

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

DATE: January 31 - February 1, 1991

LOCATION: Room 125 A
Helena Vocational-Technical Center
115 North Roberts
Helena, Montana

**REGENTS
PRESENT:** Mathers, Redlin, Schwanke, Topel, Kaze,
Musgrove, Johnson

**REGENTS
ABSENT:** Commissioner of Higher Education John M. Hutchinson

**PRESIDENTS
PRESENT:** Dennison, Malone, Norman, Carpenter, Daehling
Provost Easton

**PRESIDENTS
ABSENT:** None

Minutes of Thursday, January 31, 1991

Chairman Mathers called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Roll call was taken and it was determined a quorum was present.

Consent Agenda

Chairman Mathers stated the first item of business was approval of the Consent Agenda. He asked if there were any items on the Consent Agenda that anyone present wished to have discussed or moved to a committee agenda. None were stated.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Regent Schwanke asked that a procedure be developed for staff item justification where the salary increases might appear to be out of the ordinary. Chairman Mathers concurred with the request, suggesting Regents highlight any salary changes they have questions about and ask for discussion and justification from the unit president. Certainly there would be no reason to review every salary change submitted, nor is there any reason not to discuss those increases that appear to be out of the ordinary. It was agreed that procedure would be followed at future meetings.

Hearing no further discussion, on motion of Regent Musgrove the following items on the Consent Agenda were approved: (Includes addition of the Northern Montana College staff item inadvertently omitted from the published agenda.)

Item 70-100-R0191,	<u>Staff; University of Montana</u>
Item 70-200-R0191,	<u>Staff; Montana State University</u>
Item 70-201-R0191,	<u>Retirement of Angelina O. Parsons,</u> <u>Professor, Health and Human Development;</u> <u>Montana State University</u>
Item 70-202-R0191,	<u>Retirement of Jeffrey Safford, Professor,</u> <u>History and Philosophy; Montana State</u> <u>University</u>
Item 70-203-R0191,	<u>Retirement of James R. Welsh, Plant and</u> <u>Soil Science Department; Montana State</u> <u>University</u>
Item 70-300-R0191,	<u>Staff, Agricultural Experiment Station</u>
Item 70-301-R0191,	<u>Retirement of Albert Hayden Ferguson,</u> <u>Plant and Soil Science Department; Montana</u> <u>State University</u>
Item 70-400-R0191,	<u>Staff; Cooperative Extension Service</u>
Item 70-500-R0191,	<u>Staff; Montana College of Mineral Science</u> <u>and Technology</u>
Item 70-600-R0191,	<u>Staff; Western Montana College of the</u> <u>University of Montana</u>
Item 70-700-R0191,	<u>Staff; Eastern Montana College</u> <u>Eastern Montana College 1990-91 Faculty</u> <u>Roster</u> (Submitted for Informational Purposes Only)
Item 70-8000-R0191,	<u>Staff; Butte Vocational-Technical Center</u>
Item 70-8500-R0191,	<u>Staff; Great Falls Vocational- Technical</u> <u>Center</u>
Item 70-800-R0191,	<u>Staff, Northern Montana College</u>

January 31-February 1, 1991

Announcements

Commissioner Hutchinson announced a breakfast meeting would be held with the Regents and members of the Education Subcommittee at 7:00 a.m. tomorrow, February 1, in the Meadowlark Room of the Colonial Inn.

Chairman Mathers stated that without objection the order of the committee meetings would be changed so that each of the joint committee meetings would be held before the regular committee meeting.

The regular meeting of the Board of Regents recessed to hold concurrent and joint committee meetings.

Joint Meeting: Administrative, and Academic and Student Affairs Committees

This portion of the meeting was chaired by Regent Kaze, Chairman of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee.

Policy Submission Agenda

Dr. David Toppen, Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs, reviewed Item 18-003-R1077, Admission Requirements; In-state Undergraduates; Montana University System. He explained there has been a certain level of confusion on the issue of admission standards in the System. There are two specific, definable difficulties having to do with the way admissions officers on the individual campuses deal with transcripts of students transferring from one institution to another. One difficulty has to do with the status of the student in the sending institution, i.e., is the student in good academic standing at the sending institution. One part of the language in current policy that deals with good academic standing implies in parenthetical expression that an in-state transfer applicant must be in good academic standing (not on probation) in the sending institution. This has caused minor

January 31-February 1, 1991

chaos in admissions offices. This particular phrase is internally inconsistent because in the minds of admissions officers there is conflict in the definition of "good academic standing" and the definition of "probation". Probation indicates a state of alert on the part of the institution and is informing the student they stand in the position of being in danger of suspension, but still at this point have full right to enroll in classes and to all offerings of the institution, and therefore, even though on probation, are by definition of admissions officers in good academic standing. There also is no consistency in definition of "probation" among units of the System. Striking the phrase "not on probation" from the policy will go far to make the policy easier to interpret, and has full support of the admissions officers.

The second problem lies with the definition at the bottom of page one of the policy which defines "in-state transfer." In summary, the definition provides a loophole that enables a student to attempt 12 credits at a community college, thereby gaining access to the admissions office at the senior institution, then regardless of the status of the attempt, gain entree into the senior institution. While no change in policy language in this definition is proposed, it is strongly recommended that the campuses be very careful in presenting literature to students. Students must be advised that attempting those 12 credits might open the door to the admissions office, but success is required to open the door to the classroom.

Brief discussion was held on students future access to other institutions who have been suspended for academic reasons. While individual units have forgiveness policies, generally the academic problem at the sending institution has to be repaired before a student so suspended can enter another institution in the System.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Item 18-003-R1077 was received for action at the March 1991 meeting.

Joint Meeting: Budget, and Academic and Student Affairs Committees

Resolution Requesting that Graduate Library Studies be added to the WICHE Program in Montana

State Librarian Richard Miller presented testimony and the resolution from the Montana State Library Commission (on file) requesting the addition of two slots leading to the Master's Degree in Library Science to the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education program for Montana.

Mr. Miller stated in summary that such addition would provide opportunities for Montanan's that does not presently exist. There are job opportunities going begging in this field for lack of qualified candidates. While it is always hoped those receiving the master's degree would return to Montana, that is not the primary goal. The most important issue is to provide citizens with an opportunity to earn this degree, which is considered the initial degree for librarians working in libraries in this and all other states. Mr. Miller requested the Board's serious consideration of the request to seek funding for the two additional slots. The cost would be approximately \$14,600 over the biennium.

In discussion of the request, Deputy Commissioner Noble noted this request has been discussed in the Commissioner's office. While there is recognized need for the offering, the Commissioner's office position at this time is to attempt to restore the cuts recommended for the next biennium by the Executive Branch. All new slots for medical students are recommended to be eliminated; other fields have been reduced to funding for only one slot. The position must be to reinstate current level as a priority over establishing a new

January 31-February 1, 1991

field. This program has suffered steady decline of legislative support since the mid-70s. Every effort will be directed to restoration of current level.

Regent Redlin noted in her nearly ten years on the Board the position with regard to the WICHE Program has been attempting to maintain support for existing programs. Failure to at least ask for additions to the program might stifle needed growth. At her request, Mr. Miller elaborated on need for graduates of such a program, particularly in Montana. The need certainly exists in rural areas, but they of course are not the most attractive locations. The market in Montana would be affected by the low salaries offered, but there is certainly nationwide need.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if there has been review of Montana's current WICHE slots to determine if Montana is underserved in certain areas. Mr. Noble responded such review is a continual process. He read the fields that now have slots budgeted - medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, vet medicine, optometry, occupational therapy, public health, podiatry. Most of these provide only one opportunity for funding a student in those fields each year. The program is under constant financial pressure; student demand for all slots far exceeds ability to meet.

Mr. Noble briefly explained the application process for students attempting to enter the WICHE Program. He suggested requesting funding for the new program, if restoration of the current slots is realized, in the second year of the biennium, allowing ample notification of availability, and reducing the cost.

After further discussion of the nature and opportunities available under the WICHE Compact, Chairman Kaze asked the pleasure of the Board.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Regent Redlin moved the Board affirm that its first priority with regard to funding for the WICHE Program is reinstatement and protection of the beginning slots in the current programs. With that restoration, the Education Subcommittee should be informed of the desire of the Board to add the two slots to fund students in the Master's of Library Science program, which has proven demonstrated need, commencing in Fall 1992, at a cost of \$7,200.00. The motion carried unanimously.

Report on Television/Telecommunications

Dr. Toppen referenced discussion held by the Board at its Special Call Meeting on January 14, 1991 of the proposed agreement between the University of Montana and Montana State University for establishment of a statewide television network. Appended to that proposal was a tentative proposed budget, which the Board was asked to support either through a program modification request to the Legislature, or through authorization for the campuses to seek separate legislation. Regent Schwanke, in that discussion, asked that a summary be brought to the Board of telecommunications activities in the System, including definitions of terms, to bring cohesion to the scattered concepts so frequently brought to the Board.

Dr. Toppen distributed a document titled "Montana University System Telecommunications: Summary; Narrative; and Recommendations" (on file) in an attempt to satisfy Regent Schwanke's request. Dr. Toppen reviewed and elaborated on the information in the document. In summary, the critical elements of telecommunications are data, voice and video transmitted in various ways for various purposes, and all are critical elements in the overall telecommunications environment of the state.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Dr. Toppen also reviewed the narrative section of the document, which discusses each particular aspect of telecommunications and which provides explanation of what is meant when, for instance, the "voice phone system" in the state is discussed. He stated that in Montana at this time educational opportunities are provided mostly through data and voice. Not much is provided in the way of video information between campuses at this time. However, the System is on the brink of being able to share a great deal of educational material through formation of a telecommunications network capable of carrying pictures as well as data and voice. That is really what the statewide telecommunications network will look like someday in Montana and in the University System, and also through the K-12 environment.

