

MINUTES
OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS
WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

May 1, 1996

AGENDA ITEM 1 - Call to Order

Required statutory notice having been given, the second quarterly meeting of the Board of Regents of Western Kentucky University was held in the Regents Conference Room of the Wetherby Administration Building on the Western campus. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Earl Fischer, at approximately 8:30 a.m., CDT.

AGENDA ITEM 2 - Invocation

The meeting opened with an invocation by Mr. Jason Vincent, Spirit Master, and Senior from Brownsville, Kentucky.

AGENDA ITEM 3 - Roll call

The following members were present:

Ms. Kristen Bale
Mr. Earl Fischer
Ms. N. Joy Gramling
Mr. C.C. Howard Gray
Ms. Tara D. Higdon
Ms. Peggy Loafman
Mr. Cornelius A. Martin
Dr. Raymond Mendel
Mr. Burns Mercer
Mr. Fred N. Mudge
Mr. Raymond B. Preston

Also present were Dr. Thomas C. Meredith, President; Mrs. Liz Esters, Staff Assistant for Special Projects and Secretary to the Board of Regents; Dr. Robert Haynes, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. James R. Ramsey, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Dr. Jerry Wilder, Vice President for Student Affairs; Dr. Randall Capps, Parliamentarian; Mr. Fred Hensley, Interim Vice President for Institutional Advancement and Director of University Relations, and Ms. Deborah Wilkins, University Counsel.

In keeping with the policy of the Board, the agenda for the meeting and information and materials pertinent to items thereon had been mailed in advance of the meeting by the President to members of the Board.

**AGENDA ITEM 4 - Disposition of minutes of the regular meeting of
January 26, 1996**

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 26, 1996, were presented by Chairman Fischer. Motion was made by Mr. Mudge and seconded by Ms. Bale to approve the minutes as submitted inasmuch as copies had been mailed to the Board members prior to the meeting. The motion carried.

RECOGNITION - President Meredith recognized the following student organizations and students.

- **William E. Bivin Forensic Society** which just won the second national title in one month at the National Forensic Association National Tournament at Western Illinois University. Western's debate program was named the best in the nation by taking the debate sweepstakes. Western's team finished ahead of second-place Colorado State by more than 50 points. The coach and dynamic leader of the group is Ms. Judy Woodring.

Robert Mattingly, a Crestwood senior, took his second NFA debate championship as a freshman and earlier this year won the 1996 Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha Lincoln-Douglas Debate Championship. Robert is the only two-time repeat champion at this tournament in its 26 years.

Two students, Nashville senior Adam Black and Crestwood senior Chris Fleming, won national championships in duo interp-retation. Sophomore Chris Chandler and senior Lee Watts, both of Bowling Green, finished second.

An ad that is running statewide about the excellent Forensics Society, entitled "*Don't Argue With Western!*" was distributed to members of the Board.

- **College Photography Awards** - Eleven Western Kentucky University students won national awards in photojournalism, including first and second in "*College Photographer of the Year*" competition. Mr. Mike Morse is the director of this program.

Patrick Witty of Glasgow, Kentucky, was named the "*1996 College Photographer of the Year*" in the competition sponsored by the National Press Photographers Association and the University of Missouri. Witty also won second place in sports portfolio.

Chris Stanford, of Warner Robbins, Ga., finished second in the CPOY competition. He also won second place in picture story.

- **Hearst Photojournalism Competition** - For the seventh consecutive year, Western Kentucky University has won the Hearst Photojournalism Competition. Four Western students are among the 12 semi-finalists in the National Photojournalism

Championships, giving Western the points title and a \$10,000 award. Those four students are David O'Connor of Lexington;

Michael Fortier of Davidson, Michigan, Scott Panella of Hudson, Ohio, and Chris Stanford of Warner Robins, Georgia.

- **Brian Bixler, Academic All-American**, was recognized for accomplishments in the classroom and in the football program, having been named "Male Athlete of the Year." Brian will graduate with a 4.0 GPA and enter the University of Cincinnati Medical School.

Chairman Fischer noted that, "In the interest of being as open as possible, we have adopted a procedure where we are holding our separate committees as a committee of the whole of the Board. We would like to continue that this morning, so that everybody can witness as much as they can about the workings of the Board and its separate committees." Dr. Mendel requested that the minutes reflect Mr. Fischer's statement.

AGENDA ITEM 5 - Committee reports

5.1 - Academics Committee, Mr. Fred Mudge, Chair

Mr. Mudge presided over the Academics Committee with the following agenda:

5.1.1 -

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that, for Prominent Programs (Educational Leadership, Psychology, Teacher Education, Accounting, Chemistry, Folk Studies) students who meet the new assistantship requirements be granted out-of-state tuition waiver whether or not an assistantship stipend is tendered. It is further proposed that, for the first year (1996-97 FY), the number of these out-of-state waivers be limited to a maximum of ten students.

BACKGROUND

Our practice has been to waive the out-of-state portion of tuition only for graduate assistants. Those graduate assistants receive a stipend and pay in-state tuition.

Since we have only a limited number of assistantship stipends available to graduate programs, the Board of Regents action to waive out-of-state tuition for graduate assistants in prominent programs has had little impact on enrollment.

A common practice among graduate schools is to break the linkage between the waiver of out-of-state tuition and the awarding of an assistantship stipend. When the pool of qualified non-resident applicants exceeds available stipends, the university waives the out-of-state tuition permitting the student to come without a stipend. This principle is the basis of the SREB Academic Common Market in which universities waive out-of-state fees for qualified students from other states. Few students are financially able to pay the out-of-state graduate tuition.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Out-of-state fee waiver for 10 students, 2 semester = \$36,800

(In-state fees paid by 10 students, 2 semesters will be \$20,610)

After an explanation of the recommendation by Dr. Robert Haynes, Vice President for Academic Affairs, motion for approval was made by Ms. Bale, seconded by Mr. Preston and carried.

5.1.2 - RECOMMENDATION

President Thomas C. Meredith recommends the appointment of the first two recipients of the University Distinguished Professorship program. The University Distinguished Professorship program is designed to recognize faculty members who have served the university over a long period of time and have compiled an outstanding record of achievement in teaching, research, and service.

A University Distinguished Professorship Committee, chaired by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and consisting of the deans of the four undergraduate colleges and four faculty representatives elected by the faculty of each college, was appointed to recommend the first recipients. This Committee selects no more than two University Distinguished Professors a year, with a maximum of ten serving at a given time.

The University Distinguished Professors are expected to demonstrate sustained excellence and provide leadership for innovative and/or inter-disciplinary efforts in teaching, research/creative activity and service. They will conduct faculty seminars and participate in colloquia as appropriate. They will also be expected to serve on the Advisory Council of the Center for Teaching and Learning.

These faculty will receive recognition as a distinguished faculty member with an annual stipend of \$2,000 and an annual travel allowance of \$1,000.

I am pleased to recommend the following two faculty members as Western's first University Distinguished Professors:

Dr. Carlton Jackson
Department of History

Dr. Daniel L. Roenker
Department of Psychology

DR. CARLTON JACKSON, Professor of History

Dr. Jackson has been a faculty member at Western since 1961. He received post-secondary education at Birmingham-Southern College and the doctorate from University of Georgia. During his long service to Western, he has compiled an outstanding record of accomplishment. He has published fifteen books (with more on the way) and numerous articles on subjects ranging from Zane Gray to Hattie McDaniel, to the history of the Scotch-Irish. He has received numerous awards including Fulbright Professorships in Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and Finland; invited lectureships in South America, Iran, Germany, China, Belize and Austria; and Potter College and university-wide awards for research and public service. His reputation extends well beyond the campus and he is a deserving recipient of one of Western's first Distinguished University

Professorships.

DR. DANIEL L. ROENKER, Professor of Psychology

Dr. Roenker received his undergraduate degree from Thomas More College and his masters and doctoral degrees from Kansas State University. After a brief stay at Millikin University, he came to Western in 1976 and has remained here since while compiling an excellent record in teaching, research and service. Dr. Roenker frequently notes that his first love is teaching. Student evaluations rank him among the very best at the university even though he teaches the difficult subject of statistics. His research work has focused on mental imagery and cognitive and perceptual abilities. He has published numerous articles in these fields and is now engaged in a major federally-funded project on perception/cognition in older drivers. Dr. Roenker has already received College of Education and Behavioral Science awards for excellence in teaching and research. He is a worthy recipient of the designation as Distinguished University Professor at Western.

President Meredith noted that the deans and Dr. Haynes, in 1994, forwarded to him a recommendation to establish a University Distinguished Professor program. "It certainly fit in with the kinds of things that we had been talking about--the direction we wanted to head with "Moving to a New Level..." I was very pleased with their recommendation and quickly endorsed it and brought it to the Board for approval," President Meredith stated.

Dr. Haynes indicated that the award is designed to recognize a really outstanding faculty member who has spent years of service at Western; and mainly, it is in the interest of recognition. To assist in that, they will be appointed for a period of five years, and they will receive a stipend of \$2,000 on their base salary during the period they hold the Distinguished Professorship They also receive \$1,000 travel funds to assist them with being even better than they are now. Dr. Haynes stated, "The monetary feature is not the thing that is significant; it is the fact that these people have made incredible accomplishments and achievements for the institution. This is a way in which we can recognize some of those accomplishments and achievements."

Following introduction of the two recipients, motion for approval of the recommended appointment of the first two recipients of the Distinguished University Professor Award was made by Dr. Mendel, seconded by Mrs. Bale and carried.

