

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

DATE: December 10-11, 1987

LOCATION: Conference Room
Montana University System
33 South Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana

REGENTS Lind, Hurwitz, Kehoe, Kaze, McCarthy
PRESENT: Morrison, Redlin
Commissioner of Higher Education Carrol
Krause

REGENTS None
ABSENT:

PRESIDENTS Carpenter, Easton, Koch, Merwin, Norman,
PRESENT: Tietz

PRESIDENTS None
ABSENT:

Minutes of Thursday, December 10, 1987

Chairman Lind called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. Roll call was taken and it was determined a quorum was present.

Report on University of Montana/Western Montana College Merger

President Koch, University of Montana, presented the document "Progress Report and Recommendations, UM-WMC Merger, December 1987" (on file). He explained the cooperation between the two units in preparation of the report had been excellent,

December 10-11, 1987

and the document reflects that. To place the report in context, he reviewed the charge given to the University of Montana and Western Montana College by the Board of Regents in January 1987. That charge was to develop a plan to administratively merge Western Montana College as a four-year branch campus of the University of Montana by July 1988, with certain specific mandates included in the motion regarding offerings and discontinuance of programs. A separate motion passed at the same meeting required a formal review of the merger be held by the Regents two years after the implementation of the merger plan (1990).

President Koch then reviewed the remainder of the progress report, including the merger objectives; summary of meetings and procedures to date; the name of Western Montana College (acted on at the July 23-24, 1987 meeting of the Board); leadership at Western Montana College; administrative and financial arrangements; student services; academic programs and services; and governance and legal issues.

In Section VII, Student Services, the request was made that the Board reconsider its action of January 1987 which discontinued WMC's football program, and allow Western to reestablish a football program if such a program is deemed by the two units to be consistent with the mission, priorities, and financial capabilities of Western. Three reasons for this reconsideration were cited: (1) Academic Considerations. (2) Financial Considerations, and (3) Campus/Community/Alumni Support. Academic considerations included Western's ninety-year tradition of preparing teachers and coaches for schools in Montana, and Western's Sport Medicine program. Football also provided an opportunity

December 10-11, 1987

for practical experience in athletic training in the Sports Medicine program. Without football, only a small number of students can obtain the supervised practical experience in a contact sport which is required for certification as an athletic trainer.

Other policy issues which will require further Board consideration and action include necessary changes in statutes; sharing of revenues and expenses, the recommendation that Western be the only campus in the System with open admissions; change in appointments to the Local Advisory Board for WMC; and authorization for the University of Montana to establish a graduate center at Dillon to offer a master's program using faculty from UM and WMC.

In summary, the presidents of the two institutions were optimistic about the merger. The intent of the merger is to improve institutional efficiency and administrative cooperation under the philosophy of "one institution in two locations." The real benefit of the merger will be in the academic relationships established between the two campuses.

Cautions were added, however, that while the merger may provide efficiencies, it does not provide major financial savings. This merger effort should be carefully monitored over the next several years to determine its actual strengths and weaknesses. A merger which increases costs to Western would not be beneficial, nor should the merger be a drain on the resources of the University.

Appendices A, B, and C, were also reviewed.

At the conclusion of the review, Chairman Lind commended the presidents of the two units, their

December 10-11, 1987

personnel, staff, and faculty for the cooperation which led to the presentation of the merger plan. He called for questions or comments from the Board, or from other interested parties.

Regent Hurwitz stated he had received many letters from rural school administrators deploring the loss of the football program at WMC. He favored reconsideration of that action. He believed the figures presented in the merger document, and the proposal to reinstate football at WMC with emphasis on preparation of teachers and coaches, were excellent arguments for such a reconsideration.

Regents questions on various aspects of the merger recommendations were responded to, including library resources, computer networking, collective bargaining agreements, and others. It was reiterated the goal of the merger was to provide better educational opportunity within limited resources. Any monetary savings would be reinvested to add to that educational opportunity.

John Warren, member of Western's Local Executive Board, spoke to the importance of football at some of the other units which are not as involved in teacher education as Western. He believed Western's football program was equally if not more important to the mission of Western, and encouraged the Board to seriously consider its reinstatement. He also commented that the recommendation which would change the appointment process of members of the Local Executive Board from gubernatorial appointments to a council appointed by the President of the University of Montana would ultimately weaken the effectiveness of citizen participation.

December 10-11, 1987

Chairman Lind stated formal action on the recommendations will be taken at the January 1988 meeting, after opportunity for consideration of the options and recommendations by the Board.

Campus Faculty Presentations on Conversion From Quarter to Semester System

Chairman Lind explained the format to be followed for the campus presentations on the conversion from quarter to semester system, noting each affected campus has been given an allotted amount of time for its presentation. Following those, any other interested persons present wishing to speak to the conversion would have an opportunity to do so.