Dr. Toppen stated in terms of public radio, the campuses have done a good job in using their resources to a level which is appropriate to their communities and to the state. Public radio provides a model for what the System hopes to do in video as well. Dr. Toppen spoke also to the importance of learning to discriminate between educational tv in its strictest closed circuit sense, and public television in its very broadcast, public access sense. With the passage of House Bill 30, the System is on the brink of being able to interface with every school district in the state of Montana. The pieces are beginning to fall into place; those pieces consist of hardware, software, money, and commitment on the part of the faculty to develop educational programming.

The proposal brought to the Board in early January would lead to an overall statewide public television network, not unlike the public radio network already in place. What is now proposed, to obtain funding for that project, is for the two campuses to work with the Commissioner's office to develop

January 31-February 1, 1991

a minimal proposal leading to separate legislation for funding. The following minimum ingredients would be needed; the data voice video link between Missoula and Bozeman, some support to keep KUSM operating in Bozeman, and the essential planning and engineering dollars to make it possible for the University of Montana to look forward to placement of essential equipment to serve the Missoula community properly. At least that much support is necessary to keep that plan going.

Dr. Toppen concluded his report noting that up to this point Montana's lack of development in the telecommunications area will work to its advantage. That is, there is time to coordinate and develop a master plan for its development. The point is imminent, however, where many expenditures on campuses will lead to a hodge podge system unable to communicate with one another. That must be prevented. A statewide integrated telecommunications plan must be developed encompassing all delivery systems, at least for all entities that comprise the systems of higher education.

Dr. Toppen asked the Board's permission to do three things:

(1) Permission to work with UM and MSU to find legislative support for the proposal that will link the campuses and enable them to continue the public television environment in Montana;

(2) To reaffirm the Board's commitment to the development of a statewide telecommunications environment for education, expanding higher education's role and linking with the K-12 education system, and

(3) Mandate the Commissioner's office to develop enhanced and more responsible policies to deal with this technology and development of courses for credit at remote locations.

January 31-February 1, 1991

President Flower, MCC, spoke to current Regents policy which provides for recognition of centers for telecommunications. The expectation is that will expand, which follows one of the recommendations of the Education Commission that remote areas be served through telecommunications technology. As that occurs, the FTE's served must be recaptured in the funding formula. This has apparently caused consternation among some legislators; the Chairman of the Education Subcommittee indicated it might be wise to garner legislative support early on.

President Malone, MSU, spoke to the difficulty encountered by MSU in bringing up KUSM without state support. The Board has been concerned about the station's indebtedness. That will be fully addressed within a few months. However, until just a year and a half ago Montana was the only state without some form of public television. The benefits of the agreement reached by MSU and UM are considerable when you consider that both comprehensive universities could not only deliver their programming to the entire state along with other units in the System who can join the loop. The ability of all the units of the System to insert local programming through this delivery system is a major development to the cultural resources of the state.

Regent Kaze asked about the "market share" of public radio. He was told studies have been conducted, not so much to determine rating points as to learn if KUSM is doing its job. KUSM is in a commercial market consisting of approximately eleven or twelve stations; its listenership is third or fourth, which is significant because public radio is usually much lower. What is significant is the contributions. KUSM is operated 75% from contributed funds; fully 38% of its operating budget comes from individual listeners who in some cases

January 31-February 1, 1991

contribute their "last buck". That kind of support tells KUSM it is doing the job it is intended to do. It appears KUSM's audience is much larger than most public radio stations, and its donor base significantly larger than comparable market size even in some metropolitan areas.

President Carpenter reported on indicators of KEMC's success, citing its national ranking in 44th place in terms of non-commercial radio stations; in markets under 300,00, KEMC is fifth in the nation. State support for KEMC is 15% of the total budget.

President Dennison concurred with the recommendation made that the University of Montana work with the Commissioner's office and MSU to determine "where we are now and how we can get there" in order to have a state-wide delivery system. The monies sought will be matching funds, and will be leveraged as well.

Commissioner Hutchinson spoke to the recommendations and requests for approval from the Board made by Deputy Commissioner Toppen. He stated the issue of higher education centers and the counting of FTE will have to be addressed. Board approval to move forward as requested on the agreement between UM and MSU is the first step. Then Deputy Commissioner Toppen would meet with the System's academic vice presidents to talk about adjusting the higher ed center policy to accommodate the kinds of telecommunications delivery systems presented by Dr. Toppen.

In response to Regents' questions, Dr. Toppen explained a pared down request will be brought back to the Board, recognizing fiscal constraints, that will provide the nuclear components described earlier to link the campuses together, and finding ways to bring UM to a point where it can see its way to becoming a full 50/50 partner in the network,

January 31-February 1, 1991

and "keeping the lights on" at KUSM. He stressed again the importance to the whole telecommunications enterprise of HB 30, a joint proposal from OPI, OCHE, and the Department of Administration that will put telecommunications in school districts throughout the state. Passage of that bill will put in place an infrastructure that enables local communities to receive programs originating from institutions of higher education in the state in their local school buildings. The single largest missing element is the high speed link between U of M and MSU. A detailed budget to provide that link has not yet been developed, and that would have to have the approval requested earlier by Dr. Toppen to seek separate funding.

Clarification was asked by Board members of exactly what they were being asked to do. Essentially, authorization from the Board is requested to approve the continuing cooperative agreement between the two universities and the Commissioner's office, including budget preparation, which will allow the process set out in the agreement to move forward, then to do the two further planning issues set out by Dr. Toppen above. The high speed link between the two universities is essential, and a key element of that would be authorizing seeking a biennial request from the legislature of approximately \$450,000. When the actual figure is determined, a conference call meeting of the Board of Regents would be called to gain approval of the final budget request. This budget request would be separate from the Regents' budget.

Regent Topel asked what would be the differences between this enterprise and the one already in place at MSU, which has experienced severe budget problems.

President Malone stated that KUSM's budget problems occurred because KUSM was essentially brought into being without a state appropriation. The current debt of KUSM is approximately

January 31-February 1, 1991

\$180,000; MSU is committed to redressing that debt. The system package can work in a "pay its own way" basis. The University of Montana will not compound the problem; it will not have to duplicate MSU's costs to deliver the public television signal because that will be delivered to UM by MSU. With this sort of appropriation, that "tub can stand on its own bottom" and be a total statewide system. If the kind of support being discussed today is not provided, the future of public television in Montana will become an open question.

Regent Redlin concurred with the legitimate concern of adding additional costs to programs. However, in her opinion this is a project which has the potential of serving the entire state. That is a very important concept to those living on the fringes. The Board should not back away from a proposal which will reach people where they live; it may have to be phased in, but it should not be dismissed. The question to ask is, is this an educational effort the State needs. If that answer is yes, then the next question is how best to get where you need to go to attain it.

Regent Kaze concurred with Regent Redlin, noting perhaps the threshold question is that presented in the two recommendations contained in the document distributed today by Dr. Toppen.

Recommendation and Regents' Action: Commissioner's staff is granted authority and responsibility to seek a sponsor for a bill, on a provisional basis, to provide the minimal funding necessary to begin implementation of the high speed link agreement between UM and MSU. Final approval of the appropriation requested will be requested from the Board of Regents before such sponsor is authorized to place the bill into the legislative process. Presidents Malone and Dennison, working with Deputy Commissioner Toppen, will develop a budget

January 31-February 1, 1991

recommendation for the Regents' consideration at tomorrow's meeting. The Board, through this action, affirms its commitment to the development of a statewide telecommunications environment for education, expanding higher education's role and linking with the K-12 education system, and to the development of enhanced and more responsible policies to deal with this technology and development of courses for credit at remote locations.

Item 70-7000-R0191; Approval to Proceed with the Development of an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Dental Hygiene Education; Montana Vocational-Technical System

Deputy Commissioner for Vocational-Technical Education Brady Vardemann briefly reviewed the report titled "Dental Hygiene Education and the Vocational-Technical System of Montana, January, 1991" (on file) sent to the Regents on January 21, 1991. The report represents the culmination of two years of study and review relative to the feasibility of establishing a program in dental hygiene education within the public sector of higher education in Montana.

The report, organized into three sections, provides relevant background information, the results of a special consultation review by a nationally known expert in dental hygiene education which includes conclusions, and the recommendations formulated by staff of the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education for consideration and action by the Board of Regents.

Ms. Vardemann explained the study was conducted over the last two years to determine which, if any, of the units should be authorized to implement a dental hygiene program to fill the void created by Carroll College's discontinuation of its baccalaureate level dental hygiene program effective June 1990. This leaves Montana the only state in the continental

January 31-February 1, 1991

United States without a dental hygiene program. There is great concern in the dental community over this because it believes there is an existing, on-going need for this level of practitioner.

Three dental hygiene proposals were presented to the Board and are tabled awaiting the results of the study. The institutions submitting dental hygiene proposals are the Helena and Great Falls Vocational-Technical Centers, and the Butte Vocational-Technical Center in concert with Montana Tech.

Ms. Vardemann called attention to page 21 of the report of the consultant, which lists conclusions of Ms. Sherry W. Burke, RDH, MS, Delaware Technical and Community College, the consultant who prepared the report. Ms. Burke's conclusions included (1) there is need in Montana for an on-going supply of dental hygienists; (2) the program should probably be supplied by a public higher education institution which would serve the entire state, and (3) the Montana vocational-technical institutions are capable of meeting the needs and accreditation standards of accredited dental hygiene programs. Ms. Burke's report concluded that of all institutions submitting proposals, the one that has the greatest opportunity of developing a successful dental hygiene program is the Great Falls Vocational-Technical Center. Reasons for that conclusion were cited in the report.

Ms. Vardemann stated the staff request at this point is that the Board of Regents provide guidance on how it wishes to proceed with regard to the dental hygiene proposals. Summarizing the staff recommendation on page 23 of the report, the recommendations are: (1) that the Board of Regents authorize the Great Falls Vocational-Technical Center to continue the development and feasibility studies with regard to possible fielding of a dental hygiene program configured in the

January 31-February 1, 1991

associate of applied science degree at some point in the future; and those plans and developments will include upward mobility opportunities for students who desire them; (2) direct the Commissioner to form a special advisory committee for the dental hygiene program representative of all appropriate bodies; (3) direct the office of the Commissioner of Higher Education to seek funding opportunities from all appropriate entities; and (4) mandate that the development of the program will include those steps necessary to lead to accreditation of the program by the Commission on Dental Accreditation of the American Dental Association.