5.2 - Finance Committee, Mr. Burn Mercer, Chair

Mr. Mercer opened the Finance Committee as a Committee of the whole Board, indicating that Item 9 on the agenda (athletic fee increase) would be moved up to 5.2.7 and considered as a part of the Combined Budget.

5.2.1 - Review of Third Quarter Financial Statement for 1995-96

Dr. Cecile Garmon, Assistant Vice President for Finance and Administration, reviewed the Third Quarter Financial Statement for 1995-96, indicating that staff has reviewed the report and found nothing different or alarming. [A copy of the report is attached as Exhibit A.]

5.2.2 - Recommendation for approval of the revised budget for the Third Quarter Fiscal Report for 1995-96

President Thomas C. Meredith recommends that the Western Kentucky University Board of Regents approve the Revised Budget for the Third Quarter of 1995-96. [Attached as Exhibit B.]

Again, Dr. Cecile Garmon presented the same comments as for the previous agenda item; nothing different or alarming was found in the revised budget.

Motion for approval was made by Ms. Loafman, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried.

5.2.3 - Recommendation for approval of an increase in the budgeted amount of externally-funded grants for public service in 1995-96

RECOMMENDATION

President Thomas C. Meredith recommends that the Board of Regents approve an increase of \$750,000 in the budgeted amount of externally funded grants for public service in 1995-96. This increase would bring the total in this account to \$6,750,000.

BACKGROUND

Each year an amount of external funding in various areas is projected in the annual operating budget. This projection is based on historical, environmental, and political considerations and reflects only money which comes to grant activity from external sources. It does not include any institutionally-funded sources. During some fiscal years, external funding surpasses expectations and it is necessary to increase the amount of resources allocated to corresponding budgets. At this time it is apparent that external funding in the area of public service will exceed projections. The President recommends to the Board of Regents that an increase of \$750,000 be approved for that budget.

Motion for approval of the recommendation to an increase of \$750,000 in the budgeted amount of externally funded grants for public service in 1995-96

was made by Mr. Preston, seconded by Mr. Mudge, and carried.

5.2.4 Recommendation for acceptance of the Accountants' Report on Agreed Upon Procedures dated June 30, 1995, as submitted to the University by Baird, Kurtz & Dobson.

[The report was enclosed as a separate document and is included in the Board's official files.]

BACKGROUND

On an annual basis, Western Kentucky University contracts with Baird, Kurtz & Dobson to provide to the University a report entitled "Accountants' Report on Agreed Upon Procedures." This report is provided to University management to assist the University in complying with NCAA Bylaw 6.2.3.1. Baird, Kurtz & Dobson reviews selected accounting records and internal control structures of the University.

Again, for the year ended June 30, 1995, Baird, Kurtz & Dobson has made one recommendation with regard to the internal control and operating procedures of the athletics program. As indicated on page six of the "Accountants' Report on Agreed Upon Procedures," one individual in the ticket sales department has access to cash and also initiates recording of cash transactions. Baird, Kurtz & Dobson recommends that the cash be counted and transmitted by a person having no other ticket sales duties. This internal control weakness has been discussed by the Board of Regents in prior years when the same observation and recommendation have been made by Baird, Kurtz & Dobson.

Dr. James Ramsey, Vice President for Finance and Administration, pointed out that the University is required by the National Collegiate Athletic Association to have an external auditor review the revenues and expenditures of the athletic program. It is not a full-blown audit; the full-blown audit is included in the Annual Financial Audit, but is a review of revenues and expenditures in Athletics. As a part of the audit, Baird, Kurtz & Dobson does look at the internal control structure, and again this year has reported a material weakness in the terms of segregation of duties in the Ticket Office.

President Meredith noted, "We are concerned that each year Baird, Kurtz and Dobson writes into this report that there is not enough differentiation between those selling the tickets and those counting the cash in the Ticket Office. It is a very small, three-person operation, and a lot of internal controls have been put into place already with the Internal Auditor directing those, but BKD feels an obligation to write that in each year. A plan has now been developed to address this. We'll bring that back to you for information, and it won't be in future audits.

"

Motion for acceptance of the Agreed-Upon Procedures Report performed by BKD on Athletics was made by Mr. Mudge, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried.

5.2.5 - Recommendation for acceptance of the Accountants' Report on Subsequent Events as provided by Baird, Kurtz & Dobson and dated February 22, 1996

[Letters dated January 16, 1996, and February 22, 1996 were provided to the Board and are included in the Board's official files.]

BACKGROUND

Western Kentucky University's financial statements are annually submitted to the Comptroller of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for inclusion in the state's annual financial report. Western finalizes its financial statements and submits the statements to the Commonwealth prior to the completion of the state's annual report. As a result, the University is required to provide a subsequent events letter to the state indicating no significant changes have occurred in Western's financial condition during the time from which Western's financial statements are completed and the financial statements of the Commonwealth are completed.

The Board adopted a subsequent events letter prepared by Baird, Kurtz & Dobson at its meeting held on January 26. Unfortunately, the state was unable to complete its financial report at this point in time and an additional subsequent events letter was required for the period ending February 22, 1996. The acceptance of the subsequent events letter is routine and as indicated in the letter to President Meredith and the Board of Regents, no significant changes have occurred which significantly change the financial condition of Western Kentucky University during this period of time.

Dr. Ramsey reported that the state auditor requires that we produce a letter to the state auditor indicating that there's been no change in the financial condition of Western Kentucky University from the date of the completion of our annual financial report until the date in which the state's annual financial report is completed. Western's annual financial report was presented to the Board in October, and the state didn't finish its' annual financial report until February.

Motion for acceptance of the Accountants' Report on Subsequent Events for the period from December 15, 1995, through February 21, 1996, was made by Ms. Loafman, seconded by Ms. Bale and carried.

5.2.6 - Recommendation for acceptance of the report and recommendations provided by the W F Corroon consulting firm to implement a new classification and compensation plan at Western Kentucky University

RECOMMENDATION

President Thomas C. Meredith recommends that the Western Kentucky University Board of Regents accept the report and recommendations provided by the W F Corroon consulting firm in implementing a new classification and compensation plan at Western Kentucky University. It is further recommended that employees be moved to the new minimum pay levels as outlined in the Corroon study unless there are exceptions approved by the Department of Human Resources. The long-term goal is to provide increases so that average salaries are closer to *mid-point* of each pay band.

BACKGROUND

At its October 29, 1992, meeting the Board of Regents passed a motion charging the institution with developing a process to analyze the University's compensation structure for all employees. The action requested that the University "do more than has been done in the past when it has been studied and compared with other universities with which we compete." This Board action also called for "a plan to deal with the findings." Subsequently, the Board was presented a plan for enhancing faculty salaries over a three-year period. The University has made significant progress toward achieving the Council of Higher Education's regional university salary benchmarks, and will continue efforts to enhance faculty salaries.

In concert with the second element of the Board's charge, the institution is now focusing on staff salaries. On April 21, 1995, the Board approved a proposal to secure the services of the W F Corroon consulting firm to assist in the analyses and implementation of a new classification and compensation plan. Corroon is a leading international consulting firm specializing in compensation, benefits, and insurance services. They have successfully led projects at a number of universities including the University of South Dakota, Delta State University, Washington University and just recently launched a project at the University of Texas System.

Discussion:

Objectives of the new classification and compensation plan were identified as follows: (1) to develop a rational, objective job evaluation system which reflects the values and goals of WKU; (2) to develop a job evaluation process that ensures pay equity and can accommodate future changes in job design; (3) to create a job evaluation system that is easy for the University to administer independently; (4) to identify a salary structure that is competitive with relevant labor markets with consideration of the University's funding capabilities; (5) to create an efficient job documentation process that collects all the information needed for accurate job evaluation, job description development, and ADA compliance; (6) to develop policies and procedures that ensure consistent administration over time; and (7) to implement a plan, combined with a communication program for employees that builds on-going commitment to the new compensation program.

While Western's existing classification and compensation plan only includes non-exempt support staff, the scope of the proposed plan was broadened to include all positions below the "Director" level. The University felt it was important to integrate these positions into a formalized system so that salary decisions are administered in a fair and consistent manner. As a result, the plan will assist the University in effective compensation management for approximately 850 positions.

At the outset of the project, Corroon representatives met with

more than 75 employees in order to understand attitudes and to obtain suggestions for the design of a new plan. In addition to employee input, department heads were consulted for their ideas and recommendations. This information provided a vital foundation for the study.

Corroon is recommending that the University utilize a "point-factor" job evaluation system. This methodology is one of the more common forms of job evaluation and will help Western identify and define individual job characteristics in ways that are meaningful to the institution. These characteristics are as follows: knowledge, problem solving, decision making, supervision, and working contacts. Each job is rated using a step-by-step approach to ensure evaluation consistency.

After the collection of job information from each employee and an analysis of each position, Corroon utilized several local, regional, and national surveys as a basis for constructing a new salary structure. As a result, Corroon is recommending a pay structure with ten different pay "bands" or grades. The structure incorporates the popular concept of "broadbanding" in that the number of "bands" are fewer and have a wider range than traditional structures. This new structure is consistent with the "flattening" of organizational structures in the corporate world as well as higher education. Each pay "band" will have a *minimum*, *mid-point*, and *maximum* salary value. The pay *minimum* is the lowest amount of pay for a given job, the *mid-point* is the middle value of the pay "band" and represents average market salary, and the *maximum* is the highest amount of pay unless market conditions dictate otherwise.

