

THE BOARD OF REGENTS  
OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
Montana University System

MINUTES

---

**DATE:** MARCH 22, 1993

**LOCATION:** MONTANA HIGHER EDUCATION BUILDING  
CONFERENCE ROOM  
2500 BROADWAY  
HELENA, MONTANA

**REGENTS PRESENT:** BILL MATHERS (CHAIRMAN), JIM KAZE (VICE CHAIRMAN), TRAVIS BELCHER, PAUL BOYLAN, CORDELL JOHNSON, KERMIT SCHWANKE, AND TOM TOPEL; COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION JOHN HUTCHINSON

**REGENTS ABSENT:** NONE

**PRESIDENTS PRESENT:** BRUCE CARPENTER (EMC), BILL DAEHLING (NMC), GEORGE DENNISON (UM), AND LINDSAY NORMAN (TECH); PROVOST MIKE EASTON (WMCUM); JUD FLOWER (MCC), AND DON KETTNER (DCC)

**PRESIDENTS ABSENT:** MIKE MALONE (MSU); HOWARD FRYETT (FVCC)

**DIRECTORS PRESENT:** JANE BAKER (BUTTE VT), GEORGE BELL (BILLINGS VT), ALEX CAPDEVILLE (HELENA VT), DENNIS LERUM (MISSOULA VT), AND WILLARD WEAVER (GREAT FALLS VT)

**DIRECTORS ABSENT:** NONE

---

Chairman Bill Mathers called the regular meeting of the Board of Regents to order at 8:00 a.m. Roll call showed that a quorum was present.

Regent Jim Kaze moved that the minutes of the December 10-11, 1992; January 21-22, 1993; and February 15, 1993 meetings be approved as mailed. The motion passed unanimously.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **STAFF ITEMS**

Because the Board members had some questions about the Consent Agenda

items, and because some people from Montana State University were delayed, Chairman Mathers said the Board would consider the items individually.

a. Item 78-100-R0393 - Staff; University of Montana

Regent Kermit Schwanke expressed a concern about the manner in which staff replacements were portrayed. He said in most cases there was no way to determine whether the replacement's salary was higher, lower, or the same as that of the individual being replaced. Regent Schwanke said that until the legislative session ended and they knew their exact budget, he opposed any salary increases that could not be completely justified to the Board.

University of Montana President George Dennison noted that UM's items did not include any increases.

Commissioner of Higher Education John Hutchinson said that a member of his staff carefully reviewed staff items as they were received and made follow-up phone calls to the campuses on any precipitous salary increases. Those items were then brought to his attention. He said he was satisfied that none of the March staff items were irregular. Hutchinson pointed out that some increases reflected obligations made by the campuses to faculty after completions of terminal degrees, for example—additional money had been awarded in the past for that type of work. Some of the increases also reflected changes in responsibility, and some of the larger salaries involved "soft" money acquired by the institutions to run grants.

b. Item 78-101-R0393 - Proposal to Honor the Memory of Professor John C. Ellis; University of Montana

President Dennison said UM wanted to honor the memory of Professor Ellis, who died last year, by naming the bell tower in University Hall "The John C. Ellis Carillon Tower." President Dennison said the proposal was widely supported across the campus.

**Regent Paul Boylan moved that Items 78-100-R0393 and 78-101-R0393 be approved. The motion passed unanimously.**

c. Item 78-500-R0393 - Staff; Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology

d. Item 78-500A-R0393 - Staff; Montana Bureau of Mines & Geology

Regent Cordell Johnson noted that if some of Montana Tech's salaries were not supplemented by the private sector through the Montana Tech Foundation, they probably wouldn't be able to keep those people at Montana Tech. He said he appreciated the private-sector support but that faculty salaries should be a state

obligation.

According to Montana Tech President Lindsay Norman, the practice of supplementing salaries with outside funding was initiated with Board concurrence about 10 years ago because of the campus' inability to be competitive in attracting the types of engineers the college required. He said raising those funds was becoming more difficult because the college was typically asked why the state wasn't assuming those rightful responsibilities.

Regent Schwanke asked whether the Butte legislators were aware of those problems.

President Norman said the legislators received an annual report that documented every cent of the funds. He said the Butte delegation was also aware of the increasing difficulties the college was having with trying to justify expenditures of private dollars for state obligations.

**Regent Travis Belcher moved that Items 78-500-R0393 and 78-500A-R0393 be approved. The motion passed unanimously.**

- e. Item 78-600-R0393 - Staff; Western Montana College of the University of Montana

**Regent Belcher moved that Item 78-600-R0393 be approved. The motion passed unanimously.**

- f. Item 78-700-R0393 - Staff; Eastern Montana College
- g. Item 78-701-R0393 - Mr. Glenn Iverson, Professor of Physical Education Emeritus; Eastern Montana College [Late addition to agenda]
- h. Item 78-702-R0393 - Dr. Richard H. Waltner, Professor of Sociology Emeritus [Late addition to agenda]

Responding to a question from Regent Kaze as to whether staff replacements were being paid higher salaries than their predecessors, Eastern Montana College President Bruce Carpenter pointed out that EMC's starting salaries were set under a collective bargaining agreement. For two salaries specifically targeted by Regent Kaze, President Carpenter said that one was lower and he wasn't sure about the other.

**Regent Schwanke moved that Items 78-700-R0393, 78-701-R0393, and 78-702-R0393 be approved. The motion passed unanimously.**

## 2. CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION ITEMS

- a. Item 78-102-R0393 - Street and Parking Lot Repairs, Family Housing; University of Montana
- b. Item 78-103-R0393 - Electronic Security Access System, Residence Halls; University of Montana
- c. Item 78-104-R0393 - Replace Carpet, Residence Halls; University of Montana
- d. Item 78-105-R0393 - Replace Safety Net, University Golf Course; University of Montana

According to President Dennison, all these projects were auxiliary enterprises paid for with funds realized by the operations themselves—no General Fund money was involved.

Regent Schwanke asked whether this type of work was done by Physical Plant staff or whether it was contract work.

President Dennison said it depended on the size of the job and where UM could get the best price.

Regent Kaze moved that Items 78-102-R0393, 78-103-R0393, 78-104-R0393, and 78-105-R0393 be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Mathers said the Board would consider MSU's staff items after the committee meetings. The Board recessed at 8:35 a.m. for concurrent committee meetings.

When the Board reconvened at 10:20 a.m., Chairman Mathers said they would begin with MSU's Consent Agenda items.

