The State Board of Regents met at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, June 28-30, 1973. Those present were:

**Members of State Board of Regents:**
- Mr. Redeker, President
- Mr. Bailey
- Mr. Baldridge
- Mrs. Collison
- Mr. Perrin
- Mrs. Petersen
- Mr. Shaw
- Mr. Wallace
- Mr. Zumbach

**Appointees to State Board of Regents:**
- Mr. Barber
- Mr. Brownlee
- Mr. Slife

**Office of State Board of Regents:**
- Executive Secretary Richey
- Mr. Caldwell
- Mr. McMurray
- Mr. Volm
- Pauline Van Ryswyk, Secretary

**University of Iowa:**
- President Boyd
- Vice President Chambers
- Vice Provost Hardin
- Provost Heffner
- Vice President Jolliffe
- Director Strayer
- Director Hawkins

**Iowa State University:**
- President Parks
- Vice President Christensen
- Vice President Hamilton
- Vice President Moore

**University of Northern Iowa:**
- President Kamerick
- Business Manager Jennings
- Provost Martin
- Director Kelly
- Vice President Stansbury

**Iowa School for the Deaf:**
- Superintendent Giangreco
- Business Manager Geasland

**Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School:**
- Superintendent Woodcock
- Business Manager Berry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 28</th>
<th>June 29</th>
<th>June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members of State Board of Regents</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointees to State Board of Regents</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of State Board of Regents</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Iowa</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa State University</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Northern Iowa</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa School for the Deaf</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School</strong></td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
<td>All Sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President Redeker called the meeting of the State Board of Regents to order at 9:10 a.m., Thursday, June 28, 1973. The following business pertaining to General or Miscellaneous items was transacted on Thursday, June 28, 1973.

President Redeker announced the board meeting will begin Friday, June 29, at 8:00 a.m.

REGENT MERIT SYSTEM PAY PLAN. The Board of Regents was requested to adopt, effective July 1, 1973, the proposed Board of Regents Merit System Pay Plan as amended including the proposed rules for the administration of the plan with the understanding that the proposed pay grades for Custodians I and II will be reviewed following agreements reached with the Federal Wage and Hour authorities and, further, that the proposed salaries of specific classes to which objection was made at the public hearing will be reviewed and, if such review results in higher proposed pay grades, such increases will be retroactive to July 1, 1973.

President Redeker commented that there have been several modifications to the pay plan since the public hearing (June 22) and stated to those in attendance that the first item on the agenda was consideration of the modified plan to be presented by Executive Secretary Richey.

Mr. Richey reported the Board of Regents held a public hearing on the proposed pay plan on June 22, 1973, as required by law. Approximately 40 persons made oral or written presentations and 200-400 people attended the hearing. The comments and objections to the proposed plan related to the following matters:
1. The validity of local wage survey data.
2. Sex discrimination.
4. The inflexibility provided in the plan in terms of progression in pay steps as well as the maximum amount allowed for specific classes.
5. The appeal process for classifications.
6. The lack of shift differential pay, the lack of longevity pay.
7. Objections both to the full range pay grades as being too long and to the short range pay grades as being too short.
8. The provision for pay differences between the various institutions.
9. Objections to the pay grades recommended for various specific classifications.

Mr. Richey's present action on the modified pay plan was as follows:

I. Implementation:

The proposed policies for implementation of the new Pay Plan do not take the unusually rapid growth in cost of living of the last several months fully into consideration. The proposed policies provide as follows:

1. No employee will be paid less than the minimum rate of the pay grade to which his or her class of position is allocated.

2. No employee will suffer a reduction in pay on July 1, 1973, as a result of the implementation of the Pay Plan.

3. Rates of employees who are presently paid above the maximum of their new pay grades will be identified as "red circle" rates. Employees whose rates are red circled will receive no increase in pay in their present classification for as long as their rate exceeds the maximum of the grade. (It is recognized that red-circling rates is a temporary procedure and plans will be made to eliminate such rates.)

It is further recommended that implementation of the pay plan guarantee that no employee including "red circled" rates shall receive less than a 2.5% increase in pay effective July 1, 1973.

Mr. Richey stated this represents any modification from the plan as it was originally proposed prior to the public hearing.

The purpose of this additional recommendation is to offset partially the effects of the unusually high rate of inflation mentioned earlier. It should be reiterated that it is the Board's intent to eliminate red-circle rates as quickly as possible and that no further increases for such positions in subsequent years will be granted for as long as their rate exceeds the maximum of the pay grade.
The fiscal effect of the recommendation that no employee receive less than a 2.5% salary increase during implementation of the proposed new Pay Plan is not great. It is anticipated to cost between $15,000 and $20,000 at the University of Iowa, $23,000 at Iowa State University and less than $4,000 at the University of Northern Iowa. Only one position is affected, to my knowledge, at the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School and none are expected to be affected at the Iowa School for the Deaf. Adoption of this policy would provide pay increases to a large number of employees who would otherwise receive no increase next year during the transition to the new Pay Plan.

II. Cost of Living Increases

The proposed Pay Plan discussed at the public hearing did not take into consideration growth in cost of living other than as reflected in the wage survey data of January-February 1972. It is anticipated that the proposed plan of implementation proposed above will offset partially the effects of inflation.

Mr. Richey stated the average increase under the plan will range between 5 1/2% and 6% for non-academic employees. The total increase of the merit plan plus the increases provided by the legislature will average between 8% and 9% for employees covered under the merit system in 1973-74. This percentage is the best in anyone's memory.

The salary increases provided by the bill passed during the closing hours of the legislature will be in addition to those proposed in the pay plan. Such increases will range from $312 annually to the lower paid employees to $0 for those earning more than $10,000.

Mr. Richey emphasized that no employee shall receive less than the minimum pay for his class which was sometimes a 25% increase to get employees up to the new minimum.
III. The Wage Survey

The Board of Regents Merit System Rules, paragraph 4.1, state that the pay plan "will be developed to reflect the relative difficulty and responsibility of the work involved in the various classes, what is paid for similar work by other employers in the pertinent labor market, and the availability of funds." (Emphasis added)

A "Wage Survey" is the technique utilized to determine what other employers are paying for similar work.

In planning to make a "wage survey" the Interinstitutional Personnel Committee needed to make the following decisions:

1. What positions, or jobs, shall be surveyed?
2. Which organizations should be surveyed?
3. What data, or information, was to be requested?

Positions to be surveyed:

It was determined that the wage survey would cover selected "key" or benchmark jobs within the Regents system. A "key" job is, by definition, a job common to the industry or locality, which can be easily described, and with a current wage strongly influenced by market conditions.

The Interinstitutional Personnel Committee selected 32 jobs as key jobs to be included in the wage survey.

Organizations surveyed:

The following guidelines were used to select those organizations to be requested to participate in the wage survey:

1. The organization must have an established personnel office, providing some assurance that the data obtained would have a high degree of credibility;
2. The organization must employ 250 individuals or more;
3. The organization must utilize a cross section of the key jobs being surveyed and employ a substantial number of employees in jobs being surveyed; and
4. The organizations selected must employ a substantial number of the total work force in the community, excluding the surveying institution, thus assuring a representative sample of the wages paid for the key jobs.

Some discussion was held regarding the boundaries of the labor market. It was felt by some that the wage survey should include those organizations which recruited and drew employees from the labor market utilized by a Regent's Institution. This might mean including organizations outside the local community.

However, it was also felt that justification for wage differences between the Universities could only be based on a community wage survey.

The decision was therefore made to use only the local, or community wage survey data, even though additional information from organizations outside the community was available.
Regent Zumbach stated to the board that after having done research regarding future surveys he felt more consideration should be given to employee input. Mr. Barber indicated support of Regent Zumbach's comment and stated that both academic and non-academic personnel should be consulted.

Regent Shaw stated he had no objection to the suggestions of Regent Zumbach and Mr. Barber but added "you probably aren't going to get uniform recommendations and input".

MOTION: Mr. Zumbach moved the board approve the concept that when future geographic labor surveys are in the planning stages that employees and/or impartial independent third parties be solicited for input and to help determine the validity of the proposed survey. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion.

Regent Collison suggested that employee input be submitted early.

VOTE ON MOTION: The motion passed with all ayes.

Mr. Richey continued with his review of the wage surveys:

The Information Requested:

It was further decided that each organization surveyed would be requested to provide the following data on each of the jobs surveyed.

1. The minimum and maximum of the wage range for the key job, with an indication of current effective minimums (e.g. hiring rates) and maximums if different from the established range;
2. The number and distribution of employees in the range;
3. The normal length of time for progression from the minimum to the maximum of the range;
4. The amount of increase, if any, scheduled or anticipated for implementation in 1973; and
5. Any information regarding the amount and applicability of "shift differentials".
The Survey Instrument:

Following the above guidelines, the key jobs were identified, organizations were selected to be surveyed and a survey instrument was developed. (See App. I)

Each Regent's Institution used this instrument to survey the organizations in it's community during February, 1973.