Salary structure "100" is the default structure into which all jobs slot unless extraordinary pay considerations are demonstrated either through difficulty in recruiting and retaining employees or through documented salary survey data. Upon such justification, a job moves into market structure "200."

Based on Corroon's evaluation of each position and an analysis of individual employee salaries, approximately 335 employees have current salaries which are below *minimums* of the new salary structure. The immediate goal is to adjust salaries to the new *minimums*. To accomplish this, approximately \$479,700 in salary adjustments is required. With the added cost of fringe benefits, this amount increases to \$575,700. Of this amount approximately \$455,600 will be funded by the University budget with the remaining \$120,100 funded by auxiliaries, grants, and other sources. The portion of the cost funded by the University budget will come from \$150,000 allocated in the current year's budget with the remaining balance funded in the FY 96-97 budget. Over the long term, it is our goal to move average salaries closer to the *mid-point* of each pay band. The President and Executive Officers concur with Corroon's findings and recommend that these minimum salary adjustments be implemented immediately (retroactive to January 1, 1996) and that the long-term goal be supported.

Secretary's Note: The full report from Corroon was forwarded to members of the Board of Regents for their review prior to the meeting, and a copy is filed in the Board's official files.

President Meredith noted that soon after the new Board was created, in October of 1992, the Board passed a resolution charging the institution with

developing a process to **"analyze the university's compensation structure for all employees."** That action requested that the University **"do more than has been done in the past when it has been studied and compared with other universities with which we compete."** The resolution also called for a plan to deal with the findings.

Shortly thereafter, the Board was presented with a plan for enhancing faculty salaries over a three-year period. Dr. Meredith stated, "We have made significant progress toward achieving the Council on Higher Education's regional university salary benchmarks. Of course, this effort continues beyond that three years."

Approximately a year ago the Board approved a recommendation to secure the services of W F Corroon and Company, a consulting firm, to assist in the analysis and implementation of a new classification and compensation plan.

Prior to that, the University had hired three faculty, on an internal contract, to do a similar kind of analysis. Very good findings were produced by those three, but it was felt that an even greater-depth study needed to be done by an outside consultant.

The analysis has been finished by the consultant; it's been through an internal review, and is now brought to the Board for consideration.

President Meredith pointed out that only one part of this study deals with actual dollars and actual compensation figures. Even though that is where the focus is, there are a number of very important policy matters that are a part of the Corroon recommendation which will assist the University for many years to come in how it is structured and how all employees are dealt with in a fair and equitable manner. Dr. Meredith stated, "We think it improves a number of areas on our campus in this regard in dealing with our employees, and again sort of flattens the organization a little bit."

Mr. Tony Glisson, Director of Human Resources, at Western Kentucky University, and the institutional coordinator for the study done by Corroon, told the Board that this project has been ongoing for approximately one year and has

included a lot of input on policies and procedures and the appropriate direction to go with the program from the campus community--the staff, department heads, and administrators. Two consultants with the consulting firm have worked very closely with this project.

Mr. Glisson stated, "We feel we have made progress in a number of areas. There were a number of goals and objectives; we don't feel like we've answered all the questions. We don't feel like this is the perfect compensation system. I don't know of any university that does have one. There are strengths and weakness of each, and as we go into the future, I would hope that we can enhance and add things to it that will only improve it. Part of our goal was to look at our bottom-line salaries, which started with the faculty study over a year ago. As a result of what we bring to you today, we are talking about moving up the entry-level salary, the lowest salary we pay any of our full-time people from \$5.37 to \$5.78 per hour--an increase of 7.6% increase. This was desperately needed with the entry-level positions. The average staff salary (for everybody included in the report and in the new plan) will go from \$20,503 to \$21,069--about a 2.7% adjustment. This averages in all of the professional level positions as well as the non-exempt support staff positions. When you look at the overall market, we did some composite numbers prior to the adjustments that we are recommending, and then after the adjustments, in terms of the market, we were at about 86.4% of the market average prior to this. With the adjustments we are recommending today in this first round of implementation, that percentage would move to about 89.1% The range on the adjustments being recommended goes from \$4,800 per year to \$12 annually. The average adjustment was \$503. The final product is before you today."

Mr. Steve Smith, Vice President of the Compensation Division of W F Corroon and project leader for this study was introduced. Mr. Smith reiterated, "No compensation system is perfect; however, we believe we have built a strong foundation system from which you can continue to work and refine. That is the goal for any compensation system, because any compensation system represents one point in time, and that is today. Jobs change, pay rates change; and as those

change, what we have put before you, is a process and a system to adjust to those changes as much as a dollar figure to get you in the ballpark."

Mr. Smith spent summarized what they tried to accomplish in the study-- how it was done, and then entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Gramling asked about the procedure to follow if a department discovers that a mistake has been made and an employee is put in the wrong pay band.

Mr. Smith responded, hopefully, they minimized any opportunity for mistakes. The process for evaluating jobs to place them in pay bands was first completed by the external consultants. The consultants read all of the questionnaires in an initial review; second, they went to the Human Resources team that reviewed the work of the consultant; and third, they went to the department directors prior to coming to the Board for another review process. There have been a number of checks and balances throughout that should minimize the concern. Policies address not only specific cases where people may have issue with where their current job fits, but there is also policy that suggest that, on an on-going basis, these jobs will be reviewed so that they continue to remain current. Employees will have opportunity, and there is a commitment by Human Resources to have ongoing review of these jobs, or six years from now, you will be in the same place you were a year ago.

Mr. Glisson indicated that a specific appeals procedure will provide employees an opportunity to disagree. If there is an error, then Human Resources should know about that.

Dr. Mendel asked if the study had carefully addressed and analyzed Western's benefits, number of paid vacation days, number of paid holidays, tuition waivers, and insurance package as compared to competing employers.

Mr. Glisson responded that the issue of benefits was talked about specifically in discussions with the President and Vice Presidents to make sure that that was included, and Corroon was asked to specifically look at that issue.

Mr. Smith reported that general findings were such that overall the Western benefit packet is better than market competitors. The retirement plan and

the paid time off plan are in excess of the competitor's. Tuition reimbursement is offered; however, by the time other factors are considered, for example your medical plan is not perceived to be by employees nor was a comparison to market data to be as rich in terms of total allowable benefits, total contributions for the employees, and some of the limitations on the disabilities plan makes you below market in that area. The overall sense was that Western is slightly better than market. Mr. Smith stated, "I think, however, one of the things that we put together and talked about with the executive team as we addressed this issue was, is it [fringe benefits] significantly better to subsidize lower pay compared to market. Our recommendation was no, it is not. Clearly there are advantages to working in a college and university environment, and many of your people spoke to that. However, we also conducted focus groups and other types of settings, and people speak to the advantages and the excitement of working in other kinds of environments. To some degree people select the kinds of places they work. Again we did not find anything compelling in those kinds of arguments that would allow us to subsidize lower pay."

Mr. Mudge asked if it was the University's strategy to be at 100% of market, and Dr. Meredith indicated, "We have not identified that as a goal. We've been gathering information about what it would take to get to an average overall of the group--say at 90%, 95%, etc. We're almost at 90% of mid-point now, how much is it going to take to move this group to 90, then 95%. We'll come back at some point in time and say, here's a long-term goal, and you all can tell us to scale it back or move it up, or do whatever."

Ms. Gramling commented, "I want to say that I really appreciate the efforts of the administration to address this issue. I think the staff feels that way, and I think a lot of faculty members are glad to see that staff salaries are going to be addressed. I appreciate that, and it's been anxiously awaited. There have been a lot of concerns about this beginning step, which is a good one. It's bringing people up to the minimum level. Overall, this is going to effect the newer employees rather than the older employees--not older in age-- but the people who have been here the longest. I want to explain to you how this is going to play out

at Western if this recommendation passes and to emphasize the fact that we really need to couple this with a commitment to go to the mid-point--to really make a commitment to that. Right now, let me use an example of a woman that I talked to who will get a small adjustment that will bring her to the minimum; she's been here ten years, but tomorrow they could hire someone else into the office who would make the same thing that it's taken her ten years to get to that point. We're talking about people who have lived through budget cuts, and they've taken on a lot of extra work because of downsizing--people that have really hung in there and have devoted their careers and their work lives to Western. I really have a concern about that. We can do this thing today and raise people up to the minimum, and that's not a bad thing--that's a good thing; but unless we commit ourselves to going all the way with this thing, and we're talking about a big commitment, monetarily, it could cause a lot of morale problems. It could undo whatever good can be done by doing this. I'd like to push for us to maybe come up with some sort of timetable to make the commitment or to at least have some more discussion about the commitment. If we can't make the commitment, I'd like to see this pool of money that's available today be divided in such a way that more people will benefit from it if we can't be sure that we can't go all the way with this plan."

Mr. Glisson indicated that salary compression is what Ms. Gramling was talking about and that it was definitely an employee relations issue. Mr. Glisson reported that he talked with a number of organizations as the study began about their implementation strategy. Most of them dealt with the problem that's broken the worst first; and that's getting people at least up to minimum.

Saying that from a work motivation point of view and in terms of maintaining productivity and the incentive values of money, it is better to give people a multi-year increase of 5% than giving them a one-time increase of 15%, Dr. Mendel argued that it would be prudent to accept the general plan and to revisit the way in which it is implemented.