University of Montana

Gerald A. Fetz, Chair, Faculty Senate, and Professor of German, University of Montana, reviewed his written testimony in opposition to the conversion (on file), presented on behalf of faculty and students of the University of Montana. Professor Fetz explained the extensive faculty discussions on the issue in the past weeks which were conducted with intensity and out of deep and genuine concern for the well being of the University, the System, and especially for maintaining and enhancing the quality of education offered to Montana students, and the faculties' ability to carry out research and service missions. The deliberations among faculty, campus deans, and students revealed a strong consensus that the quarter system ought to be retained at the University of Montana. Professor Fetz noted the written comments which were submitted from virtually every corner of the campus included expressions of concern, reservations, and arguments against the conversion which seemed almost universal,

December 10-11, 1987

regardless of discipline, as well as a multitude of arguments that focused on concerns specific to particular departments, programs or disciplines. He stated it was on that basis they were asking the Board to reconsider its decision on conversion to the semester system.

Also presenting either written or oral testimony in opposition to the conversion from the University of Montana were:

Professor Robert B. Hausmann, Chair, Linguistics Program, UM, presenting testimony (on file) which addressed the concern on behalf of the UM's interdisciplinary programs.

Dr. Dennis McCormick, Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature Department, UM, speaking to the concern for the foreign study program such a conversion would create. In summary, the conversion would require devoting one-eighth of a student's academic career to obtain the foreign study experience, as opposed to the present system which allows completion of their study abroad in one-twelfth of their academic experience. Freeing faculty to participate in the foreign study program for the longer term would also be extremely difficult, if not impossible. Dr. McCormick stated his belief these factors could lead to the demise of the program itself, and this in a time when international education is more important than ever before.

Scott Snelson, President, Associated Students, University of Montana, presented a resolution unanimously passed by Central Board in opposition to the conversion (on file). Mr. Snelson also spoke to reduced access, particularly for non-traditional students, such a conversion would create.

December 10-11, 1987

Jennifer Isern, Truman Scholar at UM and member of Central Board, spoke in opposition to the conversion, citing elimination of employment opportunities in forestry, agriculture, and recreation industries if a change to the early semester system was implemented.

Other testimony in opposition included responses to assumptions that conversion would lead to enhanced enrollments and retention, the "national trend" to semester systems, and monetary savings. The issue of increased faculty work-load to accomplish the conversion in times of strained resources was also addressed.

Written testimony (on file) was also submitted from Robert R. Brock, Associate Professor, French Section Head; "An Outline of Arguments against the Change to the Early Semester System" by J. Cox, F. McGlynn, P. Koehn, and T. Roy, University of Montana; a summary of arguments presented in opposition to and concerns expressed about the proposed conversion to semesters dated November 1987 from the Executive Council of the Senate (ECOS); a memorandum dated October 8, 1987 on Proposed Conversion to Semester System from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, UM, Doris Simonis, Chair & Gerald Fetz, Vice-Chair; and numerous memorandums on the impact of the proposed changes from various departments at the University of Montana submitted during the on-campus discussions in preparation for this presentation.

Dr. Fetz completed the presentation on behalf of UM's faculty and students with a pledge of support to the Board's commitment to address problems such as transferability of credit between institutions, and the diverse calendars within the System. It is the

December 10-11, 1987

faculties' belief such problems can be solved in ways other than through conversion to the semester system, and the faculty at the University of Montana would welcome the opportunity to work with the Board in finding alternative solutions to those and other concerns to make the System more responsive to the needs of its students.

Professor Fetz concluded by responding to Regents' questions including questions of breadth and depth of the two systems, sequential courses, actual numbers of courses that would be eliminated by the conversion, increased faculty workload to implement the conversion, and flexibility or lack of same provided by the semester system. The conversion's impact on the established system of interdisciplinary programs at the University was also discussed.

Montana State University

Robert Brown, Chairman, Faculty Council, Montana State University, stated on November 13, 1987 MSU hosted a workshop for the Montana University System Coalition to discuss the issues involved in transition to the semester system. Many of the issues presented earlier by the UM faculty were part of that discussion. A faculty poll was conducted after that workshop to determine the position of MSU faculty on the semester system. Dr. Brown introduced Wayne Larson, Vice Chairman of the Faculty Council, who was present to present the results of the faculty poll, and Katy Malee, President of the Associated Students of Montana State University, who spoke to the students' response.

Mr. Larson outlined how the poll was designed, and explained its dissemination. Analysis of the responses indicated 69% of the faculty responding

December 10-11, 1987

wanted to retain the quarter system; 30.8% were in favor of change to the semester system. The strongest opposition was from the letters and science college, in history, English, psychology, and to some extent sociology. The strongest support for conversion to the semester system was from the nursing department. Ninety percent of those responding they wished to retain the quarter system indicated they felt very strongly.

Mr. Larson stated the top three reasons listed for changing to the semester system were: (1) quality of instruction; (2) quality of research, and (3) costs and benefits to the students.

For remaining with the quarter system, the top reasons selected were (1) class size; (2) teaching loads; (3) quality of instruction; and (4) costs and benefits.

A very serious concern of the MSU faculty was the conversion will require a great deal of work on the part of everyone, faculty, administration, and classified staff. If all were certain there were sufficient advantages they would be happy to support the effort. There is, however, considerable skepticism whether sufficient resources will be made available to assist in the transition. This is not a criticism of the legislature, Regents, or the administration. Given the economy in Montana there is doubt people can be given release time or any other concrete assistance to allow them to work on the conversion and carry on continuing responsibilities. Mr. Larson reported on behalf of the athletic program there would be some savings in that department if conversion is implemented.