- a. Item 78-200-R0393 - Staff; Montana State University
- b. Item 78-300-R0393 - Staff; Agricultural Experiment Station
- c. Item 78-400-R0393 - Staff; Extension Service

After MSU Provost and Academic Vice President Mark Emmert responded to a number of questions from Board members on MSU's staff items, Regent Boylan moved that Items 78-200-R0393, 78-300-R0393, and 78-400-R0393 be approved. The motion passed—Regent Schwanke voted no.

d. Item 78-202-R0393 - Authorization to Replace the Roof on the Hedges Food Service Facility at Montana State University

In response to a question from Regent Johnson, Provost Emmert said the project would be funded by auxiliary funds.

Regent Belcher moved that Item 78-202-R0393 be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

### 1. ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

a. Denturist Association of Montana

Committee Chairman Regent Kaze said the committee heard a report from Roland Pratt, a lobbyist for the Denturist Association of Montana. According to a reference in a Montana statute, the Board of Regents is responsible for approving an accrediting agency in order for a denturist to be licensed in the state of Montana. The case in question involves a private, for-profit denturist school in Oregon. If people who complete that program want to apply for licensure under Montana law, the Board of Regents is supposed to approve the accrediting agency involved. Regent Kaze said the Board had never approved accrediting agencies for private, for-profit trade schools—only public institutions. He said the Board may eventually be faced with that question. For the time being, however, the committee suggested that the Denturist Association seek Northwest Association accreditation.

b. Announcements

- Dawson Community College made a request for and received approval from the Commissioner's Office to rename some options in its law enforcement program.
- A transfer articulation agreement between Northern Montana College and the Billings Technical Center on automotive technology had been approved by the Commissioner's Office.
- The committee heard a report about new developments relative to the EPSCoR program. EPSCoR is largely a collaborative statewide effort among Montana State University, the University of Montana, and Montana Tech, along with the colleges, technical centers, and other state agencies, to attract basic research dollars to Montana. Dr. David Toppen, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs, reported that the state would receive about \$5 million to \$15 million in research funding

by the year 2000.

c. Notice of Intent - Butte Technical Center

Regent Kaze said the committee approved the Butte Technical Center's notice of intent, although the notice was not being brought forward at the usual time. The Butte center, however, was involved with a reduction-in-force program that could produce major changes on the campus, and the center wanted direction from the Board as to whether it should proceed with that type of planning.

In response to a concern as to whether the Butte Technical Center should become involved in environmental hazardous waste technology, Regent Kaze said the center had an offer of some seed money from MSE. Also, since Butte is one of the country's largest Superfund sites, the proposed program could serve as a vehicle for improving future enrollment at the Butte center. Kaze said the item would be brought forward to the Board under the regular agenda process.

Chairman Mathers asked whether Montana Tech had a similar program and whether the college would be working with the Butte Technical Center.

Montana Tech President Lindsay Norman pointed out that Montana Tech was the designated hazardous waste research training facility for the state as well as for EPA nationally. He said the Butte Technical Center's program was intended to develop competent, technician-level people. According to President Norman, an academic articulation agreement already in place between Montana Tech and the Butte Technical Center would serve as an excellent focal point for working together on this type of program.

d. Item 78-502-R0393 - Proposal for Authorization to Offer a New Minor through the Department of Chemistry at Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology

e. Item 78-4000-R0393 - Proposal for Authorization for Miles Community College to Offer a New One-Year Certificate Program in Human Services and Juvenile Corrections and to Delete an Existing One-Year Certificate Program in Farm and Ranch Operations

f. Item 78-8001-R0393 - Approval for Conversion of Two-Year Certificate Program in Accounting Technology Program to Associate of Applied Science in Accounting Technology; Butte Technical Center

g. Item 78-8002-R0393 - Approval of Proposal to Consolidate the Currently Approved Certificate Programs in Administrative Assistant/Secretarial Science, Legal Office Secretary and Medical Office Secretary into One Associate of Applied Science Degree in Office Technology with Three

Areas of Emphasis; Butte Technical Center

- h. Item 78-9001-R0393 - Approval of Proposal to Convert the Three-Semester Certificate in Aviation Maintenance Technician to an Associate of Applied Science degree in Aviation Maintenance Technology; Helena Technical Center

Regent Kaze said these submission items from two- and four-year institutions would be placed on the May meeting's action agenda.

- i. Item 18-003-R1077 - Admission Requirements; In-State Undergraduates; Montana University System (REVISED 301.1)
- j. Item 18-004-R1077 - Admission Requirements; Out-of-State Undergraduates; Montana University System (REVISED 301.2)
- k. Item 42-002-R1283 - College Preparatory Program; Montana University System (REVISED 301.7)
- l. Item 78-002-R0393 - Academic Probation; Montana University System
- m. Item 78-003-R0393 - Academic Suspension; Montana University System

Regent Kaze said these policy submission items essentially were the beginnings of the Committee to Quality issues adopted by the Board in December. He said some minor changes had been made to several of the policies after they were mailed to the Board, and those changes would be reflected when the items were placed on the May meeting's action agenda. The changes involved the SAT equivalent to the ACT score and the number of credits required for part-time status.

Concerning new admission standards that would become effective Fall 1994, President Dennison said that traditionally when admission standards were changed, appropriate time was provided for students to accommodate those standards. He said the one-year notice may be inadequate and asked whether that had been considered.

Regent Kaze said the only significant change involved moving to an ACT score of 22. He said this had been discussed with the presidents, and it was felt the new standards could be implemented by Fall 1994 without dramatic impact.

Dr. David Toppen said they also held discussions with campus admissions officers. For any students who might be jeopardized by the early change, it was felt there was an adequate buffer left in the 15 percent exemption program for students who did not qualify. As a result, the campuses could implement the change within the 1994 time frame.

n. Item 78-203-R0393 - Authorization to Rename the Center for Interfacial Microbial Process Engineering at Montana State University

Regent Kaze said the committee recommended renaming this center as the "Center for Biofilm Engineering." He said the new name should broaden the center's research base.

**Regent Kaze moved that the Board approve renaming the Center for Interfacial Microbial Process Engineering at Montana State University to the "Center for Biofilm Engineering." The motion passed unanimously.**

o. Item 78-8003-R0393 - Approval of Program Deactivation and Layoff Plan; Butte Technical Center

Regent Kaze said that Jane Baker, Acting Director of the Butte Technical Center, was bringing this plan to the Board as a worst-case scenario. It essentially would deactivate five programs and seven tenured faculty members. Regent Kaze said if the center's budget remained at its current level, it would be able to reauthorize two of those programs—Automotive Technology and Combination Welding—with the tenured faculty in those programs intact. According to Acting Director Baker, the Assistant Director for Academic Affairs position would not be filled immediately in order to save some money, although she hoped to fill the position in the future.