Survey Data:

Figure 1 shows the coverage of the wage survey. For example, at Iowa State University we surveyed 47% of the positions covered by the Merit System. The organizations included in the survey represented 7324 employees, approximately 30% of the total work force in Story County, excluding those employed by Iowa State.

Analysis of Data Received:

The data obtained in the wage survey was used to calculate weighted minimums, midpoint, maximum, and averages for each surveyed job. Weighted figures were determined by use of the following formula:

\[
\text{Weighted minimum} = \frac{\text{sum of each company's minimum times number of positions they have in that job}}{\text{total number of positions all companies reported in that job}}
\]

Weighted midpoints, maximums, and averages are calculated using the same formula and substituting corresponding figures.

Conclusions:

The results of a wage survey must be used with discretion, as the reliability of the data may vary from key job to key job based on the number of employees surveyed and the particular organizations responding to the survey on those key jobs.

The wage survey should not be used alone, but must be considered with other relevant information to determine the appropriate wage grade for a job's classification.

We have surveyed "direct wages" only and at this time have not attempted to survey the "total" wage paid for a class of work which would include all indirect compensation (vacations, holidays, insurance, and other benefits).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Employees in &quot;key&quot; jobs</th>
<th># Employees Covered by Merit System</th>
<th>% of Covered Positions Surveyed</th>
<th>Total Employment</th>
<th>% of Total Employment Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of I</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Position in Organization Survey</th>
<th># Position in Surveyed</th>
<th>% of Position Surveyed</th>
<th>Estimated Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of I</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>7,324</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>21,074</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Story County  
** Johnson County  
*** Waterloo-Cedar Falls area
IV. Sex Discrimination

Charges that the proposed pay plan involves discrimination on the basis of sex were made at the public hearing on the basis that "predominantly female classes" were paid less than "predominantly male classes", and that proposed differences in pay did not properly reflect differences in the minimum qualifications required of certain "female classes" such as secretary as compared to the minimum qualifications required of other "male classes". It also was asked if affirmative action officers had reviewed the proposed classification and compensation plans.

Efforts have been made by personnel and affirmative action officers to establish minimum required qualifications that are directly related to performance required on the job, and general requirements such as "high school graduation" have essentially been eliminated. Further and much broader attention is being given to the subjects of testing and test validation and other issues including job classification (and minimum requirements) and performance appraisal. As has been reported previously to the Board, a comprehensive report on the operations of the Merit System and Equal Employment Opportunity and affirmative action is planned for early fall.

Regarding reference made to "predominantly male" and "predominantly female" classes, it should be noted that both Merit System and Equal Employment Opportunity principles prohibit discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, and all classes are open to applicants of either sex. It also should be explained regarding statements made concerning relations between proposed pay ranges and minimum required qualifications, that in job evaluation minimum required qualifications are only one of several factors which influence the worth of a job. Under the equal pay provisions of the Wage and Hour law, illegal discrimination exists only when the duties, responsibilities, effort and requirements of positions are similar but pay differs on the basis of sex. The principle of equal pay does not per se prohibit recognition of rates paid by comparable employers for similar work.

While the restriction of funds obviously limited what we would like to be able to do, and in spite of allegations that the proposed plan emphasizes discrimination that exists in society, and it can be noted that greater than normal adjustments are incorporated for food service classes at UNI and ISU, for lower level clerical classes at ISU, and for Nurse Aide-Orderly and Licensed Practical Nurse classes at SUI.

V. Red-Circled Rates

Employees whose present pay is above that of the maximum of the pay grade to which his or her class of position is assigned, is described as having a pay rate that is "red-circled". It had been reported previously that employees whose rates were red-circled would receive no increase in salary for as long as their rate exceeded the maximum of the grade. However, present plans now call for an exception to that policy in regard only to this initial implementation of the pay plan.

At the hearing on the pay plan, reference was made several times to the proposed pay plan as a "three-year plan". It is important to note that under previously
adopted Merit rules, the pay plan must be reviewed at least annually, and adjustments can be made, subject to required approval, at any time. It is our plan to give priority to the review of classes in which there are numbers of red-circled rates, and it should be noted that any reclassifications (and related changes in pay) based on duties and responsibilities as of July 1, 1973, will be made retroactive to July 1, 1973. Such reclassifications could reduce the number of red-circled rates.

The greatest number of red-circled rates in any one class occurs in the classification of Custodian. As has been reported previously these rates have to some extent been frozen pending the resolution of matters involving equal pay provisions under the Wage and Hour law. While a decision has been reached at the University of Iowa, revisions in class descriptions proposed as a result of the decision are presently being reviewed by Wage and Hour authorities, and decisions following similar investigations at ISU and UNI have not yet been announced. On completion of these investigations we will review the issue as it relates to classification, class descriptions and pay grade allocation, and will make appropriate recommendations which will include the matter of retroactivity regarding any proposed changes.

VI. Classification Appeals

Under Merit Rules, the final appeal on position classification is made to a "qualified classification review committee appointed by the Board of Regents". As presently constituted, the review committee consists of three resident directors, excluding resident director at the institution where the appeal occurred. Because of concerns voiced at the public hearing regarding the impartiality of the review committee as presently established, it is agreed that a change in the make-up of the committee be proposed, and recommendations in this regard will be made for consideration by the Board at its July meeting.

It also might be repeated that any reclassifications and resulting pay adjustments, on the basis of duties and responsibilities in effect as of July 1, 1973, will be made retroactive to July 1, 1973.

Regent Collison raised the question as to whether the committee will inform the department heads and supervisors of the flexibilities that are allowed for grievance so that the person who is making the grievance would be completely aware of the different options that he could exercise. President Redeker questioned whether Regent Collison was referring to the options exercised by the employee and Regent Collison replied she was. Regent Collison also raised the question that if they feel their relationship is such that they could not appear before the review committee, could they appeal to any other person?
Mr. Volm replied that under the rules on grievance appeals there is some flexibility for varied institutional procedures but the requirements state that the first step must involve the employee and his or her immediate supervisor and the last step involves a hearing before an impartial appeals board.

Regent Zumbach asked if, for example, the Secretary III's would like additional items added to their job description, what would the procedure be? Mr. Volm replied that requested revisions would be reviewed by the institutional personnel committee.

Regent Petersen stated she understood that there will be a constant review process going on that will be indirectly related to the appeals process. She stated there will be changes in the process, not only in the appeals process, but when management from all levels responds to changing situations.

Regent Bailey commented that if pursued to ultimate the hearing body would be interinstitutional.

Mr. Richey continued his review of issues related to the proposed pay plan:


The problem of shift differentials has been reported previously to the Board. As was noted, existing institutional policies range from a general shift differential policy applicable to all classes, to varying policies for specific classes, to no provision for payment of shift premiums. Because of the broad implications involved in the development of a uniform policy regarding shift differential, it is recommended that, pending further interinstitutional study, no provision for shift differential pay be adopted at this time, but that the amount of such premiums presently paid be added to and considered a part of the base salary of employees who presently receive shift premiums.

At the public hearing proposals were made for longevity pay, in addition to salaries provided within established pay ranges, for service increments of 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 years. It was stated that such a program would provide recognition and reward for long service employees. Because we believe that efforts and funds directed to getting and maintaining the pay plan at a current and competitive level will benefit all employees to the greatest extent possible, a longevity pay program such as requested at the hearing is not proposed at this time.
While requests that employing institutions pay the full cost of hospitalization insurance and parking are not directly related to the pay plan and its administration, they obviously involve the additional expenditure of funds. Because of limitations on the availability of funds at this time, no changes in present policies regarding employer contributions to these programs are proposed.

Objections to the use of two salary schedules (full range and short range) as incorporated in the proposed plan were voiced at the hearing, and recommendations were made that all employees be paid on the full range, so that ample opportunity for salary advancement within a pay grade would be provided. Recommendations also were made that all employees be paid on the proposed short range so that they might move to the maximum of the range in a shorter period of time. As previously reported, shorter ranges are commonly used for production and related jobs, in contrast to longer ranges for clerical, administrative and similar jobs because of differences needed to reflect the range of employee productivity on the job. While we continue to recommend the concept of full and short ranges as proposed, we recognize the need to review continually the assignment of classes to full or short ranges, and may from time to time recommend changes for specific classes.

Mr. Richey commented there is opposition both to the long and short range salary schedule and added that a short range has been recommended for those classes where a person can reach an optimum level of production relatively quickly.