Mr. Larson concluded his report by stating that while the last consideration may appear self-serving, a strong objection of many who responded to the

December 10-11, 1987

poll was conversion to the semester system will take away from them the privilege of enjoying some of the best months Montana has to offer recreationally, and this is one of the few remaining meaningful benefits which compensate many faculty in some measure for the disparity between their salaries and those holding similar positions in other states.

Katy Maley, President, ASMSU, and Kent Peterson and Jay Grau, Senators, ASMSU, presented written testimony on the results of the student poll and a copy of the poll responses (on file). The poll indicated overwhelming support for continuation of the quarter system by the students polled.

Hugo Smith, Physics Professor, also spoke in opposition to the conversion, citing particularly loss of flexibility, reopening of the established core curriculum, and possible reversion to narrow specialization in course offerings. He also spoke to the increased conflicts conversion would create for teaching/research faculty, particularly in the transition years.

President Tietz concluded MSU's presentation emphasizing this is another uncompensated cost the campuses will have to absorb. A whole series of federal and state regulations have been absorbed without any increase in resources. Administrative staff and marginal instructional faculty have been reduced, increasing the load on the remaining faculty, while attempting to maintain a strong quality program. What this action will do is impose a three year obligation on the administration and the staff with an estimated cost of approximately \$30,000 - \$40,000 for each of those

December 10-11, 1987

three years. This does not include the time of deans and department heads and others involved in the conversion. All campuses are already facing a series of issues that have their "backs against the wall", and no one is certain what the future holds in the way of budget for the next biennium. He questioned whether this additional burden is really worth the cost in quality of instruction, faculty time, and administrative obligations against budgets and resources which are very, very limited.

Northern Montana College

Bill Thackery, of the English Department at Northern Montana College, and member of the Faculty Senate, presented written testimony (on file) from faculty and administrators at NMC. While the depth of feeling of faculty does not appear to run as high in opposition to the conversion at NMC as at the other campuses heard from today, it is not supported. Students who expressed their feelings to Mr. Thackery, particularly in the vo-tech area, were opposed to the conversion principally on the question of access. Mr. Thackery reiterated statements made previously questioning whether the calendar change would be of sufficient value to the System to counteract the upset of continuity, the additional workload, and the very real issue that it might indeed lead to decreased enrollments particularly at a rural institution such as NMC.

Eastern Montana College

Dan Peterson, Eastern Montana College Faculty Chair, stated the Eastern Montana College Faculty Senate is not in opposition to the semester conversion, nor is the academic senate and the

December 10-11, 1987

associated students. The conversion is viewed at EMC as a mandate from the Board which is a lot of work, but which is expected to be complied with. It necessitates a complete review and assessment of the curriculum, but that can only lead to improvement in curriculum offerings. There is resistance to change among some faculty at EMC, but the overall attitude is more "for" the conversion than "against." Mr. Peterson distributed copies of the EMC "Semester Conversion Newsletter" (on file) which set out the principles and guidelines for the semester conversion on the EMC campus. He stated much has already been accomplished in beginning the conversion. Copies of selected regional institutions showing which calendar they used were distributed, as was information showing by state the number of schools on quarter calendar (excluding two year schools). Mr. Peterson noted that while the quarter system does provide more quantity, or titles of programs, you can not necessarily equate quantity with quality.

Mr. Peterson commented on the value of the process of curricular review necessary to accomplish the transition from quarter to semester system. He also expressed concern for the image of the Regents and the System if the mandate to change is rescinded. He believed that would send a negative message to the legislature, whose support and funding is crucial. Eastern's faculty is not excited about the effort and work the change will entail, but do see the potential of the outcome. Neither the quarter nor the semester system will solve all problems; both have pluses and minuses. Eastern's administration and faculty have begun the process to implement the mandate to change to the semester system, and believe it will address the

December 10-11, 1987

issues of academic improvement, transferability, and common calendar which the Regents' stated was their intent. To delay strengthens opposition.

President Tietz commented briefly on the differences, just from a mechanical point of view, of converting 5,000 courses at Montana State University and the considerably fewer number of such conversions at a smaller, non-doctoral college. The "internal searching" involved needs to be done on an appropriate timeframe and with sufficient resources to provide a truly introspective study that will result in a quality improvement that offsets the cost the review. As an example, he stated if each faculty member out of a faculty of 500 devotes one day a year to the conversion, the cost to the institution is \$91,000. That time and effort are vastly different on a campus such as EMC, as opposed to MSU or UM.

Associate Professor Joanne Sheridan, EMC, spoke in support of the original assumptions on which the Regents based their decision to implement the conversion. She stated studies reviewed indicated several of the System's problems would be addressed if the conversion is made System-wide. When asked if she would continue to argue for the change if the mandate was rescinded, she responded her only concern would be that of transferability of credits. She believed the curricula review could only result in improved programs.

Kendall McCrae, Student Body President, EMC, explained how students were polled. He stated the majority of the students at EMC endorsed the conversion, both traditional and non-traditional, citing particularly that students believed it would lead to improved student advising and transferability of credits.