**Regent Kaze moved that the Board accept the Butte Technical Center's Program Deactivation and Layoff Plan. The motion passed unanimously.**

p. Item 78-8501-R0393 - Approval of Program Deactivation and Layoff Plan; Great Falls Technical Center

Regent Kaze said Great Falls Technical Center's plan involved deactivating one program and one tenured faculty member, primarily due to a reduction in student numbers. According to Will Weaver, the center's director, student FTE counts were 10.7 for 1989-90; 6.8 for 1990-91; 6.2 for 1991-92; and 7.0 (projected) for 1992-93.

**Regent Kaze moved that the Board accept Great Falls Technical Center's Program Deactivation and Layoff Plan. The motion passed unanimously.**

q. Great Falls Higher Education Committee

Regent Kaze asked Dr. David Toppen to give a brief synopsis of his report on the Great Falls Higher Education Committee's work.

Dr. Toppen cited multiple presences of higher educational institutions in Great Falls—the College of Great Falls and the Great Falls Technical Center in particular.

He said the McLaughlin Research Center was building a large research facility immediately between those two campuses. The University of Montana and Montana State University had regular computer education programs delivered in that area, and Northern Montana College also had a physical presence in the community. Dr. Toppen said the Great Falls Higher Education Task Force was established to seek opportunities and examine constraints associated with establishing a higher education center or park in Great Falls. He said those efforts were underway, and the task force would be working with the College of Great Falls and the Great Falls Technical Center, which continues to play a pivotal role because of its proximity to the other areas.

Dr. Toppen then distributed a final copy of the *Guide to the Articulation of Equivalent Courses for Transfer between Montana's Public Community Colleges and Individual Units of the Montana University System*. Dr. Toppen said the guide would let community college students know exactly how their courses would transfer to Montana's baccalaureate institutions. He said the guide represented an important second step following creation of the core curriculum. Along with knowing there was a core curriculum they could take at any postsecondary institution, the students now would know how every course they took at either Miles, Dawson, or Flathead Valley community colleges would translate into an ultimate degree target at an intended institution.

Chairman Mathers asked whether the guide had been made available to each high school counselor in the state to help advise students.

Dr. Toppen said copies had been printed and would be sent to every high school counselor. The Superintendent of Public Instruction's Office also would help get the word out.

Regent Schwanke asked how much it cost to produce the guide.

Dr. Toppen said he didn't have a dollar amount, but when he estimated the amount of time that would be expended by faculty on various campuses to create the core curriculum, his initial estimate was 1.25 man-years. He said the effort expended on the articulation guide was probably half that.

Commissioner Hutchinson characterized the transfer environment in many states as poor and said that Montana's efforts represented a fairly significant accomplishment that many states and systems hadn't been able to achieve. He said some states had given up, and others found the project too complex to undertake because of limited funds. Hutchinson said Montana's campuses and his staff should be commended on their work.

Regent Schwanke suggested the legislature be informed about the guide.

Commissioner Hutchinson said every member of the legislature had received a copy of the document.

President Carpenter said that while it was important to have all the information compiled into one publication, he wanted to remind the Board that all the campuses had those types of guides in place for a long time.

President Dennison agreed but said those guides for the most part were campus-specific. In response to a question from Regent Schwanke, President Dennison said he felt the articulation guide would prove beneficial because it focused on the entire system. He said more people would likely use the guide if it were on METNet because it could be kept current. President Dennison said the problem with a written document was the difficulty in keeping it updated.

Dawson Community College President Don Kettner agreed the guide represented a major step forward. He said it would prove valuable particularly in view of restricting enrollments.

## 2. ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE

### a. Item 58-7006-R0388 - Building and Maintenance Fees; Montana Vocational-Technical System (REVISED 971.7.1)

Committee Chairman Regent Topel said this submission item would be placed on the May meeting's action agenda.

### b. Item 20-002-R0478 - Leave Without Pay; Montana University System (REVISED 801.3)

Regent Topel said this policy change clarified that employees on leave without pay must pay both the employer/employee cost of medical insurance if they were to be covered. He said the committee made a slight amendment to provide that payment must be made to the Business Office prior to the close of the payroll date in order for the coverage to be effective.

### c. Item 63-7005-R0589 - Department of Administration; Personnel Policies Adopted, Vocational Technical System (Parental Leave) (REVISED 730.3.1)

Regent Topel said this policy change ensured that the vo-tech system complied with state law. He said the policy may need to be changed again in the future to comply with federal law.

d. Item 78-001-R0193 - Delete Non-Resident Summer Session Fee; Board of Regents Policy 940.16

Regent Topel said the current non-resident summer session fee was \$45 per semester credit. This item would raise the non-resident summer session fee to the regular non-resident incidental fee of \$130 per credit hour at Montana State University, the University of Montana, and Montana Tech; and \$115 per credit hour at Eastern, Northern, and Western Montana colleges. The change would conform with what the legislature had built into House Bill 2 concerning projected revenues for the summer session.

e. Item 78-106-R0393 - Computer Fee Allocations; University of Montana

Regent Topel said these allocations would provide \$134,272 for new computer labs; \$26,854 for expenditures by academic units; and \$53,709 for electronic information equipment in the Mansfield Library. He said the allocations had been unanimously approved by various committees, some of which included students.

f. Item 78-501-R0393 - Authorization for Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology to Sell Real Property

Regent Topel said Montana Tech wanted to sell 14 relatively small lots for \$9,000. These properties had been acquired by way of tax deeds or were donated. They were not included within the boundaries for the unit's long-range plans, and Montana Tech does not anticipate they will ever become part of the campus. Proceeds from the sale would be used to provide deferred maintenance.

g. Item 78-9501-R0393 - Increase in Budget Authority for Construction of a Cold Storage Building; Missoula Vocational-Technical Center

Regent Topel said this item continued a project approved by the Board in June 1991. A \$50,000 cost was anticipated at that time. He said there were several reasons for the increased cost of \$96,000. Because the building could not be built where initially planned, a fire wall needed to be constructed because the facility would be connected to an existing building. A concrete floor also would be required to safely accommodate a fork lift to carry heavy loads.

h. Item 78-901-R0393 - Expenditure Authorization, Montana University System; Commissioner of Higher Education

Regent Topel said a Board policy provides that 10 percent of the computer fees generated can be used by the Commissioner's Office for systemwide benefit. He said approximately \$61,000 had been collected for that purpose but not used. This proposal would use \$20,000 to pay for MUSENet dues to allow students, faculty, and staff access to about 2,500 databases. About \$9,000 would be used to pay for

equipment already in place, and the remaining money would be used in the Commissioner's Office to add a laser printer and eight additional workstations so that the office could communicate with the campuses.