Mr. Smith noted that, "These are issues that come up in every study, because, of course, when you've not had the opportunity to fund salary dollars as

you would have chosen to and you fall behind, then obviously people who have been here longer have fallen behind further in some sense. At some point you have to bite the bullet and at some point you just have to correct things. The implementation as put before you is in some ways a correction schedule. There needs to be a long-term commitment and plan to move people aggressively, and our recommendation was to do that through performance-based pay. In addition, I think one of the things that if I were staff, and staff can take heart with this, you have consistently made improvements of faculty salaries. You've made a commitment, and over the course of time, you've moved in that direction. That's my understanding. Staff is looking at this as the same commitment for them, and I think that there would be common belief and perception out there, actually through the good communication that Tony and his group has done, that that commitment exists, and this is a first step, and stay with us."

Mr. Preston made a motion that the Corroon Report be accepted and implemented as presented. The motion was seconded Mr. Fischer.

Following more discussion on Ms. Gramling's suggestion to establish a timetable or a formal commitment, Dr. Mendel offered the following amendment to the motion, " I'd like to amend the motion to say that we accept the plan and that we revisit the issue of the manner in which we attempt to move from where we are with the available funds we have each year to where we want to be. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gramling.

Mr. Preston, as originator of the motion, indicated that the amendment to his motion was unacceptable because it effectively destroyed the intent of the motion.

Chairman Mercer asked for clarification from the parliamentarian on the point of order:

The parliamentarian ruled that the Chair could: (1) call for a vote on the amendment as stated; or (2) the chair could rule that the amendment is contradictory to the intent of the motion.

Chairman Mercer indicated that the amendment was clearly contra-dictory to the intent of the motion.

A vote on Mr. Preston's motion to accept the Corroon Study and recommendations carried with Ms. Gramling and Dr. Mendel voting nay.

Following a five-minute break, the following item was presented for consideration.

5.2.7 - Recommendation for adoption of the 1996-97 Combined Operating Budgets

BACKGROUND

The 1996-97 Combined Budgets is the University's financial plan for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1996, and ending June 30, 1997. A copy was provided to members of the Board of Regents with the agenda, and a copy is filed in the Board's official files.

Following recognitions of the Budget Committee and the budget staff, Dr. James Ramsey, Vice President for Finance and Administration, presented the recommended 1996-97 Combined Budgets. He noted that staff had met with Board members in small groups to review and answer questions pertaining to the budget. Slides listed below were used to summarize the presentation:

- **Vision for Western Kentucky University as discussed at the fall, 1995 Board retreat:**
 - Achieving national and international recognition in selected academic programs;
 - Setting high expectations for students;
 - Demonstrating innovative uses of technology and human resources in learning;
 - Being responsive to the needs of the publics.
- **Budget goals as identified in the October, 1995 Board meeting:**
 - Continued efforts to increase funding for instruction, research, and libraries;
 - Continued efforts to enhance faculty and staff salaries;
 - Funding for implementation to "Moving to a New Level...";
 - Continued enhancement of campus maintenance.

Dr. Ramsey noted that sometimes the goals do compete or conflict with each other and discussed the need to develop a tight linkage between the budget goals and the Board's vision for Western Kentucky University.

Dr. Ramsey stated, "We want to be able to allocate to you resources consistent with your vision and goals for Western, and we want to work with you over the

next year to continue to do this.

- **1996-97 WKU Operating Budget Overview**

1995-96 Total Budget **\$119,551,251**

- Educational and General 107,094,024
- Auxiliary Services 12,457,227

1996-97 Total Budget **\$124,938,178**

- Educational and General 111,808,446
- Auxiliary Services 13,129,731

Difference

- Educational and General 4,714,422
- Auxiliary Services 672,504

Total **\$5,386,927**

- **Historical Information on State Appropriations (including debt service)**

1991-92	\$54,298,700	(before budget cut)
1992-93	49,773,900	
1993-94	50,208,900	
1994-95	51,598,800	
1995-96	53,003,300	
1996-97	54,649,100	

Dr. Ramsey pointed out that the state appropriation for 1996-97 brings the University back to the level where it was in 1991-92, saying " Clearly, higher education has not been a priority for the last four years in Kentucky in terms of the allocation of state resources." Efforts will begin within the next several weeks at the state level with a commission and a task force working to address higher education and post secondary education. Hopefully, the state will in the future increase the priority level for higher education.

President Meredith pointed out that during the same time frame referenced above, the Board approved 5% salary pool increases for three of the four years. At the same time the campus became totally networked.

Dr. Ramsey noted that the Council on Higher Education now has a funding mechanism in place to generate the State Appropriation increase. It is outlined as follows:

- **Revenue - 1996-97 State Appropriation Increase: \$1,557,600**
(3.2% - Exclusive of Debt Service)

● Current Services	\$1,298,000
● Equity	-0-
● Performance	<u>\$259,600</u>
	\$1,557,600

Accountability standards and indicators are used to determine the appropriation. Last year 100% of the increased funding for Western Kentucky University was performance based. There has been, at least for the time period, a decreased emphasis placed on performance funding at the state level.

Approximately 13% of the new funding for higher education is performance based.

The equity portion is based on Western Kentucky University's funding level, and the funding level over time compared with benchmark institutions. With the equity piece, there is still an incentive on the part of universities in Kentucky to try to generate as much headcount enrollment as possible. The more students we have, the more we would qualify or be eligible for equity funding. The Council on Higher Education's formula is less student credit hour driven today than it was several years ago, but the equity piece is driven by headcount.

Higher education in Kentucky as an appropriation unit is receiving a 4% increase in state funding. Only one other area of government is receiving a higher percentage increase in state funding in next year's budget, and that is the Corrections Cabinet. As the 4% was distributed, using the formula, Western ended up with a 3.2% increase in discretionary funds, exclusive of debt service. The community colleges received 9.5% increase; Eastern Kentucky University - 4.5%; Morehead State University - 3.8%; Northern Kentucky University - 3.4%, and everyone else 3.2%. While higher education received a 4% increase, it is the equity piece that determines the distribution of a significant amount of dollars. Because of the enrollment growth of the community colleges in recent years, they are receiving a sizeable 9.5% increase.

- **Tuition**

Tuition generates the second largest piece of the revenue. The Council on Higher Education has a formula they use to determine tuition for higher education.

In-state tuition rates for undergraduates at Western will increase \$30 per semester (an increase of 3.6%). An estimated \$27,775,000 in tuition revenue is projected.

- **Percent of Total Budgeted Revenue Trends in Revenue Resources Derived from State Appropriation and Student Fees**

Going back to 1987-88, the state appropriation went from 54.5% to 43.7% of the total budget for 1996-97. Tuition and fees, in 1987-88, generated 18.4% of the total revenue compared to 23.2% in 1996-97.

- **Other miscellaneous revenue increases include:**

● Academic Services Fee	\$ 127,465
● Grants & Contracts (Federal and Private)	1,100,000
● Application Fees	\$25,000
● Late Payments	10,000
● Investment Earnings	300,000
● Shuttle Receipts	3,600
● Parking Fines	20,000

- **Mandatory Student Fees Per Semester:**
(Determined by WKU Board of Regents)

1991-92	\$70.00
1992-93	*102.00
1993-94	104.00
1994-95	110.50
1995-96	115.00
1996-97	**145.00

* Includes services such as Preston Center, Computer Services, and Student Health Service

** Includes services such as General Athletic Programming and Academic Services Fee.

The proposed increase for mandatory student fees reflects \$25 per semester (Estimate \$637,325) for Title IX Compliance and \$5 per semester increase for Academic Services Fee (\$127,465).

- **Residence Hall Rates (A/C Bldgs. Not Including New Halls) Per Semester:** (Determined by Board of Regents)

	New Students	Returning Students
	<u>1995-96</u>	
1991-92	\$510	\$510
1992-93	580	580
1993-94	625	625
1994-95	658	658
1995-96	683	658
1996-97	705	683

This recommendation supports a \$22 (average for air-conditioned halls) per semester increase for new students.

With the proposed additional revenues outlined above, Dr. Ramsey discussed the following expenditures: (What the university is buying with the additional dollars)

- **Commitment to Employees**
 - Compensation (Merit/Fringes) \$1,300,000
 - Fringe Benefits (Not Distributed) 160,000
 - Classification/Compensation Study Implementation 312,200
 - Faculty Promotions 39,000
 - Faculty/Staff Scholarships and Dependent Child Scholarships 40,000
 - New Positions (Full and Part time) 110,000
- **"Moving to a New Level..." Implementation** 250,500
- **Commitment to Students**
 - Scholarships/Graduate Waivers 209,300
 - Printing Catalogs 30,000
 - Athletics 87,000
- **Technology (including new positions)** 148,000
- **Libraries** 120,000

● **BOARD OF REGENTS GOALS:**

(1) **Continued efforts to increase funding for instruction, research, and libraries:**

<u>Unrestricted</u>		
	<u>1994-95</u>	<u>Percent of Budget</u>
Instruction	\$40,452,718	52.03%
Research	151,811	.20%
Libraries	3,909,424	5.03%
	<u>1995-96</u>	<u>Percent of Budget</u>
Instruction	\$42,758,079	53.09%
Research	186,067	.23%
Libraries	4,295,302	5.33%
	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>Percent of Budget</u>
Instruction	\$44,471,411	53.28%
Research	188,169	.23%
Libraries	4,457,105	5.34%

Note: Excluding Revenue Dependent units in excess of \$10,000

(2) **Continued efforts to enhance faculty and staff salaries**

- Salary Increase Pool of 3% \$1,300,000
 - Based on performance
- Health Insurance Increases 160,000
- Classification/Compensation Analysis 462,200
- Promotions 39,000

(3) **Funding for Implementation of "Moving to a New Level..." including enhanced expenditures on technology consistent with the Board of Regents goals;**