Dr. Scot Erler, Missoula, dentist member of the Board of Dentistry, and Michele Keisling, dental hygienist member of the Board of Dentistry, were introduced and spoke in support of the recommendations before the Board to reestablish the dental hygiene program in the State of Montana. Mr. Bill Zepp, Montana Dental Association, also spoke in support of the proposed program, and also offered assistance in the form of donated equipment used by Carroll College in its program to be given to the Great Falls Vocational-Technical Center.

Center Director Will Weaver also encouraged acceptance of the staff recommendation, noting the GFVTC is enthusiastic about reestablishment of the dental hygiene program.

Regent Kaze noted in his reading of the consultant study he did not find it a resounding conclusion in support of reestablishment of a dental hygiene program in Montana. In his reading, statistics in support of the program were not available, and a more subjective measure was used in reaching conclusions on how many people might be interested in the program. A second concern was that the Carroll College equipment may be depreciated in value or antiquated to the extent it is not a true asset to a new program.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Ms. Vardemann spoke to studies made in the past to ascertain need for the program; the best information gleaned from the two studies conducted and current Montana labor market statistics concludes there is a need for a pool of dental hygienist practitioners in the State. Speaking to the concern about the equipment, Ms. Vardemann concurred that the value of the equipment would have to be assessed, but it is believed a great deal of it would be workable. However, updating and replacement of equipment is an on-going need in such a program.

Addressing budgetary needs, Ms. Vardemann noted the first step would be appointment of the advisory group, and their first task would be development of budgetary and curricular needs to be brought back to the Board for approval. The action requested today is not approval of the program. The program is not envisioned to be started before January 1992.

Discussion was also held on the reasons Carroll College discontinued the program. These included that Carroll's program was a baccalaureate program, it was high cost, and had limited enrollment.

At the conclusion of discussion, Regent Kaze moved adoption of the four staff recommendations, with the understanding that the academic portion of the program would be brought back to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, and the budgetary portion to the Budget Committee for approval. The motion carried unanimously.

Policy Action Item

Administrative Committee Agenda

Chairman Mathers stated that without objection he would move Item 69-002-R0990, Internal Audit Reports; Montana University System for action at this time. He preferred Chief Counsel Schramm make his presentation to the full Board because the policy proposal has received such intense press scrutiny.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Dr. Schramm reviewed the proposed Internal Audit Policy, noting it is before the Board for reconsideration in an amended form. The main thrust of the policy remains the same: campus audits that reveal violations of law or policy are now required to be forwarded to the Commissioner's Office. The Commissioner is required to bring audits containing substantial violations to the attention of the Board. Dr. Schramm noted the latest amendments to the policy deal with the issue of privacy and when the reports become public documents. The latest amendments provide that the document becomes public at the time it reaches its final destination with the Montana higher education system, graphically depicted on his memorandum to the Board dated November 28, 1990 (on file).

Dr. Schramm spoke to the two major criticism directed at the policy: (1) that the definition of an internal audit report is too broad. The policy probably remains open to that criticism. After thorough examination of alternatives, Dr. Schramm stated he concluded that the "rule of reason" will have to determine what each president/director submits to the Commissioner's office. (2) The second criticism has to do with the System's external relations with the press. The allegation here is that the policy is too secret and does not give proper acknowledgment to the state's public documents law. That needs serious scrutiny because there is no claim nor intent to conceal documents the press and the public have a right to see.

Dr. Schramm explained the reasons he felt that criticism to be unjustified. Under the policy as it is now proposed every report covered by the policy becomes a public document. The only question is when does that occur; the answer is when it reaches its final resting place within the organization. Dr. Schramm stated his belief that prior to that

January 31-February 1, 1991

it is reasonable to say it is a draft, or tentative, document. No document will remain indefinitely out of the reach of the public unless the content of the document is otherwise privileged under applicable law. The document might have been more accurately labeled a policy to "bring campus reports out of the cellar and into the light" because that is what the policy does.

Dr. Schramm concluded he believed the policy is one that is defensible, and recommended its approval.

Discussion included questions on the definition of "report" contained in the policy. Dr. Carpenter asked if that definition could be tightened up somewhat. President Dennison echoed that view. He suggested that a reference be inserted to clarify that what is covered by the policy are internal audit reports. Some campuses do not have a person titled "internal auditor", and hence the broadness of the language. President Dennison suggested amendatory language.

Dr. Schramm responded to the proposed amendment, suggesting Dr. Carpenter's suggestion regarding definition of "report" to include language specifying the report was prepared by an employee as part of his or her job duties would move in the direction proposed.

After further discussion, it was agreed the presidents would meet with Dr. Schramm and agree on amendatory language and bring the policy back for action on tomorrow's agenda.

Concurrent Committee Meetings

The Board recessed at this point to hold scheduled concurrent committee meetings.

Minutes of Friday, February 1, 1991

Chairman Mathers called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. with the same members present.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Chairman Mathers called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. None were stated, and the minutes of the December 13-14, 1990 meeting were ordered approved.

Old Business

Merger Reports

Dr. Hutchinson briefly reviewed past actions of the Board leading to the merger reports being placed on the Board's agenda at today's meeting. In November 1989 the Board adopted the merger policy prepared by the Commissioner's office. In addition, the Commissioner's office was charged with the responsibility of exploring possibilities of merger of the vocational-technical units located in Butte and Billings.

Both studies were completed around November 15, 1990. Commissioner Hutchinson summarized the conclusions of the merger studies as set out in the individual merger reports submitted to the Board with the agenda material for this meeting.

Speaking to the Billings merger report, Dr. Hutchinson noted each of the two groups approached the possibility of merger slightly differently. In Billings, the study began with a review of a number of seminal documents related to admissions and roles of the institutions, and also included study of a number of documents from institutions around the country to determine how other states configure vocational-technical education in the context of a baccalaureate degree. The Billings group also conducted a comprehensive survey of students at both the affected institutions; alumni and the advisory committee of the BVTC were also surveyed. The surveys disclosed two fundamental views: (1) there should be enhanced transferability between the two institutions (Billings VTC and EMC); and (2) the two institutions should pursue a formal affiliation.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Based on these findings, the study group made two formal recommendations: (1) proceed with formal affiliation characterized by facilitated credit transfer accomplished through an formalized articulation agreement, and proceed with examination of a inverted degree program. Dr. Hutchinson elaborated on this recommendation which is more fully set out in the merger study report on file in the Commissioner's office.

(2) Pursue further cooperation in three areas: (i) student records (integrate BVTC student records into EMC's format; (ii) student affairs (housing and residential life; student services; financial aid and scholarships; admissions; and (iii) fiscal affairs (physical plant; personnel, computer center; business office; printing; and mail room.

In summary, Dr. Hutchinson stated this merger study results in the recommendation to implement the two formal affiliations listed above. He commended the leaders of those two institutions and those serving on the merger study team.

At the Commissioner's request, President Carpenter, EMC, stated his institution's wholehearted endorsement of the merger study report and recommendations. Concerning pursuit of the inverted degree as one of the recommendations, Dr. Carpenter noted the two institutions would like to invite Northern Montana College to share discussions of that aspect of the recommendations since that institution already offers that degree.

Director Bell also endorsed and urged adoption of the merger report recommendations, and commented on the good that has already occurred from the merger study in the form of increased amicable communications between the two institutions.

Regent Kaze asked what steps needed to be taken now. Dr. Hutchinson recommended the report and recommendations of the merger study team be accepted, which will launch

January 31-February 1, 1991

appropriate next actions, including formation of the three new study teams. The goal would be to have whatever the process brings to fruition in place within the next year.

MOTION: Hearing no further discussion, Regent Kaze moved acceptance of the Eastern Montana College/Billings Vocational-Technical Center Merger Report and the recommendations therein for the next steps to be taken with the understanding the concept will be that of an affiliation between the two institutions.

The motion carried unanimously.

Merger Study Report; Montana Tech/Butte Vocational-Technical Center

Dr. Hutchinson supplied background on formation and action of this merger study group. Two operating principles underlined the work: (1) that academic considerations would be foremost; and (2) the welfare of the student cannot be sacrificed.

After examination of curricula and possibilities for merger or affiliation, this group recommends formal academic affiliation. This affiliation is narrower than that recommended by the Billings study group.

The Butte merger study report recommends establishment of a joint academic council consisting of five members from each of the two institutions, appointed by the President and Director respectively. That council would then design a series of academic partnership programs. Roles and scopes of the separate institutions would remain the same under this proposal; sharing of facilities, libraries, equipment, activities, would be studied further. Administrative functions and authorities and budgets would in no way be merged. It is also recommended an annual report be submitted to the Board of Regents by the President of Montana Tech and the Director of BVTC on the activities of the academic partnerships.

January 31-February 1, 1991

President Norman applauded the cooperation exhibited during the merger study period. He concurred this is a more cautious approach than that recommended by the Billings team because of scarce resources, and concerns expressed by Tech's accrediting agencies that Montana Tech should not at this time embark on a full articulation or merger with another institution. Dr. Norman continued this in no way negates the importance of the areas in the academic program where the two institutions can support one another, and that is at the heart of the academic affiliation. He urged approval of the recommendations of the study group, and pledged continuing exploration of additional areas of cooperation that will open to the two institutions in the future.

Regent Redlin stated her past and continual concern with retaining a vocational-technical system in the state of Montana. She felt that it was appropriate in view of the centralization which has taken place on the academic side, that it would be wise in her view to have retained that same centralization in the vocational-technical side. She had no objections to contract services and similar working agreements between institutions in the System and units of the vocational-technical centers. Her concern centered around the curricular aspects of what is occurring.

Regent Redlin stated she believed the almost inevitable result of increased affiliation and working towards merger among University System units and the Centers is that every institution will have a vocational-technical component, and every institution will be doing everything. The Board is now working very carefully to maintain the role and scope and separated mission of the institutions, and she believed actions recommended today could "muddy the waters." She urged the Board to be very careful in its future actions in considering mergers and affiliations.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Brief discussion was held on how transferability between the two Butte institutions would be affected by this recommendation. Regent Kaze also asked under what timeframe the students in the two institutions might expect to see effects of the change. Dr. Norman replied those changes will begin to occur in the next academic year, with more implemented the next year. The recommended council would be appointed to begin next actions as soon as the study report is approved.