Regent Topel said the students who attended the committee meeting expressed some concerns about this expenditure. Some felt the money should be used only on the campuses; some felt the \$60,000 should be left in the bank until the legislative session ended for use at a later date; and others wanted to know exactly how the expenditure would benefit students. Regent Topel said the committee recommended approving the expenditure.

Regent Schwanke said the students also questioned whether the policy should be changed in regard to how much the Commissioner's Office could levy as its portion of the fees.

Regent Topel pointed out that a policy change wasn't before the Board at that time—only approval of the expenditure.

i. Item 78-101-R0193 - Sale of a Portion of Fort Missoula Property by UM Foundation for Scholarship purposes; University of Montana

Regent Topel said this item had been tabled at January's meeting until the March meeting. He said the University of Montana was requesting approval for the UM Foundation to sell a portion of the Fort Missoula property to Mark Fisher. At the time UM transferred the Fort Missoula property to the UM Foundation, consent was given to the transfer as long as UM and the Board of Regents retained the right to approve or disapprove any ultimate disposition. The sales price was \$450,000 in cash—somewhat in excess of the appraised value. Regent Topel said the committee had a question about some language in the agreement but recommended that the sale be approved.

In response to the committee's concern with the agreement language, UM President Dennison said he had made a phone call after the committee meeting. He was told the committee's concern was examined very carefully and that the language in question would place a restriction on the purchaser but would not expose the Foundation.

Regent Topel moved that the Board approve Items 20-002-R0478, 63-7005-R0589, 78-001-R0193, 78-160-R0393, 78-501-R0393, 78-9501-R0393, and 78-101-R0193, and discuss Item 78-901-R0393 further before voting on it. The motion passed unanimously.

Concerning Item 78-901-R0393, Regent Belcher asked to hear the students' position.

Montana Associated Students (MAS) President Jodie Farmer said that because the computer fee was a student fee, the students wanted to see it spent on the campuses for student activities. She agreed that the Commissioner's Office may be able to benefit students at times, but the students on the campuses were not aware of those benefits. She asked the Board to disapprove the expenditure at that time so the students could have more time to discuss it.

Chairman Mathers pointed out that the money in question was already in the bank and that Ms. Farmer was suggesting a policy change that would have to be brought before the Board as a separate item. Any policy change would not affect this particular expenditure because the money had already been collected and was available.

Regent Topel added that the \$20,000 for the MUSNet dues was a bill that had to be paid.

Commissioner Hutchinson said the policy had been in place for a number of years, and students presumably were involved when it was enacted. He said the Commissioner's Office had not collected any of the money for a number of years and that the money had been spent at the individual campuses. Hutchinson said the Commissioner's Office had begun seeking that money throughout the course of the past several years. His office collected only 4 percent of the money the first year and put the campuses on notice for 10 percent the next year to be used for systemwide objectives. He emphasized that the Commissioner's Office's objectives were systemwide objectives that did not exist independent of the campuses. Simply because something did not result in a tangible, immediately identifiable student benefit did not mean it would not benefit the students. He pointed out that his office needed to move into the modern communication world and be able to do things such as update the articulation guide by using the METNet system—a student benefit. Hutchinson said it may not be necessary for his office to collect the full amount in the future, but at that time they felt they needed to be connected to the computer system that the campuses had been using for quite some time.

Chairman Mathers said he also wanted to make it clear that the policy in question was established with student input.

Regent Topel said the policy simply required that the Board expend the funds in a manner that benefitted the system. He said the Commissioner's Office's ability to communicate electronically with the campuses was clearly a systemwide benefit. He said if the students wanted the funds spent only on tangible student benefits on the campuses, they were talking about a significant policy change.

Regent Kaze said in his opinion not a dollar was attempted to be spent anywhere in any budget that wasn't ultimately for a student's benefit or with the student in mind. He said it wasn't an issue about taking money away from students

but instead using money for students.

Ms. Farmer suggested that the Commissioner's Office's equipment budget be used to connect the staff to the campus computer system.

Regent Kaze said that budget was just as inadequate as it was on the campuses, and they couldn't perform student functions from the Commissioner's Office without the computer fee money. He said it was money properly spent for the students.

Ms. Farmer said it came to a priority issue—whether the money was better spent in the Commissioner's Office or on the campuses.

Regent Topel suggested that since the item had not been included in the Board mailing perhaps they could postpone action on it until the May meeting.

Commissioner Hutchinson apologized for the item not being ready and said the staff would have no problem with postponing the item until the May meeting. The students could present additional remarks at that time if they so desired.

Regent Kaze said he thought those remarks should be limited to the policy and not the expenditure. Changing the policy was the issue—not spending the money already collected.

**Regent Boylan moved that the Board postpone action on Item 78-901-R0393 until the May 1993 meeting. The motion passed—Regents Kaze and Mathers voted no.**

#### **STUDENTS' ROUNDTABLE WITH REGENTS**

Students represented at the roundtable included Mickie Abercrombie (UM), Jodie Farmer (MSU), Barbie Wiers (NMC), Tom Nau (Montana Tech), Deanna Smith (MSU), Fred Friedman (MSU), and Todd Mitchell (EMC) representing Laurie Durocher.

Ms. Farmer said the students acknowledged the state's tremendous deficit and realized they would have to be part of it. She said the students wanted to be assured they would have some say in regard to budget cuts and tuition increases. Ms. Farmer said the students had been told that tuition would not be increased without student input, and she wanted to know how the students would be notified. She said they were also concerned about issues such as enrollment caps and potential enactment of an athletic fee if the General Fund appropriation to intercollegiate athletics was cut. Since Board policy required student input, the students were interested in working with the Board on those issues.

A question-and-answer session followed concerning tuition increases, enrollment caps, reaching a workable balance between cuts and increases, new student senates taking over in May, timing problems for student input due to commencement, and students knowing what tangible benefits they would be losing before being asked to pay more for them.

Regent Topel asked what schedule the Board would follow in making the types of decisions to which the students were referring.

Commissioner Hutchinson said those decisions would have to be made at the May meeting because it would be virtually impossible for the Board to make any intelligent tuition decisions until they knew the final General Fund cut. He said if the regular May meeting was moved forward to precede commencement and the end of the semester, the students would have time to participate in any Board tuition decisions.