- To advertise increased admissions standards \$ 5,000
- Facilitate maximal advising for new freshmen through University College 90,000
- Increase recruitment and retention of best students 5,000
- Recruit and retain best possible faculty 25,000
- Establish improved system for evaluating faculty and staff 5,000
- Increase diversity on Western's campus 30,000
- Promote unpaid public service program 8,000
- Extend library hours through weekends 22,500
- Enhance intellectual atmosphere on campus 50,000
- Enhance service mentality among administrators 8,000
- Provide increased staff development activities 2,000

(4) **Continued Enhancement of Campus Maintenance**

- Emergency Projects
 - Emergency Electrical Upgrade
 - Cherry Hall Roof Replacement
- Campus Fire Alarm System
- Life Safety Projects
 - High Voltage Underground Distribution
 - Thompson Complex Fume Hood Replacement
- Reallocation of Utilities Savings

Finally, Dr. Ramsey summarized the Athletics Budget as follows:

I. Institutional Support

Tuition	\$27,775,000
State Appropriation	<u>50,232,900</u>
(less Debt Service)	
	\$78,007,900
	<u>* x3.4%</u>
	2,652,268

II. Athletic Resources

University Support**	2,661,768
Athletic Revenue	<u>2,398,008</u>

\$5,059,776

*Note: This Board authorized a type of formula funding approach for athletics expenditures. The forecasted tuition, state appropriation minus the debt service and the university support for athletics is 3.4% of that amount.

**Monies were moved from Student Activities to the Topperette/ Cheerleader account as a new function of Athletics.

At the conclusion of Dr. Ramsey's budget presentation, President Meredith discussed the Proposed Plan for Compliance with Title IX, dated November 27, 1995.

RECOMMENDATION

President Meredith recommends that the Board approve an increase of \$25.00 per semester in student fees to fund the expenses incurred by the University in complying with Title IX.

BACKGROUND

The University has performed an in-depth study of its obligations under Title IX and the best methods for addressing those obligations. In order for Western Kentucky University to comply with the requirements of Title IX, the University must accommodate the interests and abilities of the under-represented sex (females) at Western Kentucky University. Western has chosen to offer team sports for women in those cases where there is 1) sufficient interest and ability expressed by women for a viable team; and, 2) a reasonable expectation of competition for that team in the institution's normal competitive region. The study was sent forward by Mr. Lewis, Mills, Athletics Director; Mr. Barry Brickman, Assistant Athletics Director; Ms. Pam Herriford, Assistant Athletics Director; Deborah T. Wilkins, University Counsel, and Dr. Steve White, Faculty Representative on the Athletics Committee.

The proposal listed three options:

1. Proportionality:

The rates of participation of women and men in athletics should be substantially proportionate to their respective rates of enrollment as full time undergraduate students.

2. Program Expansion:

Demonstrate a continuing practice of program expansion, through the addition of team sports, for the under represented sex.

3. Meets the Interests:

Offering a team sport for women in those cases where there is

- 1) sufficient interest and ability expressed by women for a viable team; and,
- 2) a reasonable expectation of competition for that team in the institution's normal competitive region.

The timeline for the proposal is:

1992 Began to study compliance figures

(Institutional budget cuts at this time)

- 1994 November - NCAA certification visit
(Title IX Compliance Plan required by March 31, 1996)
- 1995 November 27 - Title IX Compliance Plan filed with President
- 1996 March 11-12 - Consultant, who was former Office of Civil Rights Representative
- March - June - Surveyed incoming students at OAR to determine interests
- March 29 - Title IX Compliance Plan filed with NCAA
- April 4 - Met with student leaders to discuss fee increase to comply with Title IX
- May 1 - Plan presented to Board of Regents for approval

The Plan calls for:

- Add three women's team sports over five years
- Swimming, begin in 1996-97, competition begins 1997-98
- Softball, begin in 1998-99, competition begins 1999-2000
- Soccer, begin in 2000-2001, competition begins 2001-2002

Costs:

1996-97	\$ 64,000
1997-98	182,000
1998-99	345,000
1999-2000	538,500
2000-2001	644,000
2001-2002	761,000
2002-2003	824,500

Note: All sports will be competing by year 2001; 2002-2003 will complete funding of soccer scholarships.

President Meredith listed and discussed the following options to become in compliance with Title IX:

1. Adopt the Plan
2. Don't do anything.
3. Reduce male athletic opportunities.
4. Institution budget the amount needed.
5. Ask the fans to pay for it.

Four students who had requested to speak to the Board; each submitted their thoughts in writing ahead of time. Each had the understanding that three minutes would be allotted to make their particular points. The four students spoke in the order that the request was received. Speaking against the student fee were Amy D. Steinkamp and Pamela Howell; speaking in favor of the fee were Shannon L. Pogue and Neal Parrish.

Following the student comments, Dr. Ramsey presented the last of the budget presentation

5.2.8 - Recommendation for approval of capital construction projects from the Auxiliary Reserve

RECOMMENDATION

President Thomas C. Meredith recommends that the following capital construction projects be approved by the Board of Regents with funding from the Auxiliary Reserve:

■ Upgrade Fire Alarm System for Five Residence Halls	\$174,682
■ Replace Existing Water Fire Extinguishers with Dry Chemical - A-B-C Type	16,000
■ Replace Shower Room Partitions in Four Residence Halls	90,000
■ Replace Gilbert Hall Cooling Tower and Relocate from Roof to Ground	39,000
■ Replace Defective HVAC Piping in Pearce-Ford Tower	35,000
■ Replace Central Hall Chiller and Cooling Tower	170,000
■ Miscellaneous Repairs and Equipment Replacement in Resident Hall Apartments	<u>20,000</u>
Total	\$544,682

BACKGROUND

The Auxiliary Enterprises of Western Kentucky are self supporting; i.e., revenues generated from the operation of the residence halls, bookstore, and food service are used to finance the expenses for these operations. While the goal of Auxiliary Enterprises is not solely to generate a “profit,” these operations must be managed in a business-like fashion to ensure that Educational and General (E&G) funds are not required to support their operation. It is also necessary to generate funds to reinvest in plant and equipment that is integral to the success of these operations.

Over the past several years, under the direction of Mr. John Osborne, Coordinator of Business Services, Auxiliary Enterprises has generated annual profits that are retained in an Auxiliary Reserve account. It is requested that the cost of the above capital expenditures be financed from the Auxiliary Reserve. The current balance in the Auxiliary Reserve is \$1,776,174. The Bookstore Renovation project has previously been identified as a \$600,000 expenditure. After accounting for the above recommended projects, the Auxiliary Reserve would be maintained at approximately \$600,000, approximately 5 percent of total Auxiliary revenues/expenditures.

Dr. Ramsey reported that the number one goal of the auxiliary programming is to provide quality support services to the student; and at the same time, since these are self supporting, cannot receive state appropriation, it is necessary to make a profit in the operation. As of today, there is an undesignated fund balance of approximately \$1.7 million that has accumulated over the last several years. Approximately \$600,000 has been programmed for possible renovation of the Bookstore. That money is encumbered, and seven new projects are being recommended totaling \$544,682.

Chairman Mercer called for discussion on segments of the proposed budget with the Title IX first, followed by the Combined Operating Budget, and the Capital Budget.

Ms. Higdon reported that the proposal was presented to student leaders where twelve organizations were represented. Students were asked not to discuss the proposal until the material was in the hands of Board members. Once these leaders discussed this with their organizations, if there was considerable controversy, they were to come back and talk to her. This group was asked to brainstorm other alternatives. Support for this proposal was unanimous in the room,. Ms. Higdon stated, "A lot of people came in not really knowing where they stood on it; and quite honestly I was one of those people.

Once it was presented and laid out, the rationale, the other alternatives, it was convincing,

. Higdon indicated that the group of student leaders was supportive of that

strongest, and most represented organizations on the campus, each of whom were elected delegates from the groups, most of them composed of a representative body of other organizations--Spirit Masters, Student Alumni Association, Residence Hall Association, Panhellenic Council, Intrafraternity Council, Women in Transitions, etc.

Dr. Meredith stated, "Just a touch of philosophy about this. There is nothing secretive about this; nothing intended to even be that way. We've not imposed any fees on this campus at all without first talking to students in some way or another. Not many campuses would do what we do, quite frankly, and that is to call in the student leaders on this campus and to lay out a proposal before them before it ever moved forward, before it was put in the hands of this Board even, and to say "give us your feedback; tell us whether or not we're on the right track; tell us whether or not we're making a mistake; tell us whether or not we're reasonable, just give us some feedback." We sat in this room for an hour and talked about all of that, back and forth; and then I asked them to please not talk about it publicly until the Board had this in their hands. I didn't think you all should be reading about all of the details of it before you had it in your hands. After getting their feedback, then we moved forward with that plan. They felt like that was the best option, and that is when it was mailed to you, and then we awaited your reaction."

Ms. Higdon noted that several of the students expressed their concern with the way this would be depicted in some of the media sources, and it was requested at that meeting that the media sources be given exactly what was presented to that group, because they felt like once students were presented with this and given the understanding that they had after that presentation that they would be more receptive to this once they

had all of the facts."

Dr. Meredith reported that he invited the *Herald* to his office, and they came; and he gave them all of the handouts. They had all of the information, and they wrote follow-up stories on it."