VIII. Recommendations regarding the pay grade allocation of specific classes.

In a memorandum to the Board dated June 15 it was indicated that the allocations proposed for four classes (Architectural Assistant, Cook I, Custodian and Greenhouse Caretaker) were being reviewed. At the public hearing specific requests were made verbally or by written statement for a review of the pay grade allocations of the following classes:

- Library Assistants
- High-Voltage Electricians
- Sewing Machine Operator
- Greenhouse Caretaker
- Assistant Foreman
- Pipefitters
- X-Ray Technicians
- Custodian I

A review of all of these classes is in process and a report thereon including recommendations will be made to the Board as soon as the study is completed.

Changes in the wage schedule from full range to short range are hereby recommended for the following classes: Bus Driver I, Bus Driver II, Gardener, and Custodian, Lead. These changes are in accord with the principle followed in allocating other classes to short ranges.
IX. Summary of Changes Proposed After the Public Hearing

1. Amendment in the policy on implementation (see I. on page 2) so that no employee including those whose rates are "red-circled" will receive less than a 2.5% increase in pay on July 1, 1973.

2. A change in the allocation of the following classes from full-range to short range: Bus Driver I, Bus Driver II, Gardener, and Custodian, Lead.

Regent Bailey questioned Mr. Richey as to how the proposed pay plan affects the general budget. He stated the Board Office has kept the budgets in mind during the whole process and it is reasonably close to the budgets approved by the legislature. Iowa State University got funds from additional sources on an emergency basis because it has so many classes that were raised to the minimum. Mr. Richey went on to comment that the board requested 6 1/2% increase and received funding for 5%.

Regent Collison raised the question as to whether the classification plan actually takes into consideration part-time employees as far as raises are concerned. Mr. Richey stated part-time employees are included.

President Redeker raised the question of alleged pay inequities involving library assistants. He stated if this is a result of a purely geographical survey we should opt more for comparison of job requirements as opposed to the geographical survey results. President Redeker encouraged Mr. Volm to do more research in this respect. Mr. Volm responded that these points will be considered and followed up.

Regent Baldridge commented that in the board's presentation to the Internal Revenue Service there will need to be some expectation and rationale for going beyond wage guidelines.

Regent Shaw responded by stating this is a question of knowing what kind of flexibility we have. We have set a number of dollars to deal with and we
have been experiencing cost of living at a 7% annual rate. He questioned whether we have the flexibility to, for example, put a ceiling on all increases and if so, how many dollars it would produce. Regent Shaw stated these are not immediate but future problems.

Mr. Richey stated that there was flexibility to establish a minimum increase but that would probably create problems in terms of equity although it would save money. One of the major costs in this thing is the cost of increasing everybody to the new minimum recommended. It costs $825,000 to move people to new minimum.

Regarding pay grade allocations at IBSSS, Superintendent Woodcock reaffirmed his contention that these allocations should be the same as made at UNI and cited the 1973 Administrative Management Society survey to show that wages in Cedar Rapids are similar or higher than wages in the Waterloo area.

Mr. Richey commented that the AMS survey was conducted much later this year than in previous years and there were 15 fewer companies in the survey than in past years and among the 15 not included were some of the large and high paying employers of the community.

Regent Petersen stated that "survey taking is less than an exact science" but for our purposes one of the best instruments we have to use. Taking into consideration that the surveys are not perfect, the information does prove useful. She queried of Superintendent Woodcock the effect with regard to their total budget.

Superintendent Woodcock stated their total preliminary budget is based on total study of the institution and there appears to be no problem with the recommendations he is making in terms of funding. He stated they are getting
more use out of their money for example by changing the night watchmen positions to custodial positions.

Regent Petersen commented that "to fund this we are adding, changing and starting from the grass roots total staff involvement".

Superintendent Woodcock also added that the school has eliminated 1 1/2 teaching positions in the secondary schools and added two teachers in the primary area.

Regent Collison questioned the reaction of house parents being reduced to a 40 hour work week and Superintendent Woodcock stated their income is reduced unless the base salary was changed. He also added that the pay scale for house parents proposed by the Board Office and IBSSS vary greatly.

Superintendent Woodcock stated the responsibility for someone else's child and making decisions in emergency situations is very important work.

Regent Collison then questioned whether there is any anticipated change in the job description or in the training of the house parent. She also asked whether any training in counseling is included in house parent qualifications.

Superintendent Woodcock stated that it is recommended that house parents have two years of college or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

Employee Comments on Merit Pay Plan

Employees were then given an opportunity to comment on the proposed pay plan. Eleven different persons offered comment.
President Redeker first requested comments on the cost of living increase.

It was stated that the Board of Regents as employers are subject to various legal requirements. She questioned whether board members understood what "red circle rate" means or whether they are relying on others.

Another university representative from the Anatomy Department of the University of Iowa stated the cost of living increase barely covers the cost of inflation.

President Redeker then requested any comments concerning the geographical wage survey.

A representative of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees commented that when a survey among companies is taken in a geographical situation smaller than the university system it seems unlikely a fair situation would exist. The companies surveyed are not really representative of the university situation. Regent Shaw questioned this representative and asked what he felt the answer was and the representative stated collective bargaining is the only answer.

President Redeker then opened up the floor for discussion on salary surveys.

A University of Northern Iowa employee stated building trades employers were never surveyed. Their rates were never included. He recommended the board take an impartial survey such as the U.S. Department of Labor does which will reflect the actual facts.

President Redeker then opened the floor for comments on red circle positions but there were none.
President Redeker asked if there were comments on the appeal procedure.

A representative commented the appeal procedure is not fair because often times you appeal to the same people who initially made the decision. President Redeker stated there will be a review of this matter.

John Walton, UNI, stated he didn't understand how shift differential is not justified in the pay plan. He asked how shift differential can be eliminated when it is paid in every other area.

Mr. Richey stated that a uniform shift differential premium policy is not included in the proposed pay plan because of the cost factor, but noted that the matter would be given serious consideration in the future.

A University Hospital representative stated employees need some incentive to encourage them to work the night shift or most would prefer the day shift.

A representative stated that the board places employees below other things in the priority list and employees should be first priority.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved the board adopt the Regents Merit System Pay Plan as amended including the proposed rules for the administration of the plan with the understanding that the proposed pay grades for Custodians I and II will be reviewed following agreements reached with the Federal Wage and Hour authorities and further that the proposed salaries of specific classes to which objection was made at the public hearing will be reviewed and if such review results in higher proposed pay grades, such increases will be retroactive to July 1, 1973. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion.

Regent Collison questioned Mr. Richey whether there will be an opportunity to review the appeal procedure and Mr. Richey stated it will be reviewed at the July meeting.
VOTE ON MOTION:  The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION:  Mrs. Petersen moved the board approve the classification descriptions for use in implementing the Merit System Compensation Plan subject to review as requested on June 22, 1973.  Mr. Wallace seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.  The minutes of the May 10-11, 1973 meeting were approved as corrected.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL COORDINATION.  Dr. Martin introduced two representatives of the Regents Committee on Educational Relations at this meeting.  Those present were Dean of Admissions Walter Cox, University of Iowa and Professor James P. Sandrock, University of Iowa.  The board was requested to approve the area schools for state aid for 1972-73 as named on the letter dated May 14, 1973 from Daryl Pendergraft, Chairman of the Regents Committee on Educational Relations to Dr. Martin which follows:

At its meeting on Thursday, May 10, 1973, the Regents Committee on Educational Relations approved the recommendations of the State Department of Public Instruction relative to the Area Community Colleges as indicated below:

Area II - North Iowa Area Community Colleges - Mason City
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team in 1974-1975 school year.

Area III - Iowa Lakes Community College - Estherville - Emmetsburg
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1975-1976 school year.

Area V - Iowa Central Community College - Fort Dodge - Webster City, Eagle Grove
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1973-1974 school year.

Area VI - Iowa Valley Community College - Marshalltown, Iowa Falls
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1974-1975 school year.

Area IX - Eastern Iowa Community College - Davenport, Muscatine, Clinton
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1976-1977 school year.
Area X - Kirkwood Community College - Cedar Rapids
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team in the school year 1973-1974.

Area XI - Des Moines Area Community College - Ankeny, Boone
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1973-1974 school year.

Area XIII - Iowa Western Community College - Council Bluffs, Clarinda
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1976-1977 school year.
This institution is also to be revisited by a special team consisting of two representatives of the State Department of Public Instruction and one from the Regents institutions during the 1974-1975 school year to assess the degree of progress toward fulfilling the recommendations of the evaluation report prepared during the 1971-1972 school year.

Area XIV - Southwestern Community College - Creston
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1975-1976 school year.

Area XV - Indian Hills Community College - Ottumwa, Centerville
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1976-1977 school year.