Hearing no further discussion the Chairman called for a motion.

MOTION: Regent Kaze moved approval of the recommendation of the TECH/Butte Vo-Tech Merger Evaluation to create an academic partnership while maintaining separate administrative and educational identities. This cooperative venture is anticipated to lead to increased cooperation between the two institutions in the future, at which time they may wish to revisit the issue of a more complete integration of the two institutions. The motion carried unanimously.

Tenure for Administrators

Dr. Toppen referenced previous instructions from the Board to bring forward additional information on the issue of tenure for administrators, a topic that has undergone considerable discussion before the Board. He distributed a handout showing the results of a survey on the subject conducted in Fall 1990 by the Board of Regents of the Georgia University System (on file). The survey of twenty systems throughout the United States dealt with not only tenure for administrators on campuses, but also with issues of the appropriateness of the rank for such administrators, and rank and tenure for administrators in system offices as well.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Dr. Toppen explained faculty rank is the issue of giving to an administrator a title and certain implicit responsibilities having to do with his/her academic and professional background and generally for senior level administrators corresponds to the rank of professor. Faculty rank for system administrators is more difficult to assess because there is not an academic entity to which that individual's rank can be attached. There are still numerous systems around the country who give system administrators academic rank as well, frequently as a result of the system administrator moving to that position from a campus, or when system offices are located on campuses.

Dr. Toppen continued rank is more a courtesy rather than a reality in dealing with both campus and system administrators. Speaking to the issue of tenure, certain systems will enable a campus administrator to earn tenure. Of the 20 systems surveyed, 7 allow their system administrators to earn tenure; 16 enable their campus presidents, vice-presidents, etc., to earn tenure.

The issue of instantaneous tenure is the last of the survey items on the handout. Of those 20 systems, approximately half -- 11 of the 29 -- allow the appointment of administrators onto the campus with instantaneous tenure, and 3 systems will appoint commissioners, chancellors, deputies, etc., with instant tenure.

Dr. Toppen stated the issue before this Board is whether it wishes to alter its existing policies which in summary generally allow the appointment of administrators on campuses with rank, and do not allow any of the other five options.

Various details of granting of tenure were discussed. It was stressed that the issue of granting tenure

January 31-February 1, 1991

is rather more complex than merely making the decision whether or not one grants the right to continuous reappointment, which is the definition of tenure. Academic rank in some university systems is given to system administrators who have the title of "professor" with no discipline or designation regarding retreat rights mentioned. The issue of tenure is tied to all of these parameters, and they were included. Under current Regents policy, on campuses tenure is granted to an administrator which constitutes the right to continuous reappointment in the department or program which is consistent with his/her discipline.

Presidents commented on changes to present policy. President Dennison, UM, restated the University's position in favor of a change. The last discussion before the Board focused on the importance of the change to the recruitment process. UM believes the ability to grant tenure to administrators is a positive needed recruitment tool. And to include with that the provision for instant tenure in the recruitment of senior faculty members. With Montana's non-competitive salaries this additional tool to recruit outstanding faculty and administrators would be extremely useful - always done, of course, looking over the persons performance on other campuses over time. With that kind of review and decision making process, the ability to grant instant tenure would be an advantage to the Montana system. President Dennison stated with that kind of review he would endorse a similar kind of courtesy be extended to the academic professionals at the system level, after review in a department as discussed earlier.

Other presidents spoke in favor of change, but endorsed making present Board policies more permissive, so that the option to award tenure to administrators would exist in

January 31-February 1, 1991

specific instances, after appropriate review. Under this proposal, the Board would have to review and approve each such request individually. This would allow some flexibility; however, if the policy is changed, the presidents stated it does not mean everybody would automatically be tenured.

Regent Kaze spoke to the problem he felt the Board would have with the permissive granting of tenure. If the intent is to bring the tenure recommendation to the Board "after the fact" and expect the Board to deny tenure, that would be wrong. The Board action would be nothing but a rubber stamp.

President Malone, MSU, said what he had to say supports the diversity of opinion shown by the survey results. Montana State University is consistently opposed to instant tenure for administrators. The Faculty Council at MSU voted on this issue just a week ago. On that question the vote was negative on a 10 to 1 margin.

President Dennison supported President Carpenter's elegant argument. If a campus feels offering of tenure to administrators is not appropriate, they need not offer it.

President Daehling, Northern Montana College, noted he came to Montana from a system that allowed instant tenure. But in the twelve years he served as academic vice president he witnessed the appointment of approximately 90 faculty. Never once did he recommend tenure be awarded at the time of appointment. It could be achieved through the process Presidents Carpenter and Dennison are espousing. President Daehling stated he would favor a permissive policy.

President Norman, Montana Tech, stated the issue of tenure has not been a consideration in hiring senior administrators or faculty at Montana Tech. He informally polled Tech's faculty recently, and they tended to take the

January 31-February 1, 1991

same position as MSU's faculty. A permissive policy would meet with no opposition.

Commissioner Hutchinson addressed the awarding of faculty rank and tenure on the campus. Experience in a previous system found being able to award faculty rank and tenure to be enormously valuable in recruitment of senior faculty. Tenure in Idaho was granted even without peer review, which is a very liberal position. He believed having the capacity to grant that tenure to faculty members, so long as peers in the department have examined the credentials and agree with that award, would be helpful in recruitment efforts. It is much more than just a courtesy. Earning of tenure and advanced rank is a difficult and long process. No one obtains tenure without having demonstrated real capacities in the classroom and in the laboratories. It is continued recognition of significant effort.

As to awarding tenure to system administrators, Dr. Hutchinson stated it is his opinion that he could relinquish tenure as a reward. However, he stated that for an academician to move from a campus to a system and relinquish the title of professor is extraordinarily painful. If you want to recruit top-notch academicians into the system office, these kinds of continued recognition of effort are important. He urged the Board to vote to grant tenure to campus administrators, senior administrators, after peer review, and give serious consideration to granting the continuation of faculty rank to senior academic administrators in the system office.

Regent Redlin stated in her view tenure is a good thing. It is an important safeguard so professors are not bound by the current societal viewpoints. Tenure for administrators is somewhat different. If it is to be a permissive employment tool, Regent Redlin stated she did not see how it would be a particular advantage. All you could say

January 31-February 1, 1991

to the person being hired is "maybe you will get tenure." The other concern Regent Redlin stated is that Montana's schools are small. Tenure is a legal, binding contract. On some campuses there is already a full compliment of tenured professors. Giving tenure to administrators would tend to "bulge" certain departments, in her view. If you hire an administrator to fit the tenure pattern on a particular campus, you are hiring a professor, rather than looking at the talents as an administrator. Regent Redlin stated in her opinion a tenured administrator is "neither fish nor fowl". She was not certain tenure for administrators would be good for Montana.

Considerable discussion ensued on the varying pluses and minuses of the issue of tenure for administrators. It was pointed out that in the interview process on many of the campuses one of the questions asked by serious candidates is, "is tenure possible?" The only answer available now is no. Some excellent candidates drop out of the pool when they hear that response. Making the policy permissive was encouraged. Retreat rights were discussed; smaller institutions would certainly have to utilize a permissive policy sparingly. Legal ramifications were reviewed by Chief Counsel Schramm. Under present Regents' policy, a tenured professor moving into the Montana system loses tenure at the sending institution, and is not awarded tenure in Montana.

MOTION: At the conclusion of the discussion, Regent Johnson moved the six units of the Montana University System be granted the flexibility to award instant tenure and faculty rank to academic administrators. A roll call vote was taken. Regents Topel, Kaze, Redlin, Musgrove voted no. Regents Johnson and Schwanke voted yes. Chairman Mathers voted yes. The motion failed four to three.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Montana Public Television 1991-1993 Biennium Budget

Deputy Commissioner Toppen presented the budget request prepared by the Montana State University and the University of Montana to allow a legislative request to be made for minimal funding for the public television enterprise discussed in yesterday's meeting. Both campuses are in accord with the budget proposal, and believe it reflects an excellent example of cooperation between units of the System. General fund dollars in the amount of \$480,000 will be requested for the biennium.

Discussion was held on the requisite match requirements at each institution. It was agreed that either campus's failure to raise their match would not necessarily mean loss of funds to the other campus which did raise the matching funds. In conversations with legislators on the feasibility of such legislation, indications have been received that it would be better if the appropriation language of the general fund dollars was contingent on the match coming in. Two separate line item appropriations, one for MSU and one for UM, will be placed in the bill.

Regent Kaze expressed concern with a proposal aimed at implementing a statewide system of public television which could be postponed because of failure to raise the required match by either of the campuses. Regent Redlin noted other programs have been "stepped in" and this could be viewed in the same way.

Marilyn Wessel, Director of Communications, MSU noted in terms of the required UM match, that is intended to be requested from a federal granting source available every year, and whose top priority is to help states expand their public television system. Montana is the only state that has not obtained a grant from them for that purpose, and they have urged a request be made. In terms of being in a good position

January 31-February 1, 1991

to get federal match money, the University of Montana is in that position. As President Malone has said, MSU has been extremely successful in raising private dollars for the station in Bozeman in the past, and feels confident that support will continue.

Regent Topel asked again, if MSU can not raise the money, to what extent does that indicate that private support to run a statewide public television system does not exist. Second, he stated his reluctance to ask the Legislature for such a sum of state money for public television when complete budget documents have not been developed.

Regent Mathers stated he believed there has been strong legislative support for public television in the past. There is particular interest in systems that would provide such programming to rural areas. He had no qualms in presenting this request to the Legislature because it is a separate bill providing the Legislature opportunity to fully and openly debate any questions.

MOTION: At the conclusion of discussion, Regent Redlin moved approval of the budget request for a statewide public television system as outlined in the proposal submitted by Montana State University and the University of Montana. The requested appropriation will be line itemed with separate appropriations requested for each campus, and the requisite match for each campus indicated. The motion carried, with Regent Topel voting no.

