that at Oregon they went to living groups and explained the reasons for a Union fee increase. They asked for a vote from each living group. He said the system worked at the University of Iowa too.

Briggs moved that committee be appointed to campaign in the living groups. It was seconded and passed. Anderson announced that there will be a Central Board meeting Thursday, November 12, at 4 o'clock.

Owen said that letters to the editor are good for the campaign. Dugan and Anderson thanked the consultants for coming and for their help. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Present: Burnell, Wunderlich, Hudson, Phyllis Kind,
Hoiness, Lambros, Eyer, Kind, Briggs, Phyllis Kind, ASMSU Secretary