Area XVI - Southeastern Community College - Burlington, Keokuk
Approval to be continued. To be revisited by an evaluation team during the 1976-1977 school year.

During the 1972-1973 school year there were no evaluation visits scheduled. However, a member of the Regents Committee on Educational Relations accompanied the representative of the State Department in a visit to each of the Area Schools, and Vocational-Technical Schools. This was done at the invitation of the State Department of Public Instruction, and approved by the Executive Committee of the Area Schools. The members of the Regents Committee were pleased with the progress being made, especially the obvious efforts to strengthen those areas that had been called to their attention by the evaluation team visits of the last couple of years. This pattern of having a member of the Regents Committee accompany the State Department representative in the annual visits to those schools which are not scheduled for a full-scale evaluation visit in a given year will be continued.
Regent Petersen commented there is an increased amount of communication between the Department of Public Instruction and the Board of Regents.

Regent Perrin commented it is important to understand that by law we are required to participate in this inspection and evaluation and we have to approve these schools as far as the transfer programs are concerned. He also added it is a fine example of the kind of cooperation developed between the Department of Public Instruction, the area schools and the Board of Regents.

**MOTION:** Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the area schools for state aid for 1972-73 as listed above. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR POST HIGH SCHOOL.** Regent Perrin presented an oral report on the June Coordinating Council meeting in which he stated a comprehensive plan is being developed by the Office for Planning and Programming in regard to the publication of a guide as to committees and boards that are operating in the educational field in Iowa. This guide tells where the problem should be taken. It will be available to each Board of Regents member. He also noted the council discussed additional research work that may be carried on through funds by HEW and that the council recommend to HEFC that an update of the Midwest Research Institute’s work on enrollment and attendance be carried out.

Regent Perrin also added that President Kamerick was elected as chairman of the Coordinating Council and L. C. Smith, President of Westmar, was elected vice president.
The council also announced additional assessments will not be made this year.

Regent Petersen noted that the next Coordinating Council meeting will be in September.

APPOINTMENT TO STATE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND RADIO FACILITY BOARD. The board was requested to approve the reappointment of Robert F. Ray, Dean of Extension at the University of Iowa to the State Educational Television and Radio Facility Board. His term expired June 30, 1973. He has been chairman of the board since its establishment. The term of office is three years. The Board of Regents was advised that the State Educational Television and Radio Facility Board may have problems with a quorum unless the Board of Regents acts on this impending vacancy at the June meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved that Dr. Robert F. Ray be reappointed to the State Educational Television and Radio Facility Board, as of July 1, 1973, for a three year term. Mr. Baldridge seconded the motion.

Regent Perrin stated Dr. Ray has served the board with exceptional service in the past.

VOTE ON MOTION: The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS, 1973 SESSION. The board was presented a summary of major legislative actions. A complete copy of this report is on file in the Board Office.

Mr. Richey reported the legislature had a fairly good session and the Board of Regents received very little adverse legislation.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY. The board was requested to approve the appointment of the following persons to serve
on the Interinstitutional Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity:

- U of I - Dr. Cecelia Foxley - Affirmative Action Officer
- U of I - Floating Representative
- ISU - Dr. Edwin G. Lewis - Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
- ISU - Mr. Warren Madden - Assistant Vice President for Business and Finance
- UNI - Mr. Worrie Hart - Director of Educational Opportunity Programs and Special Services
- UNI - Mrs. Jo Ann Cummings - Assistant Dean of Students
- ISD - Mr. Burnet Schumacher - Director of Personnel
- IBSSS - Mr. Al Nimmer - Director of Personnel
- Board Office - Mr. Roger Maxwell

The Board Office reported:

At its May, 1973 meeting the Board approved the reorganization of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The provisions of the new Executive Order on equal employment opportunity require a coordinated effort in achieving affirmative action and equal employment opportunities both within the institutions and by vendors, suppliers and contractors.

The presidents, superintendents and Executive Secretary recommend these persons for appointment. President Boyd has requested that the additional University of Iowa member be a "floating representative" in order that the expertise of said representative(s) can be called upon as the need arises. President Parks has indicated that Mr. Charles Samuels, newly appointed Affirmative Action Officer at ISU, will replace Dr. Lewis when Mr. Samuels officially assumes his duties in this capacity.

Mr. Richey stated that although the Board Office will have one appointee he plans to sit in on the meetings occasionally, also.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the appointments of persons listed above to serve on the Interinstitutional Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Regent Perrin requested clarification of the "floating representative" from the University of Iowa. Mr. Richey stated the president of the university designates the floating representative.
Regent Perrin suggested other institutions use floating representatives on their committees also, since this idea has considerable merit.

VOTE ON MOTION: The motion passed unanimously.

LIABILITY INSURANCE. The board was requested to (a) decide whether to purchase officers and directors insurance for errors and omissions and (b) if answer to (a) is affirmative, is coverage to be for selected Board Office personnel and the board itself or is it to be for a specified number of institutional officers as well or (c) renew request for report from Insurance Committee for a broad study of liability insurance.

The Board Office reported:

In order to provide the Board with specific information on the cost of insuring officers and directors, the policy including endorsement which was purchased in November, 1972 by the University of Northern Iowa has been used by the Board Office as the basis for a preliminary quotation by the insurance company. Excerpts are quoted from the policy as follows:

1. Insuring Clause

This policy shall pay on behalf of each and every person who was or now is or may hereafter be a Director or Officer of the Corporation who is included in the meaning of those terms as defined in Clause 2(a) of this Policy (who are hereinafter individually or collectively sometimes called the "Insureds") loss (as hereinafter defined) arising from any claim or claims which may be made against the Insureds, jointly or severally, during the policy period by reason of any Wrongful Act (as hereinafter defined) in their respective capacities of Directors or Officers.

2. Definitions

(c) The term "loss" shall mean any amount an Insured is obligated to pay in respect of his legal liability, whether actual or asserted, for a Wrongful Act (as defined in (d) of this Clause), and subject to the applicable limits and conditions of this policy, shall include damages, judgments, settlements and costs,
charges and expenses incurred in the defense of actions, suits or proceedings and appeals therefrom; provided always that such subject of loss shall not include fines or penalties imposed by law or other matters which may be deemed uninsurable under the law pursuant to which this policy shall be construed.

(d) The term "Wrongful Act" shall mean any breach of duty, neglect, error, misstatement, misleading statement, omission or other act done or wrongfully attempted by the Insureds or any of the foregoing so alleged by any claimant or any matter claimed against them solely by reason of their being such Directors or Officers of the Corporation.

4. Exclusions

The Company shall not be liable to make any payment in connection with any claim made against the Insureds:

(a) for libel or slander;

(b) based upon or attributable to their gaining in fact of any personal profit or advantage to which they were not legally entitled;

(c) for the return by the Insureds of any remuneration paid to the Insureds without the previous approval of the stockholders of the Corporation which payment without such previous approval shall be held by the Courts to have been illegal;

(d) for an accounting of profits in fact made from the purchase or sale by the Insureds of securities of the Corporation within the meaning of Section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and amendments thereto or similar provisions of any state statutory law or common law;

(e) brought about or contributed to by the dishonesty of the Insureds; however, notwithstanding the foregoing the Insureds shall be protected under the terms of this policy as to any claims upon which suit may be brought against them, by reason of any alleged dishonesty on the part of the Insureds, unless a judgment or other final adjudication thereof adverse to the Insureds shall establish that acts of active and deliberate dishonesty committed by the Insureds with actual dishonest purpose and intent were material to the cause of action so adjudicated;

(f) based on or attributable to any failure or omission on the part of the Insureds to effect and maintain insurance;

(g) which, at the time of happening of such loss, is insured by any other existing valid policy or policies under which payment of the loss is actually made, except in respect of any excess beyond the amount or amounts of payments under such other policy or policies;
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(h) for which the Insureds are entitled to indemnity under any policy or policies in force previous hereto;

(i) for which the Insureds shall be indemnified by the Corporation for damages, judgments, costs, charges and expenses incurred in connection with the defense of any action, suit or proceeding to which the Insureds may be a party or which they may be threatened or in connection with any appeal therefrom, pursuant to the law, common or statutory, or the Charter or By-Laws of the Corporation duly effective under law, which determines and defines such rights of indemnity.

NOTE: The wrongful act of any Insured shall not be imputed to any other Insured for the purpose of determining the applicability of the Exclusions enumerated in this Clause 4.

Endorsements include:

Exclusion of Bodily Injury Endorsement

"It is agreed that this policy shall not apply to and the Company shall not be liable to make any payment in connection with any claim made or suit brought against the Insured for any damages, direct or consequential, arising from bodily injury, sickness or death of any person."