Regent Topel explained he is not opposed to the concept. Rather, he did not believe he had adequate information to be able to say it is in the best interests of the System to proceed in the manner outlined.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Discussion of Representative O'Keefe's House Bill 226 on Off-Campus Fees

Chairman Mathers moved this item for action at this time. Mr. Garth Jacobson was present to discuss Representative O'Keefe's bill.

Chief Counsel Schramm explained operative section of the bill introduced by Representative O'Keefe (HB 226) is the section labeled "New Section" on pages 5-6. The section would prohibit charging incidental fees to part-time students taking off-campus coursework. He explained the issue involves students such as Mr. Jacobson, who is taking the off-campus public administration program. The program is run jointly out of Bozeman and Missoula; the coursework is all in Helena. The students pay regular tuition; then pay \$21 per credit hour for off-campus delivery fee to cover extra costs of professors traveling from the campus communities to Helena to teach the courses. The students are also required to pay a \$1 per credit hour computer fee, and the campus building fee. The argument propounded by these students is that they are not on campus, and should not have to pay the computer and building fees. The fees support the System's bonded indebtedness.

Mr. Jacobson distributed a MSU MPA 4 Credit Class Costs handout (on file). He stated his appreciation to the Board of Regents for all they do to support both traditional and non-traditional students in their efforts to obtain higher education. The argument he has is one of fairness. As illustrated on the fee sheet, students in the off-campus program pay tuition, registration and MPA assessment costs totalling \$199.00. That is fair. The additional fees set out on the handout (totaling \$18.40) are not fair. Mr. Jacobson spoke to the funding structure of higher education in Montana - the tax dollars that support it, and the six-mill levy - these

January 31-February 1, 1991

are paid by everyone. The students in Helena can't possibly be users of the services provided by the Strand Union Building, P.E. Building, Student Building, Health, P.E. Complex and Winter Computer, yet fees for each of these are assessed off-campus students. Mr. Jacobson disputed, however, that the amounts will negatively impact the bonded indebtedness because of their insignificant amount. He also questioned the high dollar figure quoted on the fiscal note.

Mr. Jacobson contended the disputed fees are user fees, and should apply only to students who benefit from the frills provided by the fees.

Vice President Isch, MSU, responded the \$75,000 figure on the fiscal note results from the large number of off-campus students served by MSU, particularly in the nursing program. The fees collected from part-time students are specifically pledged to the bonded indebtedness. While \$75,000 may not seem to be a significant amount if enrollments are maintained and grow, it could be significant in combination with reduced enrollments if actions are taken to cut back the size of the units, as is contemplated. If that combination occurs, the \$75,000 will ultimately land in the arena of the taxpayers of the State.

Mr. Isch noted Mr. Jacobson is correct that it is a philosophical matter whether a unit charges user fees, or charges a fee and amortizes an amount over the entire student body. He called the attention of the Board to the three academic facilities constructed on MSU's campus paid for by all students, the creative arts complex, the business and education building, and the P.E. complex. Mr. Isch noted there are probably some engineering students who questions why they are assessed fees to cover construction of those buildings. That, however, is a decision the Board has made when the fees were

January 31-February 1, 1991

established. He also mentioned if Mr. O'Keefe's legislation is successful, MSU will lose approximately \$14,000 in student computer fees. There are a number of students on campus who would also argue they do not use computers in their current program and should not be expected to pay.

President Dennison echoed the comments of Mr. Isch. These fees are not viewed on the UM campus as user fees. A user fee is that which is charged when a person enters a program and pays at a rate high enough to pay all the costs. An example of that would be the way continuing education courses are funded. But students in programs such as the one Mr. Jacobson is in are included within UM's student population. They have the same obligations as other students at the University. Loss of revenues at UM under this legislation would approximate \$35,000 per year that are pledged against bonds as well. President Dennison stated he believed it to be important to focus on the issue presented - is this a user fee? or is this a fee imposed on all students who matriculate and are considered to be part of the regular student population at the University.

Other presidents reported on the revenue losses they would experience if this legislation is successful. Such action would also expose the units to audit exceptions.

Chairman Mathers called for questions from the Regents. Regent Johnson stated his objection that the issue was taken to the Legislature for redress rather than coming first to the Board.

Chief Counsel Schramm explained he had talked with Representative O'Keefe who agreed to hold the bill until the Regents had an opportunity to discuss the issues raised. It is important for the Regents to realize the position they may be in if the legislation does in fact become law. The question to

January 31-February 1, 1991

be answered is, does the Board feel comfortable with its present policy on assessment of fees to off-campus students. There are financial implications.

Regent Redlin stated she believed these types of fees must be looked at as a supported infrastructure system rather than a specific fee. The effort of the Regents has been to be open and above board in assessing these fees in this manner, rather than rolling them into a sum labeled "tuition." This structure keeps the revenue streams clean. In her view, what Mr. Jacobson is asking through Representative O'Keefe's bill is damaging to the state, not just the University System.

Regent Musgrove, speaking as a student, stated he had never viewed these fees as user fees. Their assessment under that definition would be a nightmare.

Mr. Jacobson stated he had no intention of creating such a disturbance. When he learned the fees were statorily based, he had assumed the logical place to begin correction was with the Legislature. Hence his request for legislation to Representative O'Keefe. He had not intended to challenge the authority of the Regents. Perhaps the legislation should be narrowed in scope. Mr. Jacobson reiterated his support for the higher education system. He still firmly believed is ludicrous for students such as himself to pay health and computer fees when there will never be an opportunity to utilize those facilities.

Ms. Neils, Director of Budget and Accounting, noted for the record that the only reason the fees are referenced in statute is because the bonds used to be issued under the Board of Examiners. Referencing the fees in statute gave some security to the State of Montana in issuing those bonds. Now, of course, the bonds are issued under the constitutional authority of the Board of Regents.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Regent Kaze stated he believed what is actually being discussed is a distance learning situation. If the System is successful in its expanded implementation of distance learning offerings these types of issues will have to be addressed.

President Carpenter expressed serious concern with the wording of the proposed legislation and its use of the term "part-time" students.

Chairman Mathers asked if a motion was in order. Dr. Schramm explained if no action is taken, it indicates the Regents intent to continue its present fee policy. If that is not the case, some instruction to rework the fee schedule should be given to Commissioner's staff.

Hearing no motion, Chairman Mathers ruled the fee structure will remain unchanged. The Commissioner's office was instructed to stand in opposition to HB 226 for the reasons stated in this discussion, and for the more fundamental reason that the fee structure of the University System is a matter of Regent management, and not a matter of legislative oversight.

Legislative Report

Chairman Mathers reported on the breakfast meeting held before today's meeting with the Regents and members of the Education Subcommittee in attendance. The discussion centered around the request Representative Kadas made during a meeting with the Subcommittee last week that the Board of Regents provide a proposal to limit enrollment in accordance with one of the recommendations of the Education Commission of the 90's and Beyond. Chairman Mathers stated it was his understanding Representative Kadas was speaking to the recommendation to eliminate 7,000+ students to bring the System up to the appropriation level of the peer institutions. Another matter discussed was implementation of separate (higher) admission

January 31-February 1, 1991

requirements at the two universities. This would then result in students who are not eligible for entrance to the two universities attending the community colleges or one of the remaining four units of the University System. The repeating refrain of the entire Subcommittee membership has been "what will the Regents do if they receive only the Governor's budget request." The question has been asked by nearly the entire Subcommittee membership since the press conference held with the Governor and the Regents wherein the Regents stated they endorsed and adopted all the recommendations of the Education Commission for the Nineties and Beyond with the exception of the recommendation speaking to enrollment caps and separate admission standards at units of the System. At the press conference, the position of the Regents was that recommendation would be addressed separately at a later time. That does not appear to be satisfactory to Representative Kadas and Senator Hammond, both of whom served on the Education Commission. It becomes apparent that the reservation of response to that recommendation is not acceptable to the Education Subcommittee membership as a whole.

Chairman Mathers reported he told the Subcommittee members that the only way enrollment limitations would be considered would be under a guarantee that the present funding structure stays in place, and that in the next legislative session funding at those units would not be tied to student enrollment. Chairman Mathers stated the idea of telling a student of this state whose parents are taxpayers that they can not enter a unit of the University System is repulsive to him. The Subcommittee was told plainly that if a proposal for enrollment limitations is forced upon the Board, public hearings will be held, and the Board of Regents will not stand by itself and be the scapegoat. The Legislature will stand

January 31-February 1, 1991

with the Board. That is their responsibility as elected representatives of the people of this state, and one of their obligations is to raise money to meet the needs of the state.

Dr. Hutchinson noted the Board needs to discuss what it will do if the System receives only the Governor's recommendation for funding for the next biennium. Will the System attempt to carry on with business as usual, or will it downsize to allow a fit within the executive budget recommendation. He cautioned against discussion of specifics of how that would be done since specifics could not be provided without lengthy scrutiny of options.

Regent Redlin cautioned against "doing the work of the Legislature." She explained her concern in complying with the request of the Subcommittee, i.e., "come to us and say what you will do if you get the Governor's budget" is that while the response would have to be that some cuts would be made, if those are specified in anything less than the most general terms the legislators will feel free to pick and choose which ones fit their particular agenda and arrange the dollars to fulfill the prophecy. That would be an abrogation of the Board's responsibility as supervisor of the University System.

Going beyond that, Regent Redlin stated the concept that the downsizing suggested by the Legislature would improve the quality of the System is a simplistic solution to a very difficult problem. There are all sorts of ramifications to any cuts; if enrollments are limited at the universities, the students will likely go to other institutions within the System, thereby presumably lowering the quality of those institutions. If you downsize the entire System, the questions that need answers are legion. While a response to the Legislative request is obviously necessary, Regent Redlin cautioned against being in any way specific in responding to

January 31-February 1, 1991

exactly what the System will do in the event it receives only the amount of money recommended by the Executive budget. She cited historical actions taken by the Board in attempts to cut professional programs in the past. The response from the public was overwhelmingly against such proposed actions; the legislature was very resentful of the pressure exerted to force retention of the professional programs. There is nothing to prevent that same thing from happening again.