December 10-11, 1987

At the conclusion of the campus faculty presentations, Chairman Lind called for comments from other interested parties present.

Dr. Keith Parker, representing the faculty of Western Montana College, addressed the issue. He noted Western is already on the semester system. If the faculty were polled, there would be great diversity of opinion as to whether that was the better system. Dr. Parker stated he spoke not in favor of one system or the other, but to give an historical perspective of what the change to the semester system did at WMC. The problem was the changeover occurred in the midst of faculty dissent. The faculty at Western did not favor the conversion at the time it was recommended to the Regents. Thus, a very poor environment for the changeover was created because of lack of faculty involvement in the decision, and support for the change. While the changeover occurred, there are still longterm ramifications of the way it occurred which created, and to some extent still creates, problems between faculty and administration at Western. Speaking for the faculty at WMC, Dr. Parker applauded the Regents for the careful deliberations relative to this issue, and their willingness to listen to those who question the changeover, as well as those who support it.

Regent Morrison asked whether the University and Western were finding complications in not having the same quarter/semester system in working towards the merger of the two institutions. Dr. Parker responded it has not created any great dissonance.

Hearing no further comment, Chairman Lind directed the Commissioner, working through Deputy Commissioner Albrecht, review the concerns expressed

December 10-11, 1987

today, considering those against the Commissioner's report and recommendation made to the Board in December 1986. After that review and meeting with campus representatives to determine if those concerns are of such magnitude they would change the Commissioner's recommendation for conversion, a report should be brought to the Board at its January 1988 meeting. Should any member of the Board wish to reconsider conversion to the semester system, that will be taken up at the January 1988 meeting. It is the intent of the Board to accommodate the timelines and move rapidly to a decision on this matter.

The meeting recessed at 5:10 p.m. The Regents reconvened immediately in executive session.

Minutes of Friday, December 11, 1987

Chairman Lind called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. in the same location. Roll call was taken and it was determined a quorum was present.

Chairman Lind called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. None were stated, and the minutes of the October 29-30, 1987 meeting were ordered approved.

Budget Committee

Item 58-501-R1287, Authorization to Increase Student Health Fees; Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, was presented by President Norman. He explained that due to inflation, students had two options on their health plan -- to increase fees and maintain current level of coverage, or reduce services. The fee increase was approved at a student body election on September 22, 1987, with 77% of the total students voting in favor of the increase. On motion of Regent Hurwitz, the item was approved.

December 10-11, 1987

Item 58-902-R1287, Budget Amendment; Office of Commissioner of Higher Education, was presented by Jack Noble, Deputy Commissioner for Management and Fiscal Affairs. Mr. Noble referenced the November 18, 1987 memorandum to the Executive Budget Office and the office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst (on file) sent with the Regents' agenda material which carried a full explanation. The Commissioner's office, which manages the grant, will receive more federal funds for the program than were anticipated. The budget amendment provides authorization to disburse the additional funds. On motion of Regent McCarthy, the item was approved.

Capital Construction Committee

Mr. William Lannan presented Item 58-101-R1287, Property Acquisition Zone; University of Montana. He explained the item has been reviewed by Commissioner's staff, and although unique, carries a recommendation for approval in this instance. The item authorizes the University of Montana to purchase property within a designated zone under specific guidelines set out in the item, including approval by the Commissioner prior to purchase. The proposal is unique in that the purchases will be reported to the Board after the fact.

Chairman Lind stated for the record that because he owns property within the designated zone, he would abstain from participation in discussion or action on the item.

Regent Redlin commented approval of the concept would in her mind be another loosening of control of the System by the Regents. While she stated she was not averse to property zones being established,

December 10-11, 1987

it is one more example of others making decisions in which Regents should participate.

Vice President Glen Williams, University of Montana, distributed copies of a map showing the area to be designated, all of which is contiguous to the campus and part of the long range planning program for acquisition. He explained the University is requesting the flexibility of allowing the Commissioner to approve the purchases within the specific zone because often times a piece of property becomes available for sale and the owners do not wish to wait the sometimes month or six weeks until the next Regents' meeting is scheduled to consummate the sale. Each purchase would be reported to the Board, but with the Commissioner's approval it would be possible to close a sale prior to that report. In all other aspects, Regents' policy on acquisitions would be adhered to.

Commissioner Krause noted if this item is approved, Regents' policy for property acquisition at other units should be revised so one unit is not granted special privilege which in fact is in violation of existing policy. He suggested if this variance is approved, a proposed revision to current policy be brought to the Board granting the same or similar authorization to other units.

After discussion, Regent Hurwitz moved the Item 58-101-R1287 be approved with the proviso that any acquisitions within the property zone be reported to the Board. The motion carried with Regent Morrison voting no.

Chairman Lind also requested Commissioner's staff review existing policy to determine if language needs to be changed to allow other units to

December 10-11, 1987

establish property acquisition zones.

Item 58-102-R1287, Provide and Install Range Hood Fire Extinguisher Systems in Lodge and University Center Kitchens to Comply with Fire Marshall Report and Fire Codes; University of Montana, was recommended for approval by Mr. Lannan. The total cost of the project will not exceed \$35,000, and will be totally funded from auxiliary revenues. On motion of Regent Redlin, the item was approved.