Retention

The Company is to pay 100% of loss and costs in lieu of 95%. (Paraphrased)

Limits of liability:

$1,000,000 for each occurrence with a retention of $2,500.

A second policy is provided (Reimbursement for Directors and Officers Policy) to protect the innocent members in a lawsuit and cannot be cancelled by the insurance company.

Personnel to be considered for coverage include members of the Board of Regents, the Executive Secretary, Compliance Officer,_ERIT System Coordinator, and for institutional personnel, presidents, superintendents, vice presidents, deans, heads of departments, directors of organizational units, assistants and associates as appropriate, and members of governing boards or councils.

Authority is provided in Chapter 517A of Liability Insurance for Public Employees for purchase and payment of premiums on liability, personal injury and property damage insurance covering all officers, proprietary functions and employees. The form and liability limits are subject to approval by the Attorney General. The policy purchased by the University of Northern Iowa was approved by Mr. Leo Baker.
An interinstitutional committee has been studying the question of liability risks and suitable insurance coverage therefor. It is anticipated that the report will be completed and submitted to the board this fall. Committee members prepared a list of questions on the tort claims act and Mr. Howard Sokol's response to those questions is available in the Board Office. You will note that Mr. Sokol points out that the Regents system is not financially vulnerable but individual officers may be sued whether or not the claim has merit. He feels however that the risk to individuals is not large and that the cost of purchasing the liability insurance should be weighed against the estimated risks. The annual premium for the coverage of the board, selected Board Office and institutional personnel would range from $10,000 to $15,000 if annual premiums are purchased and from $25,000 to $35,000 for three year prepaid premiums. If those individuals covered were restricted to the board and three Board Office employees, the executive secretary, the merit coordinator, and the compliance officer, the annual premium would run from $4,000 to $7,000 and a three year prepaid premium would run from $10,000 to $15,000.

The Board Office budget did not include an item of this nature. The ability to finance the annual payment of $4,000 to $7,000 for the board and the Board Office only would depend upon salary savings for fiscal year 1973-74. A three year prepaid premium costing from $10,000 to $15,000 is out of the question in terms of the Board Office budget. The only real alternative in terms of immediate coverage would be to cover both board and institutional personnel and distribute the cost among the universities and the Board Office as well as the special schools. The three year prepaid premiums have obvious savings, which should be utilized if such insurance is to be purchased.

Regent Bailey stated the exclusion of libel and slander from the coverage would be quite undesirable. He added that is definitely an area which should be covered.

Regent Bailey questioned President Kamerick as to whether their coverage provides coverage for the board in all its activities and President Kamerick replied it doesn't. Regent Bailey commented additional work needs to be done on this and assumed the board would not like being covered under five separate policies.

Regent Petersen stated that so far in her experience the risk as an individual is not large but it may be in the future. While some of the problems are very worrisome to us and some of our decisions weigh quite heavily, the
personal financial risk does not appear to be great. Regent Petersen also questioned whether this insurance is really necessary.

Regent Shaw stated this insurance policy does not cover acts of bad faith but would cover actions that were innocently taken that either hurt someone else or give right to some kind of a claim.

Regent Perrin commented that as he read this he didn't feel the suggested policy is very applicable to our situation. He suggested the committee look at what other agencies of state government are doing and what other state governments are doing.

MOTION:
Mr. Bailey moved the board encourage the insurance committee to work as diligently as possible, especially on liability insurance for officers and employees of the institutions and for the board itself. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION:
Mr. Baldridge moved the board add to the preceding motion the statement "A report should be made not later than the October meeting". Mrs. Collison seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

VOTE ON MOTION:
The motion passed unanimously.

METHOD OF PAYING SALARIES AND WAGES. The board was requested to adopt the following positions relating to the frequency of payrolls and the standardization of certain items relating to pay: (a) the standardization of certain items relating to pay such as reduction for leave without pay, pay for partial pay periods, terminal vacation payments and other similar items especially for employees under the Merit System and (b) although we recognize that more frequent payrolls would be helpful particularly for our lower paid employees, the estimated cost of additional payroll processing makes it not feasible at
the present time because of budgetary constraints.

The Board Office reported:

On March 2, 1973 Mr. Marvin Selden, State Comptroller, convened a meeting with representatives of various state departments to initiate a study of the methods by which state employees are paid with the objective of recommending appropriate changes. He emphasized that input should be obtained from employees and from department administrations. A determination should be made of what features of the payroll system should be uniform for all state departments and what need not be uniform.

The Board Office suggested and the universities agreed that Mr. C. C. Mosier, Iowa State University, should represent the Board of Regents institutions and the Board Office on the study committee. Mr. Mosier now submits a statement of position for review and approval by the Board of Regents. Summary Report on Payroll System Study as submitted by Mr. Mosier is available in the Board Office. Available also is Comparison of State of Iowa Payroll Systems which compares Centralized State Payroll, Highway Commission and each of the state universities but omits the Iowa School for the Deaf and the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School. One of the most significant differences pertains to pay frequency: semi-monthly for Centralized State Payroll and Highway Commission but monthly for all five Regents institutions.

The Board should assess whether or not consideration should be given to more frequent payment of employees. The institutions estimate the added cost at $250,000 per year for the universities. The cost estimate of $250,000 per year has not been examined in depth to ascertain if it is a realistic appraisal of costs and whether such costs are continuing rather than one time. It is stated that there is not compelling pressure from our employees for more frequent payrolls. However, our employees have not been asked, to my knowledge. Once a month payrolls undoubtedly create substantial hardships on many employees especially those in the lower paying positions.

It is recommended that the Board adopt the position recommended by the institutions which would endorse standardization for handling certain pay items. It is recommended further that the Board instruct the Board Office and the institutions to ascertain the need for more frequent payrolls for certain classes of Regents employees and to obtain realistic statements of cost.

Regent Shaw questioned whether the state is subject to any general law as to frequency of pay. Mr. McMurray replied by stating Code 79.1 states the pay in Iowa may be bi-weekly, semi-monthly or monthly for state employees.

Regent Shaw then questioned whether that also covers private industry and Mr. McMurray stated it covered only state employees.
Regent Zumbach questioned Mr. Richey whether he has taken into consideration the cost of changing our present system. Mr. Richey replied the institutions estimated costs to be approximately $250,000 per year.

Regent Shaw queried whether the mailing of checks saves the university money and Mr. Jolliffe replied the university prefers mailing the checks as a matter of principle and also because they prefer the personal approach. He added they do not favor the policy of distributing checks through departmental persons.

Regent Bailey commented his feeling was that the employees would rather be paid twice a month although there is no indication of major dissatisfaction by employees with the current pay plan. The point was made that lower paid people are penalized most by the present system.

Regent Zumbach then questioned the possibility of paying those persons below a certain pay grade more often. Mr. Jolliffe responded by stating that any time you select one group apart from the rest it complicates the system and increases costs. The complications of withholdings, etc. would cause problems. He stated it is extremely difficult to split payroll into segments. Regent Zumbach questioned whether a contingency cost would be involved and Mr. Jolliffe replied that there would.

Regent Collison questioned whether the lower pay grades could be allowed the option of taking increased pay periods as a fringe benefit. She questioned whether we in all fairness should offer some option to people who work in the lower grades. Regent Perrin responded by stating we have to go all the way or leave it alone. He stated the assumption that this is desirable is not known for sure and stated lower paid people manage their money better.
Mr. Perrin stated if we are to change the system to bi-weekly we had better change the whole system. If we split it up it becomes more costly than ever.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Perrin moved (1) the board adopt the standardization of certain items relating to pay such as a reduction for leave without pay, pay for partial pay periods, terminal vacation payments and other similar items especially for employees under the Merit System, and (2) while the board recognizes that more frequent payrolls would be helpful particularly for our lower paid employees the estimated cost of additional payroll processing makes it not feasible at the present time because of budgetary constraints. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Regent Baldridge commented that three of his employees requested to be paid once a month. The assumption that you are benefiting employees by paying them twice a month is debatable. Regent Shaw stated there is no doubt in his mind that employees would want to be paid more often. He also commented that what really would be involved in going on bi-weekly is judgment of the university of how much employees would benefit.

Regent Petersen commented on collective bargaining and stated that we may at this point be giving away something that we might want at a later time for a negotiating item.

Regent Bailey stated that by putting the pay schedule twice a month it will reduce the funds available for the operation of the Regents institutions by roughly 2% a year.

**VOTE ON DIVISION ONE:** All members voted aye.

**SUBSTITUTE DIVISION:** Mr. Baldridge moved that the estimated cost of additional payroll processing makes it not feasible to change payrolls from a monthly basis at the present time, because of budgetary constraints. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion and it passed with Zumbach voting nay.
PROPOSED REVISION OF CONTRACT WITH BOND CONSULTANT. The board was requested to authorize amendment to contract dated August 14, 1969 between Paul D. Speer and Associates, Inc. and the State Board of Regents by deleting on page three, item number three, relating to minimum annual fees.