Chairman Mathers agreed that nothing could be done until the legislative session ended.

Regent Belcher said they needed to remember that the students would basically end up paying the \$22.7 million, regardless of whether it was monetary, in access, or in services.

Further discussion focused on the relationship between the Board of Regents and the Montana Legislature.

Ms. Wiers pointed out that the Board of Regents was the overseer that controlled and managed the University System, and that the Board members needed to stand up for themselves and say they were going to do that job. Otherwise, the legislature would try to remove them constitutionally and let the people decide who should run the System. She pointed out that the students had to stand up for themselves by having a rally that garnered good support.

Chairman Mathers said he felt the Board had stood up for itself. He said they were continually criticized for not working with the legislature when in fact they did everything they could to cooperate. He said the only thing they didn't do was increase tuition when they were asked to do so because the Board wouldn't do that without student support.

Ms. Smith said she felt the legislature's problems were with the Commissioner's Office—not the Board.

Chairman Mathers said the Board of Regents and the Commissioner's Office were the same thing.

Regent Topel said the legislature had infringed on the Board's constitutional authority. He said if he were on the Board after the session was over and if the same bills now underway were still in place, he would come to the Board with a motion to have the Supreme Court decide once and for all who had the legal right to run the University System. He said they needed to find out whether the legislature had the right to say what the Board could and could not do—those gray areas needed to be defined and resolved.

Ms. Farmer asked what they could do to improve their relationship with the legislature.

Regent Topel said that some people defined "cooperation" as "submissiveness" on the part of the Regents. He said the only way some legislators would consider the Board as cooperative would be if the Board did whatever the legislature wanted with respect to running the University System. Regent Topel said every time the Board did something the legislature didn't approve of, or if the Board made a decision that made the legislature unhappy, the Board was considered uncooperative.

Commissioner Hutchinson said his office and the Board had done everything they could to keep the lines of communication open and to make sure they were honest and forthright with the legislature. He said they worked very hard to put together the joint regents/legislative committee and were continuing to work hard to make sure the committee continued. He said his staff was asked to provide any information requested by the legislature and to answer any questions openly and honestly. Hutchinson said although there had never been any dishonesty or any attempt to hide anything from anyone, those were unshakable myths that went back 20 or 30 years and were extremely difficult to override. He told the students that he and the Board were open to any ideas.

Mr. Friedman asked whether that openness extended to negotiations with the Governor, Budget Director Dave Lewis, and the LFA.

Chairman Mathers said that he and Commissioner Hutchinson had met with Governor Racicot several times and also with House Speaker John Mercer and the Budget Office. He also pointed out that the legislature changed every two years and they were continually dealing with new people.

Commissioner Hutchinson said that much of the collective frustration and anger on everyone's parts during this session was a result of the times, and that much of it wouldn't be happening if there were an upswing in the economy. Concerning negotiations to reduce the \$22.7 million cut, Commissioner Hutchinson said that he and Chairman Mathers visited with the governor and were told that the governor didn't feel there was any real opportunity for maneuvering. Hutchinson said they received precisely the same response from the legislature. Senator Judy Jacobson told them they had better plan on the \$22.7 million amount and not some

lesser figure.

Several students suggested that the Board endorse revenue measures such as a sales tax to raise more money for education.

Regent Belcher said that pushing for a particular type of tax reform still would not guarantee any more money for higher education.

Regent Topel said he didn't think the Board should put itself in the position of endorsing any type of revenue measure. He said the Board's job was to say what was needed in order to maintain the status quo in the System, what it would cost to make changes, and then manage the System as efficiently as possible once they received the final amount. Topel said that formulating policy to generate revenue was the legislature's job. He said the Board becoming embroiled in those controversies would only degenerate into partisan politics.

Commissioner Hutchinson said it was also important to keep in mind that the fundamental reason for the Board of Regents constitutionally was to shield higher education from the political battle, which would be defeated if the Board were to insert itself into partisan politics. He said it was wise for the Board to remain distant on taking those types of positions and to focus instead on managing the System with the resources available.

Regent Kaze agreed that the Board shouldn't be attempting to make those decisions for the legislature. He also said that at the same time the legislature shouldn't be establishing tuition policy for the Board.

Before the Board recessed for lunch, the students said they wanted to make sure they would have adequate opportunity to participate in any tuition decisions and asked how they could do that.

Commissioner Hutchinson said as soon as possible after the legislative session ended, his staff would prepare some options and make them available both to the Board and to the student leadership.

Ms. Farmer asked that the students receive that material when the Regents received theirs.

Ms. Farmer thanked the Board for meeting with the students, and Chairman Mathers thanked the students for their comments.

The Board recessed at 12:15 p.m. for lunch.

When the Board reconvened at 1:30 p.m., Chairman Mathers said they would hear an update of the administrative study from Denis Curry of MGT of America.

## OLD BUSINESS

### 1. ADMINISTRATIVE STUDY BY MGT OF AMERICA

Denis Curry from MGT of America, Inc. distributed a final copy of *A Study of the Administrative Structure and Expenses of the Montana University System* dated March 22, 1993. Mr. Curry said the final report was essentially the same document in substance as that received by the Board several weeks earlier. He said he and his staff had checked the equations, percentages, etc., for accuracy and made some minor editorial changes, but no substantive changes had been made.

Referring to the legislative session environment and budget problems facing the state and the University System, along with recommendations from both the outgoing and incoming governors concerning system funding and structural composition, Mr. Curry said MGT decided early on to adhere to the context and boundaries of the study and not become involved in areas outside the realm of administrative costs and structures. He said that line was at times difficult to walk and that aspects of the study had been criticized both within and outside the System. Mr. Curry said he wanted to go on record, however, as stating that MGT had no vested interest in either party to budget controversies, and the company had done its best to call the situation as it saw it.

Mr. Curry thanked all the people who helped with the study—the campuses, the steering committee, and particularly Kathy Hicks of the Commissioner's Office, who coordinated the study activities and handled many of the arrangements. He then briefly discussed the document's executive summary and asked whether there were any questions.

Regent Topel referred to a letter sent to the legislature by Budget Director Dave Lewis that dismissed the report and claimed it could not be objective because it was paid for by the University System.