Item 58-202-R1287, Authorization to Remodel the Fourth Floor of Lewis Hall; Montana State University, was presented by Mr. Lannan. The item authorizes remodel of a series of four rooms in Lewis hall at a total estimated cost of \$59,000. Lewis Hall is an academic facility. Montana statutes require any capital construction project in excess of \$25,000 to obtain prior legislative authorization. If such a project is funded wholly with federal or private monies, the Regents can approve the expenditure with the concurrence of the Governor as defined in MCA 18-2-102 (2) (c). The item states the individual value of each of these projects is in the range of \$6,000 to \$18,000. MSU wishes to bid the project as one in the belief it will receive more competitive pricing and greater control of all the critical project phasing. The project will be financed with plant funds.

Mr. Lannan explained his concern with the proposal is that while plant funds may be interpreted to be private monies and the project could proceed as proposed, this facility is a state facility and remodeling should be paid for with state appropriated dollars. It is the responsibility of the state. To allow the state to abrogate that responsibility sets a

December 10-11, 1987

dangerous precedent. If the Governor withholds his concurrence, the project is again jeopardized. Funds for the remodel of Lewis Hall have been repeatedly requested of the legislature, but have not been made available.

Mr. James Isch, Director of Administration, MSU, elaborated on the explanation set out in the item on the need for the remodel, and responded to Regents' questions on reasons for bidding the project as a single project, the integral nature of the collections to be housed in the remodeled facility to the instructional program, and the funding sources.

After discussion, it was the recommendation of the Commissioner that the item be withdrawn. At the request of Mr. Isch, Item 58-202-R1287 was withdrawn from consideration at this time. Authorization was given to MSU to resubmit the item at a future meeting.

Item 58-701-R1287, Purchase of Real Property; Eastern Montana College, was presented by President Carpenter. Pursuant to Board policy two appraisals are available for the Board's consideration. The appraisals resulted in valuations of \$45,000 and \$56,000 for the property located at 2730 Normal Avenue, Billings. The conditionally negotiated purchase price which the Board is asked to approve is \$50,000. On motion of Regent Kaze, the item was approved.

Collective Bargaining Committee

Sue Romney, Director of Labor Relations, reported the ratification of the tentative agreement with the Montana Public Employees Association by mail ballot. The ballots are on file in the Commissioner's office.

December 10-11, 1987

By-Laws and Policy Committee

Chairman Lind explained Item 34-104-R1281, Collection and Remittance of Fees for Student, Non-profit, Non-partisan organization; University of Montana (Revised) was on the agenda for reconsideration of the funding method. The proposed revision would change the funding mechanism from a waivable fee to a voluntary and elective fee. The following rules for discussion of the revision were set out by Chairman Lind. The Commissioner's office will discuss the legal issues regarding the contract entered into between the University of Montana and MontPIRG; then MontPIRG representatives will have an opportunity to speak to that issue. Proponents of the proposed change will be asked to speak first; then opponents. All speakers are asked to limit themselves to no more than five minutes because of the lengthy discussions held on the various aspects of MontPIRG in past presentations to the Board. All Board members are completely familiar with most of the issues.

Regent Morrison requested the discussion begin with the legal ramifications of such a change. Dr. LeRoy Schramm, Chief Legal Counsel, referenced the letter from Mr. Jon Motl, attorney for MontPIRG, which explained that when the funding issue was last adopted a specific authorization was contained for ASUM and MontPIRG to enter into a two-year contract. They now assert that authorization ties the Board's hands for two years. Dr. Schramm stated he found little to disagree with in the essential conclusion reached by Mr. Motl. There are some arguments the Board can repeal that decision, but case law indicates that would not be looked on favorably by a court of law. Dr. Schramm

December 10-11, 1987

explained the two-year contract provision was inserted by an amendment presented during the discussion on MontPIRG funding before the Board in April 1987. There was no real discussion of what was intended on that amendment in the minutes of the April meeting. After review of other legal ramifications, Dr. Schramm stated the Board had arguments available if it wished to make a change which would invalidate the contract, but the outcome would be difficult to predict with confidence.

Dr. Schramm pointed out the contract entered into between MontPIRG and ASUM does appear to go slightly beyond the time authorized. The item was approved on April 28, 1987; the contract was entered into on May 1987, but did not take effect until fall quarter 1987 and runs through summer session 1989. The two year authority granted by adoption of the item in 1987, if such authority was granted, has been extended by MontPIRG for a period of twenty-eight months. The Board is not bound to honor the summer session covered in that contract period.

Kim Wilson, attorney for MontPIRG in Mr. Motl's absence, commented he believed Mr. Motl's letter was self-explanatory regarding the substantive facts. He believed both entities involved had authority to enter into the contract, that it is a valid and binding contract, and the Board is bound by that agreement for the two year period. He concurred with Dr. Schramm's analysis that the contract period had been extended for a two or three month period beyond that authorized in the April 1987 meeting.