The following letter to the Board of Regents from Paul D. Speer and Associates, Inc. reads as follows:

This letter is a proposal to modify the terms of our employment by the State Board of Regents and is to supersede as herein provided, on the first day of July 1969, our present terms of employment. As independent municipal finance consultants, we have served the Board in all of its financing since July 1, 1962. Our services will continue to be rendered on an independent and professional basis entirely in the best interests of the Board. This proposal, when accepted, will run through June 30, 1972 and thereafter until cancelled upon your giving six months' written notice to us. We outline herein a portion of the services to be rendered, but in any event the services will be complete to and including completion of each financing and will include all services usual for similar financing and necessary to successfully carry out each project:

(1) Our services are to cover all types of financing at all of the institutions of higher education under the jurisdiction of the Board and specifically, but not exclusively, will include, insofar as legislation permits, the financing of dormitories, residence halls, dining halls and appurtenant facilities, parking facilities, unions, commons, stadiums, athletic buildings, auditoriums, colosseums and administrative and academic buildings, including utilities of all sorts for any of them. This will cover all financing offered to the public and including bonds purchased by any agency of the United States Government.

(2) As called upon from time to time, we will confer with the Board, its officers and committees, and with the institutions and their officers and personnel including professional consultants such as architects, engineers, accountants and attorneys in connection with proposed financings, and we will assemble from time to time the data concerning each institution and will study same so as to be prepared to recommend financial programs from time to time to enable the Board to carry out each project.
(3) When the Board determines to examine a project for possible financing, we will prepare schedules and programs and will recommend which, in our opinion, should be adopted, which program will be based upon our study of the revenues pertinent thereto and the projections and estimates of the various officers and advisors of the Board and the institutions.

(4) When the program for a particular project or projects has been agreed upon, we will confer with the attorneys regarding financial details to be incorporated by them in the necessary resolutions and other documents and will confer with the accountants, architects and engineers involved in order to set up the program for submission of the various studies.

(5) When the Board has determined to finance any project or projects, we will recommend the time, place and method of conducting the sale and the terms thereof, together with all of the terms of the bonds to be authorized including maturities and call privileges, sinking fund provisions and other pledges.

(6) We will submit regular and timely information to all the rating services in order that they may establish the best rating possible, but no particular rating is guaranteed.

(7) Upon approval by the Board of the time of the sale, we will prepare an Official Statement covering the project and the institution together with the pertinent law and resolution and will circulate same widely to investing institutions and underwriters throughout the country in adequate time for each of them to determine his interest in the bonds. We will by personal contact, by meeting and by mail and telephone, contact various institutions in order to obtain as broad an interest in the securities as possible, will attend the sale and will recommend which bid, if any, is acceptable.

(8) Thereafter we will complete such further steps as will lead to the prompt and successful delivery of the bonds.

(9) In addition to the foregoing, we will appear before legislative committees as may be indicated and desirable for the purpose of explaining any proposals for financing pending before the Legislature.

The Board is to pay all of its own expenses in connection with this program and all financings including, but not exclusively, all costs of printing, advertising and delivery of bonds and Official Statements,
fees of attorneys, accountants, architects, engineers, ourselves and others and all of its own travel expenses and such other ordinary expenses as may be involved. We are to pay our own travel expenses and our ordinary expenses such as telephone and other overhead. We will obtain any or all of such services as the Board may request, but only upon the responsibility of the Board for payment. For all of our services hereunder we are to be paid a fee for each issue of bonds as follows:

(1) For each bond sale for any institution, a base fee of $5,000 plus 1/20 of 1% of the face value of all bonds sold. The fee is to be calculated separately for each institution's bonds even though they may be sold at the same time as the bonds of other institutions, but there shall be only a single calculation for a combination of issues for a single institution.

(2) The maximum for any such single fee shall be $12,500 regardless of the size of the issue.

(3) It is understood that we are to be paid by the Board in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969 and in each fiscal year thereafter, minimum total fees of $10,000 regardless of whether or not any bonds are sold in each fiscal year.

(4) This agreement is to be applicable as to fees and services on all projects under financial planning prior to the effective date of cancellation, and we are to be obligated to complete all such projects and are to be paid our fees at the time of delivery of such bonds regardless of when the bonds are sold and delivered, provided that we are to receive no fees after the effective date of cancellation except those directly applicable to such projects.

Acceptance of this proposal will otherwise terminate all of the obligations of the Board under our existing employment.

The Board Office reported:

The current contract was written to run through June 30, 1972 and thereafter until cancelled upon giving six months notice.

The hospital bond sale for the University of Iowa of $10 million that is scheduled for July is the only one planned for the current year and no academic revenue bonds have been authorized by the General Assembly for the 1973-75 biennium. These facts were communicated to Mr. Speer during the signing of the Iowa State University issue on June 12. I indicated that the
minimum annual retainer called for in the present contract would be bothersome to us if no issues were foreseen. Mr. Speer readily agreed to dropping of this provision of the contract and followed it up immediately with his letter of June 15 which is enclosed. The minimum fee will not be operative during fiscal year 1973-74 because of the sale for the University of Iowa Hospital.

Mr. Speer's firm has provided excellent services in a most timely manner for every bond issue during my tenure in office. Institutional personnel have expressed similar satisfaction with his services. His continued assistance and advice will be of major benefit to the institutions and to the Board. There will be no charge for these services under the proposed alteration of the contract unless new bonds are actually sold.

It is recommended that the proposed amendment to the agreement with Speer Associates be approved.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board authorize the amendment to the contract dated August 14, 1969 between Paul D. Speer and Associates, Inc. and the State Board of Regents by deleting item number three which states "It is understood that we are to be paid by the board in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969 and in each fiscal year thereafter, minimum total fees of $10,000 regardless of whether or not any bonds are sold in each fiscal year". Mrs. Collison seconded the motion.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the above motion be amended to add sincere expression of appreciation to Mr. Speer for his offer. The amendment was seconded by Mr. Shaw. In absence of any objection, President Redeker approved the amendment to the motion.

MOTION AS AMENDED: In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the motion approved.

TITLE I PROGRAM FOR 1973-74. The board was presented the following informational report:
Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 expires July 1, 1973. The program was established to be of supplemental educational benefit for educationally disadvantaged students. It now is believed that Congress will act by July 1, 1973, to continue the program for one year during which time legislation would be developed with certain revisions. Funding for 1973-74 is expected to be approximately the same level as for 1972-73 which is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>$132,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBSSS</td>
<td>40,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Psychiatric Services</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital School</td>
<td>37,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217,621</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplementary funds in the amount of $45,883 have become available and are discussed in a separate docket item.

If the funding becomes available and the allocation formula is on the basis of average daily attendance, the Board Office will expect to transmit the funding amounts to the institutions so that plans and application forms can be prepared.

A memorandum from Dr. Oliver T. Himley, Department of Public Instruction, dated June 15, 1973 quotes a letter from the federal government to the effect that 1973-74 Title I programs are expected to be funded at the approximate level of the 1972-73 programs. The memorandum is available in the Board Office.

It is expected that Title I program for 1973-74 will be docketed for Board action in July.

TITLE I SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDS FOR 1972-73. The board was requested to (1) approve the Hospital School project for multiply handicapped children in foster homes in the amount of $6,431 and (2) ratify the board action by phone approving supplementary funds in the amount of $19,778, $11,000, and $15,000 for ISD, IBSSS, and Children's Psychiatric Services respectively.

The Board Office reported:
Supplementary funds in the amount of $52,209 are available for 1972-73 and may be carried forward through June 30, 1974. In accordance with Board policy for use of supplementary funds the institutions were requested to submit one or more proposed projects which would cost between $5,000 and $15,000 with a preliminary program statement.

The Board decided at its last meeting that the programs should be defined and approved promptly so that urgent administrative decisions could be made. After the programs had been reviewed by Dr. Oliver Himley, Department of Public Instruction, the Board was polled by telephone and approval obtained from Regents Redeker, Bailey, Baldridge, Zumbach, and Petersen. The amounts requested and approved are $71,000 and $45,778 respectively with $6,431 unallocated— as set forth in detail in my memorandum dated May 23, 1973 which is enclosed (Exhibit A).

Program information for ISD (Exhibit B) and Children's Psychiatric Services (Exhibit C) are enclosed herewith. The IBSSS program information is deferred until it is definitely established whether or not Title I funding will be continued for 1973-74.