Mr. Mercer expressed concerns with the plan saying, "No question, we need to do something about Title IX to get into compliance. It's the right thing to do. It's going to be the law pretty soon that we have to. However, I still have some questions; and frankly, I think I need a little bit more study about it to be honest with you. The first year our costs are \$64,000; if there's some way we could find in the fund balance or somewhere in this university budget to fund this for the first year; give the Board a little bit more opportunity; give me personally a little bit more opportunity to study this issue to see exactly what needs to be funded."

Dr. Mendel agreed with Mr. Mercer stating, "The understanding of the issues is contingent on having all the information; and if what the students were presented with parallels what I've been presented with, then, all of the information hasn't been presented, and to make a choice among several presumed options, only one of which makes any sense given that you limit the choices and define the issues as they are, is as, was commented by the President of our Faculty Senate, no choice at all."

Mr. Martin questioned the implications of delaying the plan or even allocating the \$64,000 out of the budget.

Mr. Preston noted, "It's my understanding that we do have to file a compliance program for Title IX. I mean if we want to stay in the program, this is not a question of having an option of whether to do it or not do it, so I think we've all agreed that we're going to do it. In evaluating this total thing, in context, it's my understanding that total student fees at Western are \$145 per semester. The total student fees at Morehead State University are \$175, at Murray State University - \$160; Northern Kentucky University- \$150; Eastern Kentucky University is \$150, and Kentucky State is \$107. So it seems to me that we are very much in the mid-range, and I think a part of the thing is that we have 60% women in this university, and it seems to me that we ought to make a solid up-front commitment to get in full compliance with Title IX without dragging our feet about it."

At the request of Ms. Bale, Ms. Wilkins researched how other universities plan for

compliance to Title IX, and she commented as follows:

"I'll try to avoid naming particular institutions if I can do so if you all will bear with me. I was not able to get any information from two of the schools, I will name them--Morehead and Murray. Their counsel were not available, and we just couldn't get any information from them. No one else in the administration was willing to respond to my question which was, "Can you share with me what plans or steps your institutions are taking in order to comply with Title IX?" One of our regional institutions has already suffered from an OCR complaint approximately two years, and they are now complying with Title IX under the direction and control of the Office of Civil Rights, which ordered them to establish two women's teams and has already indicated to that school that they will also order them to establish another team in the next year. They did a compliance review after a group of female students complained about the absence of an available sport. The audit, which lasted approximately two weeks, included a three to five member Office of Civil Rights team that stayed on campus and performed, what this attorney described as, an IRS audit of their athletic program. In other words, they had to go back for five years and produce actual purchase receipts for women's uniforms--it was that type of an audit. They now must report to OCR annually and will do so until further notice, and OCR tells them what they will do and how much they will spend, and they don't care how they pay for it. The expense is not an issue, and that's been established both by the Office of Civil Rights and the Courts System. The other schools all have established committees which are studying gender equity or Title IX compliance, but none of them have offered or preferred any formal plan either to the administration or to their Board of Trustees or Regents. Several of the schools indicated to me that Western is out in front on this issue, that they are waiting to see what we do in order to follow our lead, they requested assistance from this University in developing a plan, which we of course will be happy to share with them."

"One of the things I want to point out about approving the plan but not the funding and studying it for a year, there's been some mention of a decision against LSU--Louisiana State University. I spoke with their attorney yesterday for some length of time. That was specifically their problem. They had made some verbal commitment to establish teams, had some paper plans, nothing formal had been approved by the Board, but they were

found absolutely to be not in compliance; that studying the issue, having unapproved plans to do something was not sufficient to protect them from a court action. The decision, the opinion, was issued in January, 1995; I got a copy of it from their attorney. It has not been appealed yet because it's not formally concluded. One of the issues that remained was LSU had been ordered to pay the plaintiff's attorney's fees in that case--the attorney's fees and expenses. I asked LSU's attorney if they had submitted their bill of expenses, and he said that they had this week, and it was in excess of \$1 million. They will appeal that decision, I am sure, but I have to tell you that they are likely to fail on that issue. Consistently, the courts have awarded attorney's fees, sometimes damages, against defendants who don't comply with Title IX."

"One of the most common questions that's been asked of me is "If this law has been around since the early '70's, why are we just now doing anything about it?" The law itself has been subject to a lot of controversy and bickering both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives in Washington. It suffered a blow in 1985 in a court case where the United States Supreme Court said it didn't apply to any program that didn't receive federal funding. Athletics programs used that as an excuse not to comply with it. Congress has turned around in the late eighties and passed an amendment to that law that said, yes, it will apply--if any institution receives \$1 in federal funding, then all aspects of that institution shall comply with Title IX. At that time, the Office of Civil Rights was directed to promulgate regulations and guidelines, and they did. That is why the issue hasn't really reared its head until the early 90's, and that is why we are just now getting around to it."

"I have been asked what would happen if we don't do anything, or if we do less than what we should do. I went through and reviewed the court cases and other sanctions that can be issued against a university that is not in compliance with Title IX; and of course, the most important is, you lose your existing federal funding and you lose the right to apply for any future funding. That's the sword they hold over you. We don't have to comply with Title IX, we don't have to accept federal funding. If a complaint is filed either in court or with the Office of Civil Rights, we will comply. We won't decide how we will comply; at that point, either a Federal District Judge, as in the case of LSU and Brown University, which you've heard a lot about, or the Office of Civil Rights will

decide what we will do. Many times over, these opinions have stated that expense is not a factor--that if you are found not to be in compliance, you will do what they tell you to do, whether you have the money or not."

"In LSU's case, their litigation spanned over almost a three-year period; it's still not over with, that \$1 million in attorney's fees is only the plaintiff's side. They have no idea at this point what LSU, themselves, spent."

"Finally, there's really two parts to this, there's a federal law that says we have to comply, but there's also an NCAA rule that says we will comply. If we don't pass this plan today as submitted to the NCAA, they could find us to be on restricted status; and if we are on restricted status, my understanding is there'll be a prohibition against all teams, both men and women participating in any NCAA tournaments until we are in compliance. In fact, that is a sanction that was suggested by the court in the Brown case, that one way to make the school comply with Title IX was to suspend all the athletic activity until you do what you are told to do."

Mr. Gray expressed concern about the potential costs in years two, three, four, and on up into 2002 and 2003 and asked about what the projection for the student fees would be at those points in time to cover costs.

Dr. Meredith responded that \$644,000 is the projected cost by about the fifth year, and student fees will cover that up through that time period."

President Meredith stated, "As I said to the students when I met with them in the public forum the other day, that as we head toward that fifth year where it starts to break even, the fees that are being collected as opposed to the costs, then we've got to make some decisions as an institution and as a Board, do we go back to students or do we go to the fans then?"

Mr. Mudge asked if the recommended programs would bring Western into compliance and compatible with Western's concerns.

Dr. Meredith stated, "We tried to think about costs, but you've got to address what Title IX calls for, which is need and interest. So, the committee looked at Indiana and Kentucky and Tennessee because we get 96% of our students from those three states to see what the high school girls' championship sports were in those three states. That should give you a pretty good idea of the interest, but that information is being

supplemented by survey of all of the incoming freshman students to ask what are your interests along these lines."

Discussion followed regarding a proposed timetable for further study by the Board, and Mr. Mercer stated, "What I would propose is that the Chairman appoint a task force of board members to give this more study and come back to this Board at whatever the appropriate time is for that particular committee to do their work--it may be a month"

Ms. Bale requested that if a task force is formed, that the Committee study only the funding mechanism and not get into talking about deletion of programs.

Mr. Mercer: "While I agree with what Ray is saying, I think philosophically, practically, I think this issue has to be dealt with quickly. I think I agree with what Kristen is saying, we need to deal with this particular issue. That is a discussion for another day that the Board needs to address, and I hope we have that discussion in the future. I do believe we need to do something quickly. As Cornelius said, this cat is out of the bag now, and we have to do something quickly."

Mr. Preston: "I think we could go on with this for days, weeks, or months. I think Debbie has put it very well when she's said you're going to comply voluntarily, or, if there's a complaint, you're going to be directed to comply. We have a very viable option. The student body, I believe, and I respect Tara's commitment to this thing, feel this is a viable option. **I would like to make the motion that we go ahead and approve this Title IX Compliance recommendation as it was submitted and get it on the way. If we want to modify it later, or if we want to form a Task Force to study the overall picture, to eliminate athletics, or do whatever, that's a whole other ballgame. I make that motion.**" The motion was seconded by Mr. Fischer.

Dr. Mendel made a motion to **amend the motion to not assess the student fee as a method of financing until we've had further study of other alternatives.**" The motion was seconded by Ms. Gramling.

Mr. Preston stated "That amendment is not acceptable to me as the register of the first motion."

With regard to improper amendments, the Parliamentarian read the following:

"Improper Amendments:

- one that is not germane to the question to be amended;
- one that merely makes the adoption of the amended question equivalent to a rejection of the original motion;
- one that would make the question as amended identical with or contrary to one previously decided by the assembly;
- one that proposes to change one of the forms of the amendments;
- one that would have the effect of converting one parliamentary motion into another.

Mr. Mercer asked Dr. Mendel to repeat his motion for an amendment, and the motion was restated by Dr. Mendel as follows: **"My amendment was to go ahead and accept Mr. Preston's motion in terms of beginning the groundwork to implement a plan but not to couple that with the increase in student fees at this time until other financing options have been explored."**

Mr. Mercer ruled that the amendment was germane.