Chairman Lind asked if there was a mechanism within the contract which would prevent it being renewed prior to its expiration date, thus

December 10-11, 1987

preventing the Board from rescinding its authorization. Mr. Wilson responded his reading would indicate it is a two-year contract, and he did not see a mechanism that permitted its extension. There is a mechanism to stop the contract if student support drops below an established level.

Chief Counsel Schramm stated his interpretation is that the policy as it stands is unclear whether it was intended to be a one time only two-year authorization, or a continuing authorization. That point merits review.

Chairman Lind called for questions or comments from the Board on the legal issues. Regent Morrison stated in view of that discussion, he would withdraw his proposed revision of the funding mechanism. He stated he did not believe it was ever the intent of the Board to lock in the fee mechanism; he believed the intent was to allow ASUM to collect the fees and pass them on to MontPIRG.

Regent Morrison then proposed an amendment to current MontPIRG policy to add a sunset provision to Item 34-104-R1281 which would sunset the agreement on April 28, 1989. Discussion was held on Section 7 under "Procedures" in Item 34-104-R1281. Regent Kaze stated his interpretation of that section was the contract was for a period of two years; the renewal provision, which he believed was his language originally, was intended to be active during the course of the two-year period the contract was in force. The intent was to insert into the process a mechanism to provide for regular reaffirmation that MontPIRG had the support of some proportion of the student body, not necessarily at the end of a two-year period.

December 10-11, 1987

Regent Redlin stated she still objected to insertion of language into section 7. The contract entered into was for a two-year period. At the end of that period the present policy provides a mechanism for renewal. Inserting language at this time to make the contract non-renewable was objectionable to Regent Redlin.

Regent Morrison suggested inserting a new subsection (c) in Section 7 adding that the additional requirement for renewal of the agreement between MontPIRG and ASUM would be approval by the Board of Regents. Dr. Schramm cautioned that may or may not deal with the contract issue, but would not address the funding issue of MontPIRG, which has been at the crux of many previous discussions before this Board. If in two years the Board did not authorize renewal of the agreement, ASUM would be on the outside, but the waivable refundable fee collection mechanism would remain in force.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board that the intent of establishing the two-year time period was to establish a review period for the entire policy. With that understanding, Regent Morrison moved Item 34-104-R1281 be amended by adding a new Section 8. Section 8 shall provide that the policy will be reviewed for consideration of continuation by the Board prior to April 1989. No authority to enter a renewal of the agreement between ASUM and MontPIRG should be presumed until that review occurs. It is also the Board's understanding that the referendum called for in Section 7 (a) will be held in accordance with the terms of that section. The results of that referendum indicating student support for the continuation of

December 10-11, 1987

MontPIRG will be brought to the Board before the review called for in new Section 8 is conducted. The motion carried. Item 34-104-R1281 was approved as amended.

Curriculum Agenda

Submission Agenda

Item 55-101-R0687, Master of Administration Degree; University of Montana was received for consideration at a future meeting.

Action Agenda

Item 57-201-R0987, Center for Synthesis and Characterization of Advanced Materials; Montana State University was presented by Dr. Albrecht. The information contained in Dr. Albrecht's memorandum to the Commissioner dated November 30, 1987 (on file) was reviewed. Dr. Albrecht stated the purpose of the Center is an effort to step into the current gap in materials research, and this ambitious project can best succeed under the umbrella of a center. While this may incur significant budget increases within the University, additional state funds are not sought. The impact on undergraduate studies will be minimal. Graduate students in the programs and disciplines under the Center may be significantly affected in research, employment, and instruction. Dr. Albrecht recommended the item be approved.

Dr. John Jutila, Montana State University, explained the impetus for development of the Center stating there is need to formalize the structure that will bring focus to an activity on campus that involves several disciplines, including physics, chemistry, and several programs in engineering. This proposal will facilitate both recruitment of faculty into the program, and obtaining grants and contracts to support the

December 10-11, 1987

materials science effort. The Center (SACAM) is MSU's component to the Center of Excellence Proposal which involves Montana Tech. Dr. Jutila explained the ways the two campuses would cooperate on projects, and explained the administrative organization of SACAM. He also explained that MSU is the recipient of a major material research MRG grant of \$1.7 million providing operational money and monies for personnel. Grant and contract activities, and investment of indirect cost recovery monies will serve as a major source of future funding. Dr. Jutila commented briefly on the program modification to be requested from the next legislature, noting MSU is not overly optimistic that will be approved given the state's economy. Other possible future funding sources were discussed by Dr. Jutila also. Speaking to the future of the program, Dr. Jutila stated MSU has an outstanding faculty and facility. Five to ten years down the road the SACAM will serve a growing community of high tech industries and industries having a need for new materials. This is a very important role for the center, as its potential to train young men and women for employment in those industries.

Dr. Jutila then introduced Dr. Gerald J. Lapeyre, Acting Director of the Materials Science Program, as it is now designated at Montana State University. Dr. Lapeyre elaborated on the elements of the program already in place, and on the importance of development of new materials to meet the needs of the future. Dr. Lapeyre spoke also to the very serious present and future space needs of the Center.

Concluding the presentation, Dr. Jutila referred to a document received from the National Science Foundation which has classed both the facility

December 10-11, 1987

under discussion, and Dr. Lapeyre as national resources. He urged the Center's approval.