The Hospital School proposed project was disallowed not because of lack of merit but because of non-compliance with Title I guidelines. The Hospital School has proposed the substitute project enclosed herewith (Exhibit D) in the amount of $6,431 which is the amount as yet unallocated. The Hospital School project is a cooperative project for multiply handicapped children in foster homes. The non-profit corporation, Systems Unlimited, Inc., would provide small group residential services (four children) and the University Hospital School would provide medical and educational services. The proposed substitute program has been reviewed and approved by Dr. Oliver Himley, Department of Public Instruction, subject to review and approval of the formal application.

Regent Perrin stated two problems: (1) Money received for supplemental funding is derived by head count. Many times the amount of money that was available was too small to carry on a particularly desirable project at one of the schools so we would not divide the money on a strictly per head count.
We would pool it and pick the programs that looked good to utilize that much money. This was a very sound approach so long as we keep in mind that it is the intent that the money be used to benefit the student on a per head basis. We have deviated a great deal. He also added we don't have any business deviating this far from the head count and doing it year after year. The second point Regent Perrin made involved the method used in determining funds division. He stated he was critical of the Board Office in this area. Everyone submits a plan after they have been told how much money there is going to be. If they all submit $15,000 this is more money than we have. The Board Office decides which one of these programs is best and recommends which program is to be funded. Someone has to make this decision. He added we should have someone with more expertise that would look over these plans and determine which is the best plan and recommend it from the basis of education rather than just a way of splitting up the funds. We have tremendous individuals in our institutions and we should be using their expertise to make these kinds of decisions.

Regent Perrin then restated his two concerns as follows: (1) keeping in mind the way the funds are generated and giving some weight to the student to whom it is intended and (2) that we seek and secure the proper person for decision of funding.

President Redeker stated that the Board Office is acting under previous direction of the board. One of the statements in the Procedural Guide says the Board Office shall make recommendations as to the programs to be approved. Also, the point is made that the Board Office is to avail itself of educational expertise.

Regent Wallace commented by saying he didn't think it necessary to change anything in the Procedural Guide. If the board decided the Board Office should utilize a committee this would be something else.
Regent Perrin commented the Department of Public Instruction tends to approve or disapprove a program not on the basis of the merit of the program but whether it complies with the rules of HEW. Approval is more on the mechanics. What we are looking for is an evaluation to help us gain the best educational expenditure of the money.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the Hospital School project for multiply handicapped children in foster homes in the amount of $6,431 and ratify the board action by phone approving supplementary funds in the amount of $19,778, $11,000, and $15,000 for ISD, IBSSS, and Children's Psychiatric Services respectively. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL AUTHORITY. The board was requested to approve out-of-state travel authority for two members of the Board Office staff to attend the annual meeting of the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the board approve the out-of-state travel authority for two members of the Board Office staff to attend the annual meeting of the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion. In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the above approved.

BOARD OFFICE PERSONNEL REGISTER. There were no transactions for the month of May, 1973.

NEXT MEETINGS.

NO AUGUST MEETING.

September 13-14 University of Iowa and IBSSS Iowa City/Vinton
October 11-12 Iowa School for the Deaf Council Bluffs
EXECUTIVE SESSION. President Redeker stated that there were several land transactions and personnel matters to be discussed in Executive Session. On roll call vote on whether to go into Executive Session, the vote was as follows:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker.

NAY: None.

ABSENT: None.

The board having voted in the affirmative by at least a 2/3 majority, resolved itself into Executive Session at 3:10 p.m. and arose therefrom at 6:00 p.m.

The following business pertaining to General or Miscellaneous items was transacted on Friday, June 29, 1973.

REPORT ON JUNE MEETING OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION. Regent Bailey presented an oral report on the Higher Education Facilities Commission. He stated the updated enrollment provisions were ok'd by the commission. He also commented there was a considerable amount of criticism of the original study. He stated he raised the possibility for spending the money for a study which would help us in planning a curriculum for the future. This hasn't been touched on too much. Regent Bailey also commented about the student flow report study done by Iowa State University and stated ISU did an excellent job on this for $4,000 to $5,000.

PREPARATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST FOR 1974-75. Both the Governor and the General Assembly have indicated that a request for supplemental appropriations by the Board of Regents will be considered, if funds are available, for salary increases in the second year of the biennium. The board discussed
several possible matters that require review including salary increases for academic and non-academic employees, unanticipated price inflation, effect of national economic controls, federal funding, enrollment trends, and capital projects not funded during the 1973 session. Mr. Richey emphasized the limited time for preparation of supplemental budget requests prior to presentation to the board for decision at its October meeting, which would be required for the Governor to have adequate time to consider needs of the Regents' institutions. President Boyd pointed out that availability of federal funds will likely not be clear until November or December. Board members expressed the view that a unified approach should be taken to develop the supplemental budget requests.

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved that the Board Office prepare a report on procedures together with preliminary information regarding preparation of supplemental budget requests for presentation to the Board at its July meeting. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

President Redeker announced to the board the board meeting will begin at 8:00 Saturday morning, June 30, 1973, due to the material yet to be covered.

PRELIMINARY BUDGETS FOR 1973-74. In response to Mr. Redeker's request, Mr. Richey reviewed the appropriations by the legislature to the Board of Regents to operate the institutions in 1973-74. The amount appropriated for operations for 1973-74 is $114,492,000. An additional amount of $2,581,300 was appropriated to be used if federal action prohibits an increase in non-resident tuition under a price-freeze policy and only with the approval of the Governor and the State Comptroller. The legislature prohibited increases in resident tuition and provided for a reversion of funds at the end of the first year of
the biennium. A unified budgeting and accounting system was mandated though it was recognized that the board and the institutions made significant progress in developing a comprehensive budget for 1973-75. On several occasions the two sub-committees expressed concern about the possibility of the Board of Regents requesting funds in one way and using the funds in another way. R R & A and equipment was of particular concern to the legislators and, as a consequence, R R & A was appropriated on a line-item basis. Mr. Richey emphasized that in reviewing the preliminary institutional budgets these two items should be analyzed carefully.

Considerable discussion ensued regarding non-resident tuition. The contingent amount appropriated was based on possible continuation of the federal price-freeze and assumed an increase in graduate tuition of $250 per year for non-resident students and undergraduate tuition by $100 per year for non-resident students. The feasibility of raising non-resident tuition by a lesser amount, need for maintaining the cost to the student as low as possible, value of students from other states and foreign countries to the educational process and intent of the legislature were discussed.

MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved to increase the graduate tuition by $250 per year for non-resident students and the undergraduate by $100 per year for non-resident students. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Craig Karsen, President, University of Iowa Student Senate, pointed out that students would prefer not to see any tuition increase but are sensitive to the position of the state legislature. He expressed concern about notification of students for application of the tuition increase for the first semester.
and about reduction in work-study financial aid. He requested the board to consider making the tuition increase effective with the second semester or the second year of the biennium.

The loss of funds due to a delay in the application of the tuition increase and the effect on budgeting for the second year were discussed. The institutions pointed out that availability of emergency loan funds would be provided to students to the degree possible although it was acknowledged that such funds are not sufficient to meet all needs.

The matter of providing a tuition differential with regard to professional education such as medicine, law, veterinary medicine, etc., was discussed. It was pointed out that more financial aid is available for professional education and the cost of professional education is greater than for other fields. However, such action would tend to defeat the purpose of the greater amount of financial aid for professional education if tuition were raised for such students. It would represent a departure from board philosophy of charging a flat rate.

A table is enclosed with these minutes that provides anticipated enrollment and revenue from a $100 increase for undergraduate non-resident students and $250 increase for graduate and professional non-resident students. These estimates served as the basis for the contingent appropriation and reduction in the regular operating appropriations. Mr. Moore pointed out that Iowa State suffered a $200,000 loss because of an error in the estimates. The error was promptly called to the attention of the legislature but modification of the figure was refused. The result was that $200,000 too much was taken away from the Iowa State University appropriation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan II *</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Proposed Tuition Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U of I</td>
<td>ISU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Resident:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Graduates</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident - Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Resident:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Graduates</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident - Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Second Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Plan II*

Increase Graduate Tuitions $250 Per Year, Effective 7/1/73.
Increase Undergraduate Tuition $100 Per Year, Effective 7/1/73.
No Increase in Resident Tuitions.

Office of State Comptroller
June 1, 1973
Mr. Moore pointed out the desirability of setting the quarterly tuition rate at an even dollar to avoid the added expense of carrying cents in the computer. Rates of $252 and $102 per academic year for graduate and undergraduate tuition, respectively, were suggested for this reason.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved to amend the motion by inserting $252 rather than $250 for graduate tuition for Iowa State University non-resident students and $102 rather than $100 for undergraduate Iowa State University non-resident students. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Redeker then called for presentation of the preliminary budgets from each of the institutions. He suggested that all proposed preliminary university budgets be discussed before action is taken so that problems of mutual interest may be considered. The preliminary budgets are on file as a part of the official minutes.