Mr. Curry pointed out that MGT of America was completing its 852nd project throughout the past 17 years and that his company had not reached that level by "prostituting" itself. He said he went over the draft report earlier that day to compare it with the final report. He acknowledged some tonal differences but said the message was essentially the same. He referred to a chart that unfortunately did not depict what MGT wanted to indicate in terms of functional consolidation. Mr. Curry said a casual reader of the draft report might conclude that MGT was recommending subsuming some institutions within others in a hierarchical order, although that wasn't what the narrative said. He compared the process to reviewing

a draft set of budget recommendations—as more information was received, the draft changed.

Mr. Curry told the Board he was meeting the following day with the Budget Office staff and some legislative leaders to go over both the draft and final reports. He said he didn't see the degree of difference that would give rise to Mr. Lewis' comments about the report. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to comment and said he would stand firmly behind the final report as being a reasonable continuation of the draft report.

Chairman Mathers thanked Mr. Curry for his comments.

## 2. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

### a. House Bill 2

Associate Commissioner for Fiscal Affairs Rod Sundsted distributed two spreadsheets that had been discussed at the Board's February meeting. He said the spreadsheets now incorporated Appropriations Committee and House floor actions and showed the current status of the University System budget. Mr. Sundsted spoke briefly on the changes that had been made as a result of those actions.

Mr. Sundsted said the Appropriations Committee allocated the \$22.7 million in cuts in the same manner as that recommended by the Regents. At the same time, the committee added authority to spend additional tuition if the Regents chose to raise tuition. In making its estimates, the legislature used (1) graduate student tuition costs at 150 percent of undergraduate tuition costs; (2) non-resident summer tuition at a rate commensurate with the remainder of the academic year; (3) non-resident incidental fees at 100 percent of Fiscal 1994 per-student educational cost—about \$5,300 per student; (4) resident and WUE incidental fees at 102 percent of Fiscal 1993 fees; and (5) the 1993 mix of resident and non-resident enrollments. Mr. Sundsted said the combination of those five items was about \$12.1 million that was then added in for the authority to expend tuition.

Mr. Sundsted said the committee also established tuition caps, whereby if the tuition actually received exceeded the amount in HB 2, the System would be required to revert a like amount in General Fund. Since the caps in the bill were categorized by resident and non-resident, he said there essentially were two caps. Mr. Sundsted said he was concerned with that amendment because it was difficult to get a good handle on exactly what the mix would be. For example, a shift of 100 students would produce a loss of about \$500,000 a year, even though the total number of students wouldn't change.

Mr. Sundsted said the committee also took an additional 5 percent cut from the Commissioner's Office in personal services.

Commissioner Hutchinson said they would continue to work on language adjustments in the Senate to provide as much flexibility as possible to the Board in dealing with its tuition decisions.

Commissioner Hutchinson briefly discussed other amendments that were proposed during the House's debate of HB 2.

- Student services for the Butte Technical Center would be handled by Montana Tech, and money available from that move would be dedicated to the instructional program at the Butte Technical Center—the amendment failed.
- The Dental Hygiene Program would be started at the Great Falls Technical Center with \$75,000 from each of the two universities during the second year of the biennium—the amendment failed.
- Merger language from a previous amendment would be removed (the previous amendment would have merged four of the five technical centers with nearby senior units)—the amendment to remove the merger language passed.
- The Board of Regents would be required to examine Northern Montana College's curriculum offerings in Great Falls and eliminate by the year 2001 any duplication that might exist with the College of Great Falls and the Great Falls Technical Center—the amendment passed.
- Tuition language that would require charging 150 percent of the resident fee for graduate students would be removed—the amendment failed.
- Tuition authority would be increased to cover the portion of the pay plan covered by tuition—the amendment failed.
- The Board of Regents would be required to keep the agricultural experiment stations open regardless of the final budget cut—the amendment failed.
- One-quarter of the Fire Services Training School's budget would be carried by fees to be charged back to the various fire stations, etc.—the amendment failed.
- The Board of Regents would be required to retain RERS during the 1995 biennium and, if the Board wished to propose a new system, it would have to bring that proposal either to the Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education Policy and Budget for review (if SB 77 passed)

or to the Legislative Finance Committee (if SB 77 failed)—the amendment passed.

b. House Bill 5

Commissioner Hutchinson referred to three actions taken by the Appropriations Committee. (1) Representative Wanzenried moved to have the UM Business Administration building reinstated, which the Long Range Building Committee had voted to delay—the motion failed. (2) Representative Grady moved to delay construction of the MSU Engineering and Physical Sciences building—the motion passed. (3) A prioritized list of projects for deferred maintenance money developed by the Architecture and Engineering Division included only the MSU boiler, the MSU steam and condensate lines, Montana Tech's replacement of an old electrical system, and some of the System's roof needs. Both the UM and MSU buildings were delayed for two years.

Regent Topel asked whether delaying the MSU building would cause accreditation problems.

MSU Provost Emmert said the last accreditation visit that offered a full accreditation was predicated on the assumption that the new building would be constructed. He said the Ryan labs were a set of derelict buildings in terrible condition, and the program required those facilities to be improved. Provost Emmert said whether delaying the building would absolutely cause a loss for accreditation was unclear at that time, although it would no doubt put accreditation in question. He said it could trigger an early re-visit of the program, require a show-cause warning of why the program shouldn't lose accreditation, or possibly cost the program accreditation. He wondered how many times they could continue to say that the new building would be built without losing accreditation.

Commissioner Hutchinson said the delay of UM's Business Administration building also placed that institution in difficulty as well. Among other things, the building would go a long way toward taking care of handicap access problems.

President Dennison pointed out that the buildings weren't being taken off the list—just delayed. He said it was difficult to understand why they were being delayed, however, considering the current bond market. He said those types of things should be examined carefully.

c. House Bill 23

Chief Legal Counsel LeRoy Schramm said that House Bill 23 was on its second reading in the Senate. He said it was a long, technical bill presented by Representative Ray Peck that made a number of changes in the budget amendment process. Legal Counsel Schramm said their objection to the bill concerned the 5

percent or less that includes a provision requiring the University System to submit all funds it receives greater than \$5,000—from nongovernmental sources restricted for specific purposes—to the Legislative Finance Committee for review before the funds could be expended. The rationale behind this was to make sure that none of the funds would cause a future General Fund obligation. Schramm said the System had been told to seek nongovernmental funds to make up for tightening revenue, and now they were being faced with additional bureaucracy before they could use the money. He said they would receive word later in the day on an amendment to exclude the System from that section of the bill.