After discussion, on motion of Regent McCarthy, the item was approved.

Dr. Albrecht presented Item 57-203-R0987, Authorization to grant the degree of Bachelor of Science in Technology Education; Montana State University, referencing his memorandum to the Commissioner dated December 1, 1987 (on file) and noting it carries a recommendation for approval. In addition, Dr. Albrecht commented MSU has dropped the bachelor's degree in industrial arts and wishes to move to the bachelor's degree in technology education. The changes from industrial arts to technology education include the difference between career preparation with specific technical skills to the understanding of the technological world. The changes are represented by changes in the substantive matter being taught, specifically to skill learning replaced by problem solving, and manipulative skills replaced with activities. MSU personnel involved in the program will discuss that at greater length.

Dr. Albrecht reported that since the item was submitted several discussions have been held on the proposal, and it is his recommendation the issue of duplication no longer be considered. Because of the geographic location of the three offerings in the System -- Bozeman, Dillon, and Havre -- there is no unnecessary duplication in the System in this area. He did, however, ask the Board hold a review to assess the progress of the three institutions having this offering sometime during the next year. The Office of Public Instruction supports the conversion, but also endorses the recommended progress review.

December 10-11, 1987

Dr. Stuart Knapp, MSU, elaborated on the information on the proposed change contained in Dr. Albrecht's memorandum, explaining the part played by the outside review panel who spent time on MSU's campus looking at the issue of technology education and industrial arts, and its possible conversion and place in the institution. The strong recommendation of that review team was the conversion to the technology education program be implemented. Dr. Knapp also noted that a fourth credit requirement in technology education for all students was added to MSU's newly-implemented core curriculum on the recommendation of a panel of the Northwest Area Foundation who worked with MSU on the development of the core curriculum.

Dr. Max Amberson, MSU, stated technology education is the new basic in terms of education, and is replacing industrial arts in Montana and across the nation. Forty states currently are in some stage of that reconfiguration, and he believed Montana is in the forefront of that movement because it began its movement in 1978. Dr. Amberson briefly reviewed the differences between technology education and industrial arts, and responded to Regents' questions. Dr. Amberson also discussed funding sources for the program, including proposed legislation at the national level which would establish ten demonstration centers across the nation funded at approximately \$300,000 per center if the legislation is enacted. Montana is indicated to be the leader to be selected as a demonstration center if that effort is successful.

Regents questions included the program's in-service to teachers in the field, withdrawal of the issue of duplication, and monitoring of the production

December 10-11, 1987

and demand for graduates of the program. Commissioner Krause noted it was the intent of MSU to bring this program forward when they requested withdrawal of the industrial arts program.

Acting President Easton expressed Western's support for the proposal, noting Western's movement in a similar direction. He encouraged the review of how technology education is being implemented, but if the issue of the review was duplication he would be less supportive. Because of Western's programs in place in technology education, he would prefer any issue of duplication be addressed before new programs are authorized.

President Merwin endorsed the presentation, and the comments of Dr. Easton, and also urged the high school preparation program be reviewed to add a component of technology education to relieve some of the anxiety of the public schools.

Issues of certification were discussed by Mr. Wulfe, Office of Public Instruction, and Claudette Morton, staff of the Board of Public Education.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman called for a motion. Regent Kaze moved that Item 57-203-R0987 be approved. Commissioner's staff was directed to monitor the three programs in technology education in the System, and conduct the review of the programs recommended by Dr. Albrecht and report back to the Board. The motion carried.

Item 57-704-R0987, Authorization to add the Option in Educational Computing to the Master of Education Degrees, was presented by Dr. Albrecht. He reviewed the information on the option contained in his memorandum to the Commissioner dated November 30, 1987

December 10-11, 1987

(on file), noting the target audience is experienced teachers who wish to gain a stronger educational background in use and application of computers in school. No other unit offers this option within the master's degree. No additional faculty or costs will be added. He recommended its approval.

President Carpenter elaborated briefly on the proposal, and responded to Regents' questions.

On motion of Regent Kaze, item 57-704-R0987 was approved.

New Business

Guarantee Services Agreement for Processing and Maintenance of Student and Parent Loan Programs for the State of Montana; Montana Guaranteed Student Loan Program

William Lannan, Director of the Montana Guaranteed Student Loan Program, distributed copies of the Guarantee Services Agreement and reviewed its terms. He noted no major changes will occur immediately in MGSLP, as this provides for a phase-in of these services as discussed with the Board in an earlier meeting. The change will result in reduced costs of servicing, and ultimately provide jobs for Montana citizens. Authorization is sought to allow the Commissioner to sign the Agreement on behalf of MGSLP and the Board of Regents. Chairman Lind cautioned in light of pending federal legislation that the project move forward cautiously. On motion of Regent Hurwitz, authorization for the Commissioner to sign the agreement was approved.

Commissioner's Report

Presentation by Senator Lynch on Vo-Tech Funding

Commissioner Krause introduced Senator J. D. Lynch, who had requested an opportunity to speak to the Board on the matter of vocational-technical education funding.