Regents Johnson and Schwanke spoke to the need for restructuring of Montana's tax system. Present revenue streams do not provide enough money to run the state; if "business as usual" continues in this Legislative session on the revenue side, then some very serious relocations will occur.

Commissioner Hutchinson noted he believed the Education Subcommittee would stand behind a recommendation that if the System was downsized, the System's funding level would be held at present level. That commitment, if in fact it does represent the view of the entire Subcommittee, has to be understood in the context that the Subcommittee can not bind the whole of the present Legislature. Certainly no agreement with the Education Subcommittee could be considered binding on future legislatures.

The seriousness of continued accreditation of professional programs was discussed, as capping enrollments

President Dennison noted the request to the Legislature by the System was for funds to begin the process towards catch-up. The Regents clearly took the position that could not be accomplished in one year, but one-fifth of the jump was requested the first year. Talking about the reverse of that, in discussion of downsizing or enrollment limitations, no one should expect the System would go all the way to

January 31-February 1, 1991

elimination of 7,000 students the first year. Dr. Dennison stated "you begin to make progress, I guess, in reverse. Hopefully that's progress." He noted it sounded more like the downward spiral discussed earlier. All units are in the same position in that they receive funding levels based on the average of the last two years' enrollments. In the case of UM, there are some 600 FTE students on campus over and above the funded level. The problem facing the System is even more interrelated in the literal sense. If those 600+ students are removed along with the tuition they are responsible for, you begin to see the spiral effect which will be tremendous to watch - if you are far away. It will be a very disastrous situation as the System moves into it. Dr. Dennison stated he understood the position taken by the Regents that the need is to protect quality. The System is on the verge of losing that quality. That was the position taken in UM's presentation to the Legislature, and it was felt there was a good response. These kinds of conversations will ultimately result in the same dramatic loss of applications to units of the System that Western Montana College experienced a couple years ago when debate centered over its closure.

Discussion was held by the Regents on the dangers of "body count" discussions. The System still produces high quality graduates and has received national recognition for those accomplishments. This is the result of the infusion of money in the early 1980's and the investment of that money in high quality faculty. Those faculty are still with the System, for the most part, but they are leaving. Chairman Mathers expressed his dismay with the insistence on blanket endorsement of all of the the Education Commission recommendations. By this insistence on a detailed response to the recommendation that enrollments be cut, the Legislature is putting the Board

January 31-February 1, 1991

of Regents in an untenable position. If these kinds of cuts occur, the Legislature must be prepared to share the criticism that will arise from Montana's citizens. The overwhelmingly positive vote on continuation of the 6-mill levy could be cited as an indicator of Montana citizens' support for higher education. Recent polls conducted reveal there is no question people of the state support higher education; the majority have indicated willingness to increase their taxes if the funds raised are given to higher education.

Commissioner Hutchinson spoke to focus the discussion. He stated he believed the Regents have perfectly within their purview the right to make the decision not to take a stand. Maybe the Regents would choose to simply deny the Subcommittee's demand for a response outlining what actions they would take if the System receives insufficient revenues. Dr. Hutchinson stated that he would then present that case to the Subcommittee; that the Board of Regents do not wish to become embroiled in detailed discussion of what will happen if the Governor's budget recommendation is adopted by the Legislature.

Dr. Hutchinson stated if the Board chooses to take a stand, he suggested that the stand be that there would be some downsizing of the University System, with the clear proviso that there be no loss of funds. That the System would in fact decouple from the formula. If the System is not decoupled from the formula, then all bets are off. At least seven strategies have been identified within the Commissioner's Office of how the System might be downsized; it is far too premature to pick one of those, and certainly too premature to identify any "hit list" or any kind of multiple choice of what the Regents might select. If enrollments are to be reduced, Dr. Hutchinson cautioned the System is in no position to say how many, which

January 31-February 1, 1991

ones, or where. Beyond that, no further response would be made at this time. The Board may also choose to conduct public hearings on what it believes are options for downsizing, and ask the public what its best judgment is on how it should be accomplished, i.e., fewer institutions, enrollment caps, higher admission standards, elimination of programs, etc. Dr. Hutchinson urged again that if the Board takes a stand, it should not be at all prescriptive on how downsizing will occur. He noted his advice to the Board is that is the position it should take.

Regent Topel agreed that "how to do it" is certainly premature at this time. In-put needs to be received from the public, faculty, staff, and students before a blueprint for downsizing is presented. However, he believed the Board owed the Legislature a rough "body-count". He made that recommendation in the belief the Legislature cannot make an informed decision on funding without some range of the numbers that will be affected by downsizing. The Legislature has asked for this information in the event the System realizes only the Governor's budget recommendation; the System should be able to respond to that within a range narrow enough to allow it to realize the magnitude of changes the System will have to examine.

Commissioner Hutchinson responded he could agree with that analysis. However, there would have to be a great deal of discussion and analysis before the System is in a position to "throw out a number." That simply should not be done until the System knows absolutely what the best approaches will be and what will be done. The System may decide the "stepping-stone" method proposed by some of the presidents may be the direction; Dr. Hutchinson did not believe anyone could provide a number at this stage.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Considerable more discussion ensued on this topic. Dr. Hutchinson discussed alternatives, if the System is decoupled from the formula, whereby costs could be reduced by eliminating a group of high cost programs; optimistically students would funnel into the "cash cows" on a campus. Under this procedure no "bodies" may be lost at all, but the overall cost of education would be reduced. Alternatively, the System could retain its high cost programs and cut actual human beings out. Getting a simple range is very dangerous at this point.

Presidents endorsed the need for caution at this point as presented by the Commissioner. Dr. Dennison stated his recollection of the wording of the Education Commission's recommendation was that it did not ask for a specific number; it recommended instead a process be set underway to reduce the numbers so as to bring the numbers into sync with Montana's peer institutions. The impact of reduction of numbers probably would not be felt until the second year of the biennium, if then.

Regent Kaze spoke strongly against supplying a "body count". President Carpenter explained his belief that simply reducing numbers does not equate with quality. The student/faculty ratio could be reduced, but there would be no relief for libraries, equipment, accreditation, etc. If the legislators want to understand the multiplicity of problems facing the campuses, they could be given copies of the accreditation reports. Those reports contain quality issues. Chairman Mathers spoke to the seriousness of the problem of accreditation of the School of Pharmacy at UM. The accreditation team agreed very reluctantly during the process a year ago to wait until the present legislature had an opportunity to address the issues raised in the accreditation visit. Chairman Mathers stated there was no question in his

January 31-February 1, 1991

mind that if those matters are not addressed, accreditation would be withdrawn. An identical situation exists at MSU with accreditation of its engineering program with an enrollment of 2,000 students, and NCATE at EMC on its education program. These matters have been stressed in the presentations to the Education Subcommittee.

Chairman Mathers stated it is time to reach a decision. He stated personally he approved and supported the Commissioner's approach to the problem. He expressed regret that the Regents have been backed into a situation that may result in controversy with the Legislature. Discussion was held on the appropriate format for response.

Regent Redlin stressed the need to be extremely careful that the Regents do not become embroiled "on any front." She believed the Legislature should be told the Regents cannot do what it asks. The Regents should also explain to the Governor that a totally confrontational situation is being created, and he should be asked what flexibility he could build into his stance. Regent Redlin was reluctant to state categorically that the problem is totally on either entity, but her first concern was that the Regents not be the scapegoat for either.

ACTION: Commissioner Hutchinson was asked to restate his recommendation. Dr. Hutchinson stated he recommended a response be directed to Chairman Peck of the Education Subcommittee, with copies of a formal statement directed to the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and Chairperson of the Senate Finance and Claims Committee. The response of the Regents would be that given the Governor's budget, the University System will downsize, with the understanding and clear proviso that there be a decoupling from the formula, and the System will enjoy no loss of funding from its current levels. Further, the Regents are not prepared to state how

January 31-February 1, 1991

many students would be affected, which ones, or where, or what strategies the System would use to accomplish the downsizing. The Regents reserve the right to exercise public hearings to get counsel from Montana citizens and from the campuses as to how the downsizing process should occur.

Chairman Mathers called the question on adoption of the Commissioner's recommendation. The Commissioner's recommended response to the Legislature was adopted with Regents Schwanke, Kaze, Musgrove, Mathers, and Johnson voting yes; Regent Redlin abstained; Regent Topel voted no.

Introduction of Newly Appointed Regent Paul Boylan

Chairman Mathers introduced Mr. Paul Boylan who has just been appointed by the Governor to replace Regent Redlin on the Board of Regents at the expiration of her term. Chairman Mathers welcomed Mr. Boylan to the Board of Regents, and stated all members of the Board look forward to serving with Mr. Boylan.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Administrative Committee

Regent Redlin reported the Committee agenda was shortened because the majority of the items were heard in joint committee meetings by the full Board. Nor further discussion of those items will be reported.

Policy Action Agenda

Regent Redlin reported that Item 12-004-R0676, Non-Discrimination; Montana University System (REVISED) was proposed for revision to correct wording of the System's discrimination policy, especially the sections dealing with persons having some disability. The revision before the Board was extensively reviewed in Chief Counsel Schramm's memorandum to the Board dated December 5, 1990 (on file) when the item was placed on the submission agenda at the December 1990 meeting.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Regent Redlin reported the Administrative Committee recommended Item 12-004-R0676 be approved as revised. She so moved. The motion carried.

Additions to Agenda

Action Agenda

Regent Redlin reported Item 70-101-R0191, Authorization for the University of Montana to Organize the University of Montana Flathead Lake Biological Station as a University Center, an addition agenda, was received for action at this meeting. President Dennison, UM, reported the item authorizes reorganization of all academic, fiscal and support responsibilities of the Flathead Lake Biological Station into a University Center, changing reporting responsibilities and enhancing the status, visibility and functionality of the Station within the University. No programmatic changes are proposed.

Regent Redlin reported the Committee recommended the item be approved. She so moved. The motion carried.