d. House Bill 527

Chief Counsel Schramm said this bill, sponsored by Representative Dave Brown, concerned the Regents' autonomy and would restore the pre-1972 constitutional language that basically left final governance authority of the System in the hands of the legislature. He said the bill as first introduced had the six unit presidents sitting as the Board of Regents. The amended bill changed only the governance authority and passed the House with 74 votes. Since it was a constitutional amendment that would have to be placed on the ballot, the measure would need 26 votes in the Senate. Schramm said a number of people testified against the bill during a hearing before the Senate Education Committee the previous Friday. The bill left that committee with an adverse committee report—a unanimous "do not pass" recommendation that was adopted on the floor that day by a vote of 39 to 7. He said that ordinarily would be the end of the bill, but because it was a constitutional amendment and because it had received floor action, it would now proceed to second reading for one more vote. Schramm said it was unlikely that HB 527 would receive the 26 Senate votes needed to place it on the ballot.

e. House Bill 11

Dr. David Toppen said this bill was the funding bill for METNet, the Montana Educational Telecommunications Network. A joint enterprise among the University System, the Office of Public Instruction and the Department of Administration, METNet had been funded at a General Fund level of \$300,000, and through the last two biennia the parties involved had been required to find \$150,000 a year in matching monies to make the project proceed. He said HB 11 eliminated the matching requirements, increased the General Fund contribution to the program, increased the amount of money that OPI could tax the state equalization account—the source of funds for OPI activities—and increased the amount of money the University System could attach each campus from \$1 per FTE to \$5. The Appropriations Committee's amendments reduced funding for the program to virtually zero. No General Fund or school equalization account money was in METNet as the bill passed from the Appropriations Committee to the House—the effect of which was to give authority to spend money on METNet but not put the money there to spend. Dr. Toppen said they would continue to seek funding for the program and were

exploring some federal funding options.

f. House Bill 682

Dr. Toppen said that HB 682 was a consequence of activities taken by the Appropriations Committee that zeroed the Montana Science and Technology Alliance's budget. He said the purpose of the six-year old MSTA, housed in the Department of Commerce, was to provide seed capital funding for small businesses wanting to locate to Montana. He said the return on MSTA's investment had not come back to the state fast enough to satisfy the legislature and, as a result, the MSTA office was zero-budgeted by the Appropriations Committee. House Bill 682 then eliminated all record of the agency from statute. Dr. Toppen said that was ironic in light of House Bill 394, which increased the amount of money that MSTA had to invest. He said they would be testifying on behalf of HB 682 the next day as the bill was heard before the Senate Business Committee. He said in the event MSTA was eliminated, HB 682's provisions would remove the debt and management of existing contracts from MSTA and place them with the State Board of Investments.

## NEW BUSINESS

a. Tuition Discussion

Commissioner Hutchinson said this item was placed on the agenda at the Board's request to give members a chance to present any views or comments or to have any questions answered. He said some of that had already been taken care of earlier in the meeting.

Chairman Mathers asked whether anyone had anything to add that had not been discussed during the students' roundtable.

Regent Topel said when the Board approved tuition indexing last fall, he understood that in order for it to work they had to take General Fund dollars appropriated by the legislature and basically reallocate those dollars. He asked whether the General Fund allocations by the legislature complied with that model—was the model alive or dead?

Mr. Sundsted said the dollar amounts of General Fund per unit were currently established in HB 2. He said because there was no provision to move any of that money, they were assuming they were locked into that, which took away the opportunity to reallocate any of the money. As a result, under the model they were looking at, it would take significant revisions in order for the model to fit the legislature's General Fund allocation.

Regent Topel asked whether they would have a different model at the next meeting to determine whether tuition indexing was still a viable consideration.

Mr. Sundsted said he could work on that, but when they started getting into the two caps—one for residents and one for non-residents—they would be faced with external factors that may prove difficult in fitting to a model. He said he certainly would be willing to work on that prior to the May meeting.

Provost Emmert pointed out that the model was essentially a three-variable model with tuition revenue, General Fund revenue, and the number of students—and HB 2 froze two of those variables. The only variable left was the number of students in the system and the dollars charged any one of those students. He said they were talking about adjusting the number of students in the system to generate a fixed amount of resources.

President Dennison said if they agreed as a legislative strategy to get some flexibility in regard to tuition, it seemed that the concept was very much alive and he hoped the Board wouldn't leave it without seriously considering some other variation on it.

Commissioner Hutchinson said until they knew the final General Fund appropriation it would be difficult to assign tuition dollars. If they succeeded in having some of that restrictive language removed from HB 2, tuition indexing would be somewhat rescussitated. He said he would urge the Board to hold off until after the session before forming any commitments on tuition.

Chairman Mathers asked whether that was agreeable to the Board and the Presidents. The consensus was to wait until the session ended.

Commissioner Hutchinson said his staff would try to come up with some type of reasonable model as the end of the session approached and they had a better sense of where they were headed.

b. Appeals

- Residency Appeal of Shaelynn R. Charvet
- Residency Appeal of Jeffrey J. Walla

**Regent Belcher moved that the Board not hear either appeal and support the position of the Commissioner's Office. The motion passed unanimously.**

c. Update of Minority Achievement Plans (UM, MSU, EMC, WMC, NMC, Tech)

Commissioner Hutchinson said this item was postponed from the January meeting. Plan updates from each campus that had been compiled by American

Indian/Minority Achievement Director Ellen Swaney were distributed to the Board members. UM President George Dennison, EMC President Bruce Carpenter, NMC President Bill Daehling, WMC Provost Mike Easton, Montana Tech Vice-President Tom Waring, and MSU Provost Mark Emmert spoke briefly about their respective campus plans.

d. Item 78-001-R0393 - Tuition; Montana University System

Commissioner Hutchinson said this policy item on tuition for the University System was the "tuition voucher program" that was part of the Commitment to Quality program, and they were bringing it to the Board for action. According to the policy, students who had completed 170 or more semester credit hours at one of the six units or one of the community colleges and had not yet obtained a baccalaureate degree would be charged non-resident tuition for subsequent courses attempted. Courses attempted before Fall 1993 taken in high school advanced placement programs, or transferred from out-of-state or private institutions, and those transferred from technical centers would not contribute to the 170-credit limit.

Regent Topel said he didn't see why they needed to wait five years to have the procedure effective.

Commissioner Hutchinson said he understood Regent Topel's argument, but they didn't want to get into a situation of penalizing students for actions taken prior to this policy. He said it did put off for four or five years the actual "teeth" of the policy. He said the Board could advance that date if it wanted to.

Regent Kaze suggested partially implementing the program over the next five years with full implementation at the end of the five years.

Commissioner Hutchinson said they would still be trapping students now in the system who weren't privy to the policy as they started their academic careers.