December 10-11, 1987

Senator Lynch stated his concern lies with future funding for the vo-techs now that governance of those centers has been passed to the Regents. He stated that again the legislature failed to address a future funding source for the vo-tech centers, as it has not addressed that issue since he has been in the legislature. He also no longer believes the local communities will continue to approve the voted levies that constitute a large part of present vo-tech funding. Senator Lynch stated his proposal, which would require Regent endorsement, is that if and when a special session of the legislature is called in the spring, legislation be introduced that would place on the ballot for vote at the next general election a 2-mill statewide levy earmarked specifically for vocational-technical education at the same time the 6-mill levy is placed on the ballot for units of the University System. Now that the centers are state institutions, he believed the local communities are going to demand the state assume responsibility for their financing. Senator Lynch's proposal included using the committee organized to support the 6-mill levy to promote the 2-mill levy.

Regent Morrison questioned if the 2-mill levy would be imposed for ten years, and asked what portion of the vo-tech center budgets would this comprise. Senator Lynch responded it would be for ten years, and would raise approximately \$4 million of the \$11 million budget of the centers. Regent Morrison expressed concern at that portion of the centers' budgets being comprised of levy that could be voted down in ten years. Senator Lynch noted the original legislation introduced by Representative Donaldson for

December 10-11, 1987

changes in vo-tech governance and funding included a 2-mill levy for its support, but this was consistently voted down in the House. Regent Redlin commented on the similar financial bind the community colleges face, noting they also provide considerable vo-tech education to the state. They might have rather strong feelings if some portions of vo-tech education were supported by a statewide voted levy, and they did not receive the same support. It was noted the legislature changed the language in the 6-mill levy referendum to specifically limit it to the six units of the University System. Regent Redlin noted that while people in local districts having a community college within that district do support the community colleges, they also support the six units of the System to the same degree all other tax paying citizens do, and this could not be simply glossed over.

Commissioner Krause summarized, stating the funding issue for the vo-techs is a major one that has to be addressed. The more ideal situation would be if the legislature, in its special session, would levy the two mills. That is probably unrealistic. What the System must also consider is whether placing an additional 2-mill levy on the ballot would jeopardize the 6-mill levy, or enhance its support.

Chairman Lind questioned Senator Lynch on his proposal that the same committee formed to support the 6-mill levy be utilized to support 2-mill vo-tech levy. Senator Lynch stated he believed the prestige of the membership of that committee would be difficult to duplicate.

President Tietz noted the law governing the 6-mill levy was changed in 1977. The law as changed

December 10-11, 1987

permits the legislature to levy the 6 mills without placing it on the ballot. He asked then with the 2-mill levy, would it not be appropriate for the legislature to simply impose that levy and not require a public vote. Senator Lynch responded it would be appropriate, but he did not believe the legislature would do it without an indication of citizen support.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Chairman Lind thanked Senator Lynch for making his position known to the Board. He stated the Board will address the governance issue of the vocational-technical centers at its January 1988 meeting. Funding of the centers will comprise a part of that discussion, and Senator Lynch's proposal will be included in preparation for that action.

Commissioner Krause said he wished to take this opportunity to commend the University of Montana Campus Recreation Outdoor Program for its selection as one of the ten best outdoor recreation programs in the nation by "Outside Magazine."

Change in Board of Regents 1988 Calendar of Meeting Dates

The Commissioner noted a conflict has developed with the scheduled date of the July 1988 meeting. He asked that meeting be moved to July 25-26, 1988. The meeting will be held in Great Falls. With the concurrence of the Board, the Chairman directed that change be made, and a corrected schedule of meeting dates be sent to appropriate persons.

Council of Presidents

President Tietz reported the President of the Public Broadcasting Company is in Montana at this time commemorating Montana's becoming the fiftieth of the fifty states to join public television programming. This event occurs on the twentieth anniversary of the founding of public television.

December 10-11, 1987

The Board of Public Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Faculty Association had no report.

Montana Associated Students

Steve Howrey, President, MAS, thanked the Board for its participation in the student conference in Bozeman in October. He also pledged student support for the up-coming 6-mill levy campaign.

Six Mill Levy Campaign

Chairman Lind reported the organizational meeting of the citizens committee in support of the 6 mill levy has been held. The committee consists of representatives from the campuses, Regents, and interested citizens. It is an active, enthusiastic group, which will attempt to gather both financial and public support throughout the state. He urged everyone in higher education to support the committee's activities. The formal "kick-off" will be held in late January.

Regular Agenda

On motion of Regent Kehoe, the following items were approved:

- Item 58-100-R1287, Staff; University of Montana
- Item 58-200-R1287, Staff; Montana State University
- Item 58-201-R1287, Retirement of Kenneth D. Bryson;
Montana State University
- Item 58-300-R1287, Staff; Agricultural Experiment
Station
- Item 58-400-R1287, Staff; Cooperative Extension Service
- Item 58-500-R1287, Staff; Montana College of Mineral
Science and Technology
- Item 58-600-R1287, Staff; Western Montana College
- Item 58-700-R1287, Staff; Eastern Montana College
(Includes 2 post-retirement contracts)
- Item 58-800-R1287, Staff; Northern Montana College

December 10-11, 1987

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Regents will be held on January 21-22, 1988, in Helena, Montana.

1230w