Capital Construction Additions to Agenda

President Dennison spoke briefly to the need for approval of Item 7-102-R0191, Authority to Improve Fire Alarm and Detection Systems in Residence Halls, University of Montana. Sound volume readings of the hallway alarm system show the present system is not adequate to alert individuals in all student rooms. The fire alarm and smoke detection system in the Residence Halls will cost an estimated \$160,000 and will be funded wholly from auxiliary revenues and/or reserves available for that purpose. The Committee recommended the item for approval. Regent Redlin so moved. The motion carried.

Item 70-207-R0191, Authorization to Remodel Room 401 Cobleigh Hall; Montana State University, was presented by Acting President Malone. The item requests authorization to

January 31-February 1, 1991

proceed with the planning and remodeling of room 401 Cobleigh Hall to support the Engineering Research Center as an Instrumentation Laboratory. The estimated cost of the project is \$48,000, and will be financed with funds from the National Science Foundation. In accordance with MCA 218-2-102 (2) (C), projects of this type require authorization by the Board of Regents and concurrence of the Governor. The Committee recommended the item for approval. Regent Redlin so moved. The motion carried.

Policy Action Agenda

Chief Counsel Schramm reported agreement had been reached on the amendment to Item 69-002-R0990, Internal Audit Reports: Montana University System as a result of yesterday's discussion of the item in joint committee. The following amendment is proposed to page 1 of the policy, Section 2, second line following "unit or center", insert "at the direction of the unit or center by an employee as part of the employee's assigned duties." The following sentence on page 2 of the policy would be stricken: "Such reports are not restricted to those done by employees with the job title of 'internal auditor'." With those amendments, the item is recommended for approval.

On motion of Regent Kaze, Item 69-002-R0990, was approved as amended.

Submission Agenda

Regent Redlin reported that at the request of the Commissioner, and with the consent of the Regent Kaze, Chairman of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, Item 70-801-R0191, Authorization to Change the Title of the Northern Montana College Higher Education center at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, to the Northern Montana College Higher Education Center at Great Falls; Northern Montana College, was

January 31-February 1, 1991

moved from the submission agenda of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee to the submission agenda of the Administrative Committee. The item was received for action at the March 1991 meeting.

Administrative Committee Discussion Matters

Regent Redlin reported Chairman Mathers brought to the attention of the Committee correspondence he had received concerning conditions and policies governing student life and the residence dormitories. It is the recommendation of the Administrative Committee that the Commissioner's Office will draw together a list of policies governing dormitory and student life on all the campuses, and request the Vice Presidents and Deans in charge of student affairs to report on those topics to the full Board at the March 1991 meeting. The recommendation to receive such a report was concurred in by the full Board. The Commissioner's Office was so instructed.

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Report

Notice of Intent Agenda

Regent Kaze, Chairman of the Committee, reported this is the first opportunity the six campuses of the University System have had to bring forward "Notice of Intent" proposals under the newly adopted system. The following actions were taken on that agenda:

Dawson Community College: Microcomputer Specialist Notice of Intent Proposal was withdrawn at the request of the institution.

Northern Montana College: General Science Option: Master's in Education. Place on submission agenda of the May 1991 meeting.

Montana State University: Termination of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Economics (Item 70-204-R0191);

Item 70-205-R0191, Reporting of Decision to place

January 31-February 1, 1991

the Master of Science Program in Psychology in "Moratorium" Status; Montana State University, and

Item 70-206-R0191, Reporting of Decision to Place the Bachelor of Science Degree Program in Agricultural Engineering in "Moratorium" Status; Montana State University

Regent Kaze explained the two requests to place programs in moratorium status is in compliance with Section 303.4 of the MUS Policy and Procedure Manual. Under this procedure, campuses notify the Board that such programs are in a position of abeyance for a period of three years maximum. During that moratorium period, campus review of such programs will allow a decision to be made to reopen admissions, request the program be terminated, or reconfigured, or be more appropriately renamed. No action was required on items on the Notice of Intent Agenda. However, Regent Kaze stated if anyone has questions regarding items on the Notice of Intent Agenda it would be appropriate that they be raised now.

Academic Affairs Submission Agenda

Regent Kaze reported an Addendum to Item 70-1002-R1290, Approval of Proposed Associate of Applied Science Degree in Parts Specialist Technology; Dawson Community College, was received and will be addended to the item for action at the March 1991 meeting. The addendum adds a one-year certificate within the proposal which was inadvertently omitted in the original submission.

Item 70-7501-R0191, Approval of Proposal to Convert the Approved Two-Year Certificate in Drafting Technology to an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Drafting Technology; Billings Vocational-Technical Center was received for action at the May 1991 meeting.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Action Agenda

Regent Kaze reported Item 69-9501-R1090, Approval of Proposal to Change the Approved Two-Year Certification in Electronics Technology to an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Electronics Technology; Missoula Vocational-Technical Center was recommended by the Committee for approval. He so moved. The motion carried.

Report on Transfer of Credit; Montana Vocational-Technical System

Regent Kaze noted that because of the on-going concerns of Committee and other Board members concerning associate degrees in general and the transferability of credits particularly from vo-tech centers to other units of the System, Deputy Commissioner Vardemann prepared an extensive report which was received and reviewed by the Committee (on file). Summarizing, Regent Kaze noted Ms. Vardemann and others made an excellent effort to define in very understandable terms the kinds of credits that should transfer, and those that should not, between and among which institutions. The report provides a commitment for continuing information to flow to students to be certain they are not misled in seeking information on what coursework is transferable, and that which is not. Regent Kaze distributed copies of the Report to those Board members not on the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, and encouraged each Regent to read the report. Copies of the report will be distributed to appropriate persons throughout the System. If questions arise, the Committee would be happy to address those at a future meeting.

Regent Kaze also noted for the record that he had requested Dr. Toppen to obtain a copy of the transfer of credit policy from the Colorado System. That policy is available to anyone interested in receiving it. Regent Kaze stated he is encouraging consideration by the Montana System of the kinds of policies on transfer of credits in force in the Colorado System.

January 31-February 1, 1991

Budget Committee Report

Action Agenda

Regent Topel, Chairman of the Budget Committee, reported Item 70-4001-R0191, Authorization to Increase Tuition and fees Effective Fall Semester 1991; Miles Community College, was tabled.

The Supplemental Appropriation Request in the amount of \$51,700 submitted by Flathead Valley Community College is brought forward with a recommendation by the Budget Committee that it not be approved. Regent Topel explained the request was approved by the FVCC local Board of Trustees because the College is presently funded for approximately 100 fewer students than are actually enrolled. The Budget Committee feels, however, that all units of the System are presently funded on the basis of the last two years' average enrollment and the situation at FVCC is not unique.

Chairman Mathers asked President Fryett for comment. Dr. Fryett stated he understood the rationale of the Committee, and will communicate that to his local Board of Trustees. It is possible, subject to Board of Trustees' approval, that a request for a surcharge on tuition for Spring Quarter at FVCC would be brought to the Board of Regents. Because of differences in meeting dates of the two Boards, it was agreed the request could be taken to the Regents in a telephone conference call meeting if the FVCC Board of Trustees wishes to make such a request.

Addition to Action Agenda

Regent Topel reported an addition to the Budget Committee, Item 70-9001-R0191, Expenditure of Student Computer Fees; Helena Vocational-Technical Center, was acted on by the Committee. The item provides authorization for expenditure of \$38,687.50 of student computer fees for the acquisition of

January 31-February 1, 1991

twelve IBM PS2 computers. The Committee recommended the item be approved. Regent Schwanke so moved. The motion carried.

Dr. Hutchinson noted it is a significant step that the System was given a lump sum appropriation for the vo-tech centers.

Annual Report on Gender Equity

Deputy Commissioner Vardemann introduced Ms. Carol Farris, Human Resources Development Officer, Office of Commissioner of Higher Education, who distributed and reviewed copies of the 1990 Gender Equity Report (on file). The annual report is required under the conditions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.

Ms. Farris reviewed the projects funded for Single Parent/Displaced Homemaker/Single Pregnant Women and Eliminating Sex Bias and Stereotyping, and the Montana Equity Awards and Executive Summary sections.

Ms. Farris noted while the Report is a reflection of the past, because it deals with projects in 1990, the additional handout distributed, "The Partnership in Equity Newsletter" talks about the present. This particular issue deals with that part of the reauthorization of the Perkins Act that establishes a plan to be developed outlining how Perkins Funds will be spent in the area of gender equity in the future. Formerly, a certain number of dollars were made available to the field under set parameters, and the field was asked what it would like to do with the monies. The new annual plan provides a way to focus the efforts of this money because the demands for the funds so far exceeds the available dollars.

Ms. Farris concluded her report, noting that the report her office is required to give deals with the past, the newsletter with the present, and the third part of her job description requires she make recommendations to the Board of

January 31-February 1, 1991

Regents as the sole state agent. She recommended (1) that data be collected showing faculty at various levels by gender; (2) that a gender policy including implementation guidelines be adopted by the System similar to the minority policy recently adopted, and (3) that the Board of Regents examine teacher certification requirements and how teachers are trained with the goal of incorporating ways for new teachers to know how to deal with equity in their classrooms.

On motion of Regent Redlin, the 1990 Gender Equity Report was accepted.

Comments of Regent Redlin

Chairman Mathers noted this was the last meeting Regent Redlin would attend as a member of the Board of Regents, and that she had requested a time on the agenda for comment.

Regent Redlin began by stating it is rather ironic that she should be speaking at the point on the agenda immediately following the gender equity report. She stated she had all appreciation and respect for the new appointee to the Board. With that appointment, the Board of Regents is now an all male Board. She had great concern for the situation in which the Board of Regents is now placed. Regent Redlin stated it was important to note there have been five opportunities to appoint a woman of the Governor's choice to the Board of Regents during her term. It is disturbing and distressing that has not been done. She would put it on the conscience of the Board of Regents, not only to approve equity reports, but to continue to keep that on the forefront of the Board's agendas.