Regent Belcher said he thought they needed to give at least a year of adjustment for students who had not counted on that tuition increase. He said he didn't think that four or five years was necessary, however.

Commissioner Hutchinson said they would consider that and also get input from the campuses as to what the number ought to be.

UM President Dennison expressed a concern about the UM's Pharmacy program in particular. Because those students would be in violation of the policy in question, President Dennison said the policy needed further examination.

Commissioner Hutchinson said the 170 hours was predicated on the 128-hour programs. He suggested that the item be postponed until the May meeting, at which

time they would develop a list of exceptions for programs such as pharmacy, physical therapy, engineering, architecture, accountancy, etc.. They would also examine the other compromises that had been suggested.

Referring to the policy's first paragraph, EMC President Carpenter asked why courses transferred from the technical centers were excluded while those from the community colleges weren't. He said the technical centers were also part of the System and that the language seemed to be inconsistent.

Commissioner Hutchinson said they would clarify that language so that any inconsistencies between the community colleges and the technical centers were cleared up.

Chairman Mathers said the staff would work on the various suggestions, and Item 78-001-R0393 would be placed on the May meeting's action agenda.

e. Board Policy on Athletic Fees

Commissioner Hutchinson said this was placed on the agenda at the request of President Carpenter. In light of some of the options being considered in regard to athletics and discussions about a potential athletic fee to supplement the loss of General Fund money, President Carpenter thought the Board should discuss the issue.

President Carpenter referred to Board Policy 940.8, Student Activity Fees, and said they needed to discuss whether they wanted to reconsider the policy of prohibiting student fees from going into athletics.

President Dennison said the only change he would make to the policy would be to eliminate the phrase "including athletic fees" in the first paragraph. He said the rest of the policy related to a student activity fee, which he said should not be used for athletics. He said if discussions on the campuses resulted in coming forward to the Board with a proposal for an athletic fee, there wouldn't be anything in an existing policy to prevent them from having the Board consider that proposal. He suggested eliminating the reference to athletic fees in the first paragraph of Board Policy 940.8 and then coming forward with a separate policy on athletic fees if there was agreement to do so.

Regent Johnson said he didn't think any student athletic fees—whether to support intramural or intercollegiate athletics or both—should be part of any Board of Regents policy. He said that should be left up to the campuses.

President Dennison said the process he envisioned involved extensive conversations with students, including a referendum on any such fee before it ever came to the Board. He said the reference in the first paragraph of Board Policy 940.8

seemed to pretty much exclude that type of process from consideration, which is why he suggested having the reference taken out of the policy.

Commissioner Hutchinson said they could make that adjustment and bring the policy forward at the May meeting as amended to permit the campuses to explore the possibility of an athletic fee and move ahead with that if they so desired. However, the students could still discuss an athletic fee prior to the policy is question being adjusted.

f. Report of Big Sky Conference Presidents' Meeting

President Dennison said the purpose of this meeting was to discuss actions taken by the NCAA at its convention in January. He referred to a new rule adopted by the NCAA a year ago that required all institutions participating in the Division I level to have 14 varsity sports—7 for men and 7 for women. He said the Big Sky presidents proposed an amendment that in light of the need to pursue gender equity, the 14 sports would be divided into 6 men's and 8 women's sports. President Dennison said that gender equity and cost containment in intercollegiate athletics were the two major items they had been looking at throughout the past year. Issues discussed included (1) finding competition without expending a lot of money, (2) penalties imposed on an institution for not being financially able to implement two new sports immediately, (3) providing a minimum number of scholarships or grants in aid for each sport retained by an institution, (4) how to implement new sports and put up the money necessary to support students in those sports within the same time frame, (5) reducing the number of coaches and grants in aid, and (6) an amendment that would allow up to two institutions to withdraw from participation in football in the Big Sky if they chose to do so.

## COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Commissioner Hutchinson suggested holding the Board's next meeting on May 3, which would give the staff a week after the session ended to prepare proposals on tuition and have those distributed in a timely fashion. He suggested holding the meeting in Helena again instead of Havre, which would make it easier for most of the students to attend.

After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to hold the meeting May 3 in Helena.

Updated Board policies and procedures were then distributed to the Board members, the college and university presidents, and the technical center directors.

## CAMPUS REPORTS

### a. University of Montana

President Dennison updated the Board on site visits for accreditation of the School of Journalism and the Department of Social Work. He said both were successful, and the programs had received notice of re-accreditation.

President Dennison announced that "Showcase Week," which includes the Mansfield Conference, would be held during the last week of April—culminating on May 1, the University's birthday. He said UM would be sending out information on the festivities.

### b. Eastern Montana College

President Carpenter said everyone should have received invitations to the Student Affairs Conference that would be held at Eastern the following week. One of the major topics—dealing with minority affairs—would involve all the senior institutions, community colleges, technical centers, private institutions, and tribal colleges.

### c. Northern Montana College

President Daehling said the women's basketball team at NMC was the national champ in NAIA Division II, and six of those women were named to the all-conference scholastic team with overall GPAs exceeding 3.0. Chairman Mathers asked President Daehling to extend the Board's congratulations to the women's basketball team.

### d. Missoula and Billings Technical Centers

Missoula Director Dennis Lerum and Billings Director George Bell referred to specific sections of the MGT report with which they disagreed. Director Weaver said he didn't feel that MGT adequately understood the roles of the technical centers.

Commissioner Hutchinson suggested the directors forward those comments and criticisms of the report to his office. He said the report would be an important tool his staff would use for the structural changes study due to the Board by October 1, and that it would be helpful to have the directors' comments.

## STUDENT REPORTS

Jodie Farmer again referred to the computer fee policy and said they would like to have that looked into and dealt with at the next meeting. She said they would

follow up on that in an appropriate manner. She also agreed that enactment of any athletic fee needed to be decided by the campuses. Ms. Farmer thanked the Board for the roundtable discussion and said she would like to have those continued on a regular basis to improve communication. She announced that Barbie Wiers and Tom Nau were attending their last meeting and asked them if they had any comments.

Ms. Wiers said although she supported athletics she hoped they wouldn't designate an athletic fee while simultaneously cutting back on academic programs. She said Northern Montana College continued to oppose enrollment caps and was still concerned about accreditation standards. They wanted to maintain those already in place in order to continue current programs. She thanked the Board members for an enjoyable year.

On behalf of the students, Tom Nau presented Jodie Farmer with a plaque of appreciation. He said he had learned a lot during the past year and thanked the Board members for their time and for listening to the students.

With no other business to come before the Board, Chairman Mathers adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

