Executive Committee met with the President last Thursday and discussed various matters....

Title IX  As you know, all universities are required to develop plans which will result in funding of women's sports to men's sports being proportional to the ratio of men to women on campus. Basically, what it means is that universities will no longer allowed to fund men's sports heavily and spend relatively little on women's sports. Needless to say, this is a rather expensive requirement. And so for some time I have been wondering how Western will fund this mandatory requirement.

In response to our question the President he indicated that he is getting a proposal ready to present at the May meeting of the Board of Regents. The President reported to us that he has already met with student leaders and briefed them on this matter, and they have agreed with this proposal.

After the meeting with the President there was concern among the members of the Executive Committee regarding the title IX proposal. I am sure that getting student leaders to endorse this proposal was not difficult. The question is how significant such agreement is. As Wendel Berry has observed to give a person a choice when they do not know its full consequences is not "a grant of freedom. It is a severe limitation on freedom." In short, the consequences of this decision will more far-reaching than the student leaders were aware, I am sure. We were told by the President that he had asked the student leaders not to discuss the matter until he made the proposal public.

After reflecting on this matter as members of the Executive Committee, I called a meeting on of the Executive Committee on Tuesday afternoon of this week. At that meeting it was decided that I should contact the President and invite him to make a presentation to the Senate with regard to the gender equity proposal. I sent him the following message:

"The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate is concerned about the proposed new student fees, and requests that you give a presentation outlining the proposal, with a question and answer session afterwards at the Faculty Senate on Thursday April 11, 1996. In your presentation it would be especially desirable to explain who would pay the fee (full-time and part-time? Off-campus?), how much revenue would be raised, what portion of the revenue would support Title IX and what portion would pay for telephone registration?

Let me know if you will be able to do this and if you need any equipment, such as an overhead projector and the like. AV"

The President's secretary responded for him, because the President is out of town. She said he could not attend our meeting today, but that she would relay the request to him. When I got her message, I indicated that we would be happy to have someone else who is informed about the proposal report for him, so that we would be able to get the information.

Our concern: The phasing in of a program meeting Title IX requirements is an expensive matter. How it is done is a major policy issue. While Western, like other universities, must comply with the law, there are different ways in which this can be done. There are two basic options: find new money for new women's programs or find the money internally by budget reallocations. And then there can be any combination of these two.

There are problems no matter which way one goes. If one looks for new money, there is really only one reliable source--student fees. Western has not had a significant increase in ticket income for its revenue sports for many years. So the logical option is student fees. But is it right to
ask students to foot the bill for funding additional women's sports? What benefit will these programs be to them? This is no minor question when you consider that we are talking about approximately half a million dollars a year (my estimate).

Finding the money internally to the university budget also has major problems. Right now the president asserts that the Board of Regents has decided to allot a certain percentage of the university's gross income to athletics (In spite of the fact that the Council of Higher Education is on record as saying that state funds are not to be used to fund intercollegiate athletics) and to raise this percentage will obviously have an impact on other university budgets. Whatever money is put into athletics is not available for admissions, recruitment, academic departments, etc.

The other option is that the money comes from internal reallocations within the athletic department.

My point is that a decision is about to be made, and it is a very significant one, and will have an enormous impact on Western in the long run. As such it is a matter that should be the focus of a campus-wide discussion. If students are going to bear the financial burden of these new programs, then they ought to have a say in the matter. If university funds are going to be used so that the percentage of the budget going to academic programs will be affected, then that should also be discussed ahead of time.

As matters now stand, we have been told by the President that he plans to present his proposal to the Board at the May 1st meeting. It will be too late for student and faculty input. There will not be any opportunity for discussion until the fall, by which time the policy will be in place, students will have paid the fee (if that proposal remains, etc.) In short, it will be too late.

I do not know what the President's intentions have been, but I can say the effect of his actions is that unless we can schedule a forum to discuss this matter, this very significant policy proposal will be presented to the Board of Regents without any discussion by faculty and students.

I am very concerned about this situation and I think the Senate should take action so that there is a discussion before the Board meets and takes up this matter.

Student Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount 1</th>
<th>Amount 2</th>
<th>Amount 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>670.00</td>
<td>772.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>854.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>110.50</td>
<td>790.00</td>
<td>900.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>840.00</td>
<td>955.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1996-1997  145.00 prop?  840.00?  985.00