Regent Redlin stated she believed there are three pegs that Regents ought to use when working in the educational arena. The first peg is that Regents must be advocates for education - totally committed advocates for education. There are many people involved in education, but it is the seven members of the Board of Regents who have that sole

January 31-February 1, 1991

responsibility. The Board of course has other responsibilities as well, and many people share the responsibility for education, but generally others have another responsibility which might precede their total dedication to higher education in general. That might include being the president of an institution or a person in the administrative structure of an institution of higher education, and that changes the focus just a little bit. The seven people sitting as the Board of Regents have a sole responsibility that requires a total commitment. Anyone who has run a business knows you cannot supervise, coordinate, manage, and control very efficiently if you don't care much one way or another whether it succeeds or not, or whether it has the focus of your attention. Regent Redlin urged the Board to continue to be totally committed advocates for education whether it makes practical sense or not. That does not enter into it. Advocacy is advocacy, and that is the responsibility of the Board of Regents.

The second peg is to view every issue from the standpoint of education first. There are all sorts of viewpoints - political acceptability, public acceptance, economic constraints - all are valid. But once again, there are 150 people elected to the Legislature who are worried about and responsible for the economic impact of everything that is done within the state. Regent Redlin urged the Board not to do the job of the Legislature for them. The job of the Board of Regents is to look at education first, and then consider the other ramifications. In the same way, public acceptability is a political concern which the Board can never afford to ignore. If the Board is governed by that concern, however, the focus of the Board has been changed. The focus of the Board is to look at every issue from the standpoint, "is it good for education? Does it matter to education whether it is done or not?" This could be summarized by saying the Board of Regents

January 31-February 1, 1991

works with those who operate in the public arena and in the political and economic arena, but the Board works in the education arena. The Board's responsibility is to accommodate those other needs as best it can to education, rather than the other way around. That makes quite a difference.

Last, but not least, Regent Redlin stated it must be remembered at all times that this entire effort which includes all of the wonderful, very talented, different people in this room today - very able, very well educated - are all here because of the students. If students are not the goal of the Board, the administration of the units, and all the people who work in it, it becomes a circle that rolls around without any destination at all. Regent Redlin again urged the Board and all those present to remember that students are the important point, noting that perhaps that is why she felt so emotionally involved when discussions range to the possibility of limiting our students. She believed that Chairman Mathers shared that same feeling. It seems to go against the grain of what really should be accomplished.

Regent Redlin concluded she really believed that if the Board would use those three guideposts the result would probably be good policy, and that is what being a member of the Board of Regents is all about. She thanked everyone for their kindness and consideration. Regent Redlin stated her term on the Board had been a real pleasure. Not everyone has a chance to serve on a Board that makes a difference - she was grateful to have had that opportunity.

Regent Redlin received a standing ovation and a vigorous round of applause at the conclusion of her remarks. Chairman Mathers stated most emphatically that Elsie would be back and that the System would have a fitting "going away"

January 31-February 1, 1991

party in her honor. She will be missed; Chairman Mathers stated Regent Redlin is the conscience of the Board.

Commissioner's Report

Before beginning his report, Dr. Hutchinson stated on behalf of the Commissioner's Office, and he was sure on behalf of all of his predecessors who were Commissioners of Higher Education, most or all of whom Elsie served with, he certainly wanted to thank Regent Redlin for her long tenure on the Board of Regents and her outstanding service. He noted we had just witnessed a sterling example of why Regent Redlin has been called, and properly so, the conscience of the Board. Regent Redlin will be missed very much, and is wished all the best in whatever the future holds for her.

CNA Accident Insurance

Commissioner Hutchinson called on Mr. David Evenson, Director of Benefits, who distributed and briefly reviewed the brochure and enrollment documents related to the newly-available accident insurance plan now available to Regents and other members of the University System.

Snapshot of Open Meeting Guidelines

Due to time constraints, this report was postponed to a future meeting.

Report on Regents/Legislative Committee

Dr. Hutchinson reported the Regents/Legislative Committee, called for by the recommendations of the Education Commission for the 90's and Beyond, has held its first meeting. The Committee membership is comprised of four Regents and four Legislators. A good discussion occurred in the first meeting; some of the same issues raised by the Education Subcommittee at the breakfast meeting with the Regents were raised in this meeting also. A major topic of discussion of the joint committee was that of lump sum funding. Legislators

January 31-February 1, 1991

on the joint committee are open to further discussion of lump sum funding, and have asked that a "white paper" be prepared on how lump sum funding is handled in other states. Commissioner Hutchinson noted he will prepare that document. Overall, the meeting was productive; the Committee anticipates several more meetings before the end of the year.

Dr. Hutchinson also reported on legislation that has been introduced to establish a joint Regents/Legislative Committee that would also have representation from the Executive Branch. If that legislation passes, the present Committee would be supplanted. Dr. Hutchinson will keep the Board informed.

Legislative Update

Dr. Hutchinson called the Regents' attention to the bill status report distributed at this meeting. That status report contains information on bills of interest to and being tracked by the University System, including current status.

Discussion of Vo-Tech Funding

At Regent Topel's request, Deputy Commissioner Jack Noble reviewed the report given earlier to the Budget Committee on funding for the vocational-technical centers. Mr. Noble noted one of the two top priorities of the Regents regarding vo-tech funding was to provide general fund money for vo-tech operating budgets to replace money previously appropriated by the Legislature from Carl Perkins funds (\$807,000 each year of the biennium). The Subcommittee did provide \$570,000 of that amount as general fund backfill. The second action of the Subcommittee was to incorporate the vo-tech salary equity proposal of the Board of Regents in the formula. Mr. Noble noted the Subcommittee did insist that the vo-techs convert to a formula funding method. The Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education was given the opportunity to provide the

January 31-February 1, 1991

Subcommittee with its recommendation as to what would be spent given a bottom line general fund amount as shown on the handout. Mr. Noble explained the Subcommittee's recommendation is about \$259,000 lower than the Regents' recommendation the first year of the biennium; \$251,000 lower the second year. This will result in an approximate 11% - 12% reduction in numbers of instructional faculty for the vo-techs over the biennium. In summary, the Subcommittee recommended replacement of the Carl Perkins monies for administration in a reduced amount, and salary equity money for the reduced number of faculty over the biennium. There is no support money for the vo-techs provided outside of instruction for the first year of the biennium. An approximate \$151,000 in increased support is provided the second year. The Subcommittee recommended \$200,000 of discretionary funds to the Board of Regents to handle difficulties that might occur in the next biennium, and provided increased flexibility through a single appropriation for each vo-tech center and did not appropriate the money to particular programs.

Dr. Hutchinson noted it is significant that lump sum funding was realized by the vo-tech centers.

Report on MUSFAC

At the Commissioner's request, Deputy Commissioner Toppen reported on activities of the Montana University System Faculty Advisory Committee (MUSFAC). At its last meeting, a variety of issues were discussed including legislative affairs, lump sum funding, semester conversion, etc. Out of that meeting came two specific requests from that group to be presented to the Board of Regents: (1) As the Board of Regents begins discussion on how the System can spend discretionary dollars, that ways be found to fund faculty development programs that deal with improvement of curriculum

January 31-February 1, 1991

and communication between campuses on a disciplinary level; and (2) the faculty representatives have discussed with OCHE their commitment to the completion of the conversion to the semester system. MUSFAC did ask that the Board of Regents carefully consider the timing of the semesters as the calendar is developed in years to come. There was no direct request to change the calendar at this time, but MUSFAC members did want to leave open the "window of consciousness" that there must be some way to consider starting classes a little later in the fall and ending a little later in the spring.

Statement of Regent Topel on Vote on Response to the Education Subcommittee

Regent Topel stated he wished to elaborate on his reasons for casting a dissenting vote on the Regents' response to the request of the Education Subcommittee regarding reducing enrollments in the System. He stated it was not an easy dissent to make. It was intended only to convey the message that he would have liked to see the Regents move more in the direction of identifying the progress the Board wishes to make in expenditures per student. With that exception, Regent Topel stated he endorsed the action taken by the Board.

CAMPUS REPORTS

Dr. James Isch, Chair of the Montana State University Presidential Search Committee, reported on the status of the search. On-campus interviews of the four semi-finalists will be conducted February 6 - 20, 1991. He invited any member of the Board of Regents who is interested in participating in these interviews to please do so.

President Dennison, UM, echoed the words of praise spoken regarding Regent Redlin. He also spoke to the action taken earlier in the meeting regarding Provost Donald Habbe's future retirement. He stated Dr. Habbe has served the System

January 31-February 1, 1991

and the University of Montana long and well. The only benefit in that action is that Dr. Habbe will continue to provide advice and counsel to the President.

President Dennison also called the Board's attention to an agreement reached between FVCC and UM to deliver continuing education courses at the graduate level in Kalispell, citing this agreement as another example of interunit cooperation.

All Presidents spoke words of praise and appreciation to Regent Redlin as she retires from the Board of Regents. She has been a superb Regent and will be missed. Vocational-Technical Center Directors spoke particularly to Regent Redlin's constant concern for and interest in the vocational-technical centers. It is appreciated.

President Lindsay Norman, Montana Tech, reported on the conclusion of Tech's third accreditation visit in the last six months. At the exit interview two major criticisms were leveled at the institution - inadequate faculty salaries and faculty workloads. The institution was put on notice that if its appropriation was not improved there will be major problems with accreditation.

President Donald Kettner, Dawson Community College, expressed the community college's appreciation to Regent Redlin for her continual interest and support of the three community colleges. He also reported students at DCC had voluntarily increased their restricted fees. President Kettner stated he was told by OCHE fiscal staff there was no need to report that formally to the Board, but he wished to inform the Board of the student's willingness to support the institution.

President Howard Fryett, FVCC, reported that campus anticipates completion of the semester conversion by Fall 1992. FVCC is also deeply involved in its accreditation study,

January 31-February 1, 1991

and it is going well. He distributed copies of HB 444. If the legislation passes, HB 444 would exempt community colleges from the affects of I 105. Problems with wording contained in the bill regarding a cap on the mandatory levy are being addressed, and he urged the Regents' support for HB 444.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Regents will be held on March 20-21, 1991, in Helena, Montana.

. 1311w