Mr. Preston stated, "In which case, I withdraw my motion, because that is not acceptable to me, because as the originator of the motion, I think parliamentary procedures will ultimately state that if an amendment is made to my motion that is not acceptable to me, then I can withdraw it, but I am perfectly amenable to the motion that this be an ongoing study of the thing, and we can come back later and change the method of financing. In my opinion, we've got to get something on the board that's a viable, working tool that we are in compliance, and then if we want to modify it later, there's not a problem in the world with that."

Dr. Mendel also withdrew his amendment.

Following more discussion, Mr. Martin made a motion to **"move forward with the recommendation as presented to raise the student fees by \$25, and that the Chairman appoint a Task Force made up of a cross section of people of the university including at least two Board of Regents to examine to see if there is another option that we can change in a later date."** The motion was seconded by Mr. Mudge.

Dr. Mendel made a motion to amend the motion to **accept Mr. Martin's motion with the exception of the funding mechanism. The funding mechanism would be the subject of further study, and a recommendation would be made for incorporation into the next budget."** The motion was seconded by Mr. Gray.

Following another period discussion on the motion and amendment, Mr. Fischer

called for the question.

The roll call vote on the amendment by Dr. Mendel:

Aye: Bale, Gramling, Gray, Mendel, Mercer

Nay: Fischer, Higdon, Loafman, Martin, Mudge, Preston

The amendment failed.

The roll call vote on the motion by Mr. Martin:

Aye: Fischer, Higdon, Loafman, Martin, Mudge, Preston

Nay: Bale, Gramling, Gray, Mendel, Mercer

The motion passed.

The Board adjourned for lunch at 12:20 p.m.

Returning from lunch at 1:10 p.m., Mr. Mercer made motion seconded by Mr. Preston, that the Board of Regents go into closed session for discussion of an individual personnel matter, pursuant to KRS 61.810(f). The Board, accompanied by Mrs. Esters entered closed session at 1:10 p.m.

Upon return from closed session at 1:50 p.m., Mr. Mercer stated that, "During the closed session, the Board discussed only matters within the scope of the motion, took no formal action and made no decisions."

Mr. Mudge made a motion that, "after reviewing the excellent performance of the President of the University for this past year, we include in the upcoming budget period an increase for the President in the amount of 4%." The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston.

President Meredith stated, "I appreciate the motion, and it hasn't passed so I may be speaking prematurely here, but as much as I really appreciate that, and there are a number of people on campus who are receiving a lot more than the 3% pool that we had this year, in full respect for the Board, I would ask that it be held to 3% in light of our 3% pool this year for the entire campus. I realize it's done on merit, and many did receive more than the 3%, but by the same token, I was so disappointed in the lack of dollars from the state this year when we had hoped for 7% and had worked hard for two years to try to get the 7%, and we didn't. We only had a 3% pool; again, with the deepest respect, I would ask that mine be held at that 3% pool figure until we can maybe do a little bit

better. Again, I don't want to offend anybody with that, because I'm highly respectful of the confidence you're showing with that motion."

Mr. Fischer felt it to be a good leadership move on the President's part to suggest that and stated that the Board was trying to say that the majority of the Board has the confidence in Dr. Meredith being the President of this institution and in leadership that he is providing."

Mr. Mudge withdrew his original motion and restated the motion to include the change in the percentage from 4 to 3% in accordance with President Meredith's stated wishes. The restated motion was that "after reviewing the excellent performance of the President of the University for this past year, we include in the upcoming budget period an increase for the President in the amount of 3%." The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston and carried with Dr. Mendel abstaining.

Mr. Mercer stated that the next item for discussion was a review of the budget as previously presented.

Dr. Mendel commented that the Board's first goal was to increase the percentage of the E&G going to instruction, library and research and expressed concern about the extent to which that has happened.

Using an overhead, Dr. Mendel displayed a sheet that was prepared for the first budget briefing and was distributed to the Board, which indicated the percentage of the unrestricted funds in the budget going to instruction, research and libraries. The percentage dropped from 55.6% to 55.47%, which is a drop in the percentage of the budget going to E&G of slightly better than a quarter percent. A chart that appeared in a later briefing book which changed the way it was presented, reflected an increase of two tenths of one percent. Dr. Mendel felt the increases to be illusory when presented in this way.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the classification and categorization of expenditures.

Mr. Gray expressed frustration with the budget process and the confusion of being presented two sets of numbers saying, "Here we go again, last year we did have that hard-fought battle over this budget resolution, and I hear one hand say it's this, and the other hand says it's that; I don't know what to believe. When you look at this book right here,

and it's a thousand pages of information; and that's what we do rely on the administration to give us and to believe, but you see one side says this and the other side says that. How much is athletics going up? How much is academics going up? Or is it going up? What we said in that budget resolution was that we wanted it to go up. I don't know the answer to that. I don't know the answer to it. I do say again, I do think that more money ought to be spent for academics, because that's what we're supposed to be about--academics."

Dr. Ramsey commented on the charts presented by Dr. Mendel saying, "I don't know that maybe Ray and I are saying anything different. We went through this, I thought, very clearly in a very lengthy session with you all in Lexington. The first picture that Ray presented was our picture, OK, where he showed the percentage going down. We met with three of the regents and showed them that picture and said, you know, if we didn't do Title IX, if we just forgot Title IX, that would increase the percentage going to instruction. We used that as an illustration. That policy decision which the Board could make or not make, and you just voted to make it, but that would impact the percentages. So, those particular Board members suggested then, that we pull out, and Ray's terminology is correct, the fees or revenues that are imposed but earmarked for a specific expenditure. So it was suggested to us by Board members that we then, normalize the data and pull those out. We had that lengthy discussion in Lexington and I thought we went through and discussed that in some detail. That's the numbers, and I know that you have a frustration with saying that Ray has his numbers, and we have our numbers. The numbers are the numbers--it's what you want to say--what discretion you say you have over some of the revenue sources is the issue that we talked about that day in Lexington. I don't know if that helps you or if it helps any of the other Board, but we produced that first table."

"What we presented and what Ray showed is what we presented. Again, we are not trying to hide anything. The budget is built on the recommendation of what you all adopted this morning, so that money--that \$25 fee was built into what became the denominator, and so when you divide the instructional, library, and research spending by that denominator, the percentages did what they did. That was on our sheet of paper--no debate--no question. We said, though, think about this for a minute. Think about the policy issues--suppose we don't follow that course of action that you all voted on and

adopted before lunch, then the denominator is a different number, and those percentages go up. Now have we spent one more dime on instruction? No. It's just the policy decision that we made with regard to how we funded Title IX--how it was going to impact instructional spending on a percentage basis--dollars were the same, didn't change a dime in spending. I don't think there's any debate about that."

Mr. Mercer commented, "The fact of the matter is the decision we made this morning went against what we said we were going to do last year. That's the bottom line, and we made that based upon a decision that something had to be done with Title IX. We had to step up and admit that fact, accept it and go on or not accept it and reverse course."

Regarding the funding for "Moving to the New Level...", Dr. Ramsey pointed out that because it was unknown where that money would actually end up being expended and because individual salary adjustments are not reflected on the classification/compensation system yet, those adjustments got distributed in other places; and they may end up getting spent differently. "A budget is nothing more than a plan, a forecast; we come back and audit it later and look to see how we actually spent it," Dr. Ramsey stated.

Dr. Meredith commented, "No one plays the game that we're trying to play. No one plays the game you're being forced to play. You go around the country as we do, and you talk to other institutions about how they look at the way they're spending money, no one has been forced into this game to deal with percentages like this. That's why we raised the questions that we did at the beginning. Why? Because things are not automatically going to fall nicely and neatly into little categories that have been prepared off in Washington someplace, when in fact, the very goals you set forth are being addressed, yet they don't play the percentage game. So now we have a war going on and there's confusion about whether or not we're doing it right, and other people are confused because we're trying to play a game with percentages in a category in Washington that everybody just makes their best interpretation on. Now, there's \$250,000 for New Level. It's all going for New Level. You passed New Level. What does New Level have to do with this institution? It's to improve the quality of this institution--mainly the academic quality of this institution and what happens here. That's what New Level accomplishes. The money is going toward that. It's not going to anything else--a quarter of a million

dollars for this next year straight into that. Now, unfortunately, it doesn't fit into neat little categories created in Washington, so the percentage looks bad. That's what Ray is saying, before it's over the percentages are going to look bad because you're going to end up putting some money into advising. Would everybody agree that advising helps what happens here, quality wise at this institution? Yet, the money you put into advising goes against the percentage--doesn't go into the instruction, research, or library percentage, so now that looks worse--we've done something bad, and it'll come out at the end of the year financial statement and show the wrong category, and everybody will say, well you violated what we were all about. Have we really? Have we really--no, we're accomplishing exactly one of your goals you put down. Simple, straightforward; does it fit into the neat little category? No, and that's the problem. We're in a situation here that people don't play, and we're being tied just like---we're having to play a game like everything fits into a neat little package, and the whole world operates under those neat little packages. The whole world does not. These are general categories to give you some general impressions about how people are spending their money. They are not meant to be exact, and people don't treat them as exact. We gave you what we've given in the last two years--lots of examples to tell you about how people treat them differently. That's why with the percentage game, we're going nuts. We look at your goals; we're trying to address the goals; and we look at percentage, and my goodness, here it only went up .8; yet most of the money went into that, and so some of you this time, wisely, said to us, why don't we try to get a clear picture of whether or not you're really on target. Let's take those monies that are being collected that you can't put into instruction, because they are earmarked, and let's pull those off, and let's look at what you're doing with the money with which you have some discretion. Are you giving more to academics or not? Clearly, we are. Clearly, we are; and yet, this confusion goes on because we're trying to play a game that no one intended to be played. That's why we all seem so frustrated, and you're frustrated, too, because it won't get clear. It's not going to get clear."

Dr. Mendel asked for clarification on whether library faculty would be treated as faculty or staff for purposes of compensation decisions. The President stated in the Budget Committee briefing that they would be treated as faculty.

Dr. Meredith indicated that the library faculty were concerned because they had

faculty rank that they would have a maximum placed on them, and other faculty do not have a maximum placed on them. A determination was made, as a policy issue, to relieve their maximum.

Dr. Haynes commented that faculty are on nine-month contracts. Librarians who are professional staff people, who have faculty rank, are on twelve-month contracts, so that's one of the obvious confusions. Dr. Haynes suggested that the librarians be given a choice if they wanted to be faculty members and be on nine-month contracts then they would be treated that way. We're trying to not have twelve-month full-time faculty appointments.

Mr. Preston moved adoption of the budget as presented. The motion was seconded and carried with Mr. Gray and Dr. Mendel voting nay.

Mr. Gray explained his vote as follows: "I'd like to explain my vote. I know that a lot of work has gone into this budget on the part of a lot of people over an extended period of time. When I vote no, I am concerned that the spending on academics is not at the level that it should be and is not in accordance with the budget resolution which addressed academic budgeting. Further, I would very much like to see a formula developed by the administration and presented to the Academic Committee of this Board, which would present to this Board, that will address the Board's desire to address academics in accordance with the Board of Regents' vision and the goals for 1996-97. I don't care what that format is as long as it is consistent from year to year, and we see a continued increase in the dollars going to academics, and I think at some point there should be a cap put on that, and I think that should be a part of this, but I think unless we put action to what we're doing, we're going to be continuing this same scenario year after year. Maybe it's only me that's messed up on it, but I think we really need to put something that is measurable and is specific where we can not have this same thing every year."

Ms. Gramling explained her vote as follows: "I'd like to abstain, and I'd like to explain my abstention, and that is, I think this Board needs to keep the resolution in mind. We have priorities, but this is the one priority that we've actually passed a resolution on. This is what we are very concerned about, and we need to keep that in mind whenever we vote here at this table."

Mr. Mercer noted that the last item on the Finance Committee Report is the recommendation for the approval of the capital construction projects as presented earlier by Dr. Ramsey.

Motion for approval of the recommended capital construction projects as presented was made by Ms. Loafman, seconded by Mr. Mudge, and carried.

AGENDA ITEM 6 - Recommendation for approval of a proposal to designate the existing technology and telecommunications area now headed by an assistant vice president within the Finance and Administration Division as a separate division of Information Technology to be headed by a Vice President for Information Technology

RECOMMENDATION

President Thomas C. Meredith recommends that the existing technology and telecommunications area now headed by an assistant vice president within the Finance and Administration Division be designated as a separate division of Information Technology to be headed by a Vice President for Information Technology. This area will be comprised of:

- Director, Academic Computing Services
- Director, Administrative Computing Services
- Director, Microcomputing Services
- Director, Center for Instructional Technology
- Director for Educational Telecommunications
 - Assistant Director, Educational Television
 - Assistant Director, Public Radio Services
- Director, Telephone Communications

BACKGROUND

The various computing and telecommunications areas which had previously reported to two different Vice Presidents were brought together as a single area to be headed by an assistant vice president by action of the Board of Regents in January of 1991. This alignment had been recommended by the 1990 university-wide strategic plan, Western XXI, which also identified access to computing resources and expansion of distance learning as strategic priorities for the institution. The viability and productivity of this organizational structure have been clearly demonstrated by the progress which has been achieved in the networking of the campus, the expansion of distance learning, and a number of other technological enhancements placing Western among an elite group of institutions leading in the deployment of information technology. The organizational structure has enabled more efficient management of human and financial resources including internal reallocations to more closely meet institutional priorities. It has also produced a networked campus realized for the most part within existing resources.

All of the institution's planning including Western XXI and Moving to a New Level have underscored the increasing strategic importance of information technology. In order to reflect the position of technology as a strategic resource, it is recommended that the existing area be elevated to the status of a division headed by a vice president. Many other institutions that have achieved or desire to achieve our level of technological development have already taken this action. This also further flattens the organization's structure by reducing the number of reporting levels. The reorganization will be accomplished without any additional resources.

Motion for approval of the recommendation to create a new area of Information and Technology as presented was made by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Mercer, and carried.

Dr. Robert Haynes, who is stepping down as Vice President for Academic Affairs and returning to the classroom was recognized for his many years (12) of good work. President Meredith stated, "Bob has always stood for high quality on this campus, has always pushed that and pursued that, and demanded that, and for all of his good work for this campus, we thank him for his good work."

Dr. Mendel requested that the minutes reflect that he wholeheartedly agree with the President's comments concerning Dr. Haynes.

AGENDA ITEM 7 - Recommendation for approval of personnel recommendations

Chairman Fischer presented the recommended personnel actions as outlined on pages 24-45 in the agenda packet and an addendum dated April 25, 1996. Motion for approval was made by Mr. Mercer, seconded by Mr. Mudge, and carried.

AGENDA ITEM 8 - Recommendation to authorize Western Kentucky University to implement its new optional retirement plan (ORP), effective July 1, 1996, and permit Western management to select providers based on the selection criteria identified by state statute

RECOMMENDATION

President Thomas C. Meredith recommends that the Western Kentucky University management and administration be authorized to implement its new optional retirement plan (ORP) effective July 1, 1996. Following the receipt of proposals, it is requested that Western management be permitted to select providers based on the selection criteria identified by state statute.

BACKGROUND

At its January 26, 1996, meeting the Board approved, in concept, an ORP as authorized by HB 405. The ORP is an alternative to membership in the Kentucky Teachers' Retirement System and enables participants to change employers without adversely affecting their retirement status. This is expected to benefit Western in its recruitment of new faculty and administrative staff. The ORP will only be available to individuals employed on or after the plan effective date.

The Department of Human Resources is currently engaged in preparing a request for proposals (RFP) which will be sent to potential providers. Following the receipt of proposals, two or three companies will be selected as providers of the ORP. The University will not incur any additional benefit cost under the ORP since total contributions are equivalent to those established by KTRS.

Having the ORP in place as of July 1, 1996, will enable new faculty and administrative staff to benefit from this new program. To avoid the necessity of a special meeting of the Board of Regents, it is requested that the Board delegate to Western management the authority to review responses to the RFP and to award contracts to the successful bidders with an effective date of July 1, 1996.

Dr. Mendel requested that, in pursuing this matter, since this is a faculty retirement benefit, the Faculty Senate Committee on Benefits and Welfare be consulted.

Motion for approval was made by Mr. Preston, seconded by Ms. Bale, and carried.

AGENDA ITEM 10 - President's Report

President Meredith reported that:

- **Mary Frances Bradley**, who wrote "*College Heights*" passed away within the last couple of weeks. "One of our traditions has left us, and I wanted you to be aware of that," Dr. Meredith stated. "*College Heights*" was

copyrighted in 1930 and was first performed at Chapel in 1925.

- Another major loss to the university family, **Dr. Charles Crume**, a long-time member of the faculty who retired about a year ago passed away this week. Dr. Crume drew the famous hand holding the towel that is used a lot.
- **Reorganization of the Finance and Administration area.** Information has been shared with the Board in the budget reviews about changes that are being implemented. Information will be distributed on campus shortly.
- **Press Conferences** recently have featured the total networking of the campus and the ground breaking for the Diddle Park. Approximately \$77,000 in private funds have come in to finance the building of that park. The park should be open by the time school starts in the fall.
- **Fire Alarms** - Every fire alarm system is up-to-date, fixed and running.
- **Tornado Warning System** is now in place just for the campus; hopefully the city and county will soon be able to do one. At such time as they develop their own, the two systems will be tied together.
- **President's Office** has been totally redone through the generosity of donations from Mr. Jim Brite, of Brite's Furniture.
- **An on-campus study** will be done this summer in terms of paper flow and in term of viability of reports and in terms of a whole long list of things that happens administratively on this campus to see what can be done to utilize time more efficiently. Dr. Meredith stated, "We continue to add things, the outside forces on this institution are enormous, and we keep adding to people, but we never take anything away. We just keep piling it on and piling it on, and given the cuts that we have made throughout this campus in the last four years and the continued piling on, I think we have an awful lot of people who are very, very close to burn out all across this campus, and I'm deeply distressed over that, and I'm hopeful that this study this summer will be something that will help relieve some of that and put people on track doing the kinds of things that really must be done and have to be done and get rid of some of the other things."

AGENDA ITEM 11 - Other Business

Mr. Mudge made a motion that directs the Executive Committee to examine and report back to the Board at the July 26 meeting the degree to which the University is complying with the resolution to increase funding toward the instruction area. The motion was seconded by Ms. Higdon.

Dr. Mendel asked why the Executive Committee would do that rather than the committee that was appointed to investigate the issue in the first place. Mr. Mudge felt it was a proper issue for the Executive Committee saying, "A resolution was passed, and the Executive Committee is there to function to examine the administration of the University."

Ms. Higdon encouraged the committee to examine the extent to which the intentions of the resolution comply with the percentage that we're going with stating, "I strong-heartedly believe that the computer instruction and the advisement are viable part

of instruction, and just because they don't fall into those categories, I don't think they should work against the resolution that the Board passed."

Mr. Mudge's motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 12 - Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Board, motion for adjournment was made by Ms. Loafman, seconded by Mrs. Bale. The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m.