A. University of Iowa Preliminary Budget 1973-74. A board member queried as to student aid as treated by all three universities. President Kamerick pointed out that at the University of Northern Iowa funds that were taken from student aid in last year's cutback are being restored and pointed out that UNI is providing a larger percentage of its budget for student aid in 1973-74 than in any previous year. Mr. Chambers pointed out that at the University of Iowa student aid continues to be a top priority item with the budget calling for an increase. He reported that student employment will be relied upon heavily next year and efforts have been made with lending agencies to make more money available to students next year. President Parks indicated an increase in the state contribution for student aid next year and pointed out that state funds are available only for in-state students at this time. The rules regarding
eligibility for out-of-state students are being examined. It was stated that student aid funds are inadequate to meet the demand at all the universities.

Mr. Richey raised questions regarding the preliminary budget of the University of Iowa with regard to contingency fund items that are not allocated into expenditure categories. The analysis of the budget is thus made difficult, if not impossible. Special needs and general expense are consolidated in the preliminary budget so that it is difficult to compare with the original budget requests as approved by the Board of Regents or the budget approved by the legislature. Furthermore, the preliminary budget amounts for Equipment and Books and R & R & A are not in accord with the amounts approved in the biennial budget request by the Board of Regents. In fact, the amount budgeted for R & A violates the appropriation act because it shifted funds from that category.

Mr. Chambers provided an addendum entitled "Proposed Distribution of 'Undistributed'" which is on file with the official minutes that shows an amount of $1,694,368 for equipment and books and $901,000 for R & A which comply with the previously approved amounts and with the amount for R & A in the appropriation bill. Mr. Chambers pointed out that tuition income for the current year is down $225,000 from the projection at the beginning of the year because the students were registering for fewer hours of credits even though the total head count enrollment remains constant and that no change in enrollment for 1973-74 is expected. He stated that funding availability for reimbursed overhead is unknown but that a new budget will be submitted to the board if income is higher than anticipated.

Dr. Hardin stated that changes in priorities are necessary because of failure to obtain federal funds. Funds scheduled for certain special needs are being diverted to other programs. He pointed out that in the case of the College of...
Nursing, $26,000 is required to pick up lost grants, that 25% of nursing salaries are on grants and 30% of salaries of the College of Medicine are unappropriated funds and that loss in teaching grants is substantial. Dr. Eckstein reported that the deficit in federal losses will amount to $6,000,000 by the end of 1974-75. Significant faculty losses, eleven resignations in the last month of 1972-73, have caused the administration to provide some increase in salaries. Capitation grants run out at the end of 1974-75 unless a new law replaces this program. Dr. Hardin pointed out that the President's proposed budget would cause 1,400 faculty throughout the country to be released. He stated that Congress is considering a bill to continue funding, but that the results will not be available until November or December. Discussions of special needs brought out that the University of Iowa preliminary budget contains numerous detailed items which do not require board consideration and are of the type that are considered continuously in the operation of the university. President Boyd stated that the university was presenting detailed items to inform the board of changes in priorities from the budget requests as approved by the board some eighteen months ago. Mr. Richey commented on the change in the Board of Regents' policy in 1966 from approval of detailed budget changes to a policy allowing considerable institutional discretion in such changes within the approved budget as set forth in section 7.03 of the Procedural Guide. He stated that the board now may want to consider a new procedure midway between the two approaches that would perhaps provide a quarterly report on an after-the-fact basis or if a major program is involved, it may be desirable for the board to consider the policy prior to its implementation. President Boyd emphasized that the detailed special needs items had been listed in the institutional request.

The proposed preliminary budget of $32,180,000 for University Hospitals was discussed extensively. The proposed budget is $383,000 above that approved
by the Board of Regents and $803,000 above the Governor's recommended budget.

Dr. Hardin discussed the preliminary budget proposal including special needs items of cardiac in-patient service which was included in the original Regents' request and additional items for (1) cost arising from university and federal government policy such as changes in holidays, social security rates, and equal pay of $250,800, (2) costs in the amount of $356,500 for operation of remodeled facilities and (3) an amount of $174,300 for residency program expansion. He pointed out that the 4% fee increase as proposed in the Regents' budget request could not be implemented until the price freeze is removed, that no grants and contracts are included in the proposed preliminary budget and that additional indigent patient services will be provided as a consequence of the appropriation which was increased by $1,721,000. The original Regents' request included $1,000,000 specifically in response to the need for full financing of current levels of indigent patient services for county quotas.

The proposed preliminary budget for the Psychopathic Hospital contained no programmatic changes from the original Regents' budget request.

The proposed budget for the State Bacteriological Laboratory contained a substantial increase in income from sales and services from the Regents' request of $165,000 to an amount in the preliminary budget of $282,000.

The preliminary budget includes an amount of $47,460 to cover professional and non-professional salaries on terminated grants and contracts. Dr. Hardin pointed out that this amounts to a loss of funds and the board would need to decide if general funds should be used to support the personnel to be picked up. He expects that a contract for pesticide studies will be obtained with the Department of Environmental Quality to cover the activities of these people. Regarding a reduction for General Expense from the request of $30,000, Dr. Hardin indicated cost savings including reduction in postage by using
lighter containers. A board member asked Dr. Hardin if he anticipates outside requests for service from the Bacteriological Laboratory to change. He responded that at present there is not a lot of industrial work but there is considerable work for the Conservation Commission regarding surveillance of water and air pollution. He stated that the work is changing from decision-oriented laboratory work to environmental control work. The activity does not compete with private enterprise because only analyses that cannot be performed by private enterprise are performed in the Bacteriological Laboratory.

The proposed preliminary budgets for the Hospital Schools and State Sanatorium contained no programmatic changes.

Following is a preliminary budget summary prepared by the University of Iowa for each of the units for which appropriations were made.
### GENERAL EDUCATIONAL FUND

#### ESTIMATED EXPENSE

**Starting base**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting base</strong></td>
<td>$34,545,920</td>
<td>$37,436,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic salary increases</strong></td>
<td>$7,910,757</td>
<td>$11,214,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonacademic salary increases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General expense costs</strong></td>
<td>$1,316,368</td>
<td>$1,444,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment &amp; books</strong></td>
<td>$558,000</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RR &amp; A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs charged to other funds</strong></td>
<td>$1,243,637-</td>
<td>($219,087-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated savings</strong></td>
<td>$600,000-</td>
<td>$670,000-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undistributed</strong></td>
<td>$793,824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special needs &amp; general expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quad Cities Graduate Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,861,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$41,815,000</td>
<td>$54,496,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ESTIMATED INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State appropriation</strong></td>
<td>$37,436,000</td>
<td>$41,189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student fees</strong></td>
<td>$13,940,000</td>
<td>$13,730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reimbursed overhead</strong></td>
<td>$2,960,000</td>
<td>$2,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$58,875,000</td>
<td>$57,939,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Included with Special Needs & General Expense

#### EXPLANATIONS

**Academic salary increases**

- **Base salaries**
  - Starting base: $1,470,000
  - Increase: $194,000
  - Total: $1,664,000

**Nonacademic salary increases**

- **Base salaries**
  - Starting base: $322,000
  - Increase: $45,000
  - Total: $367,000

**Equipment & books**

- Starting base: $1,444,368
- Increase to $1,470,000
- Total: $128,000
RR & A
Increase to $601,000 from $558,000  $ 43,000

Estimated savings
Increase to -$1,270,000 from -$600,000  $ 670,000

Special needs and general expense
A. Interim adjustments and commitments  $ 15,784

B. Enrollment increases in Health Sciences
(Salaries & fringe benefits)
    Medicine  $ 471,000
    Dentistry  22,000
    Nursing  26,000
    Physical Plant (included under Physical Plant)  519,000

C. Student Financial Aids  150,000

D. Physical Plant Operations
New Buildings
    Staff  $ 36,720
    Fringe benefits  5,140
    Other expense  62,200  $ 104,060
    Added cost No. 6 fuel over No. 2  236,000
    Other increases in prices and in demand - general expense  541,156  881,216

E. Other additions
Liberal Arts
    Afro-American Studies  $ 25,000
    Women's Physical Educ  12,000
    Women's Studies  12,000
    Dramatic Arts Lab  $ 18,000
    General expense  30,000
    Nursing  5,000
    Law  18,000  2,500
    Extension  2,500
    Business Administration  2,500
    Education  2,500
    Medicine  5,000
    Pharmacy  5,000
    Dentistry  5,000
    Engineering  2,500
    Admissions & Records  7,500  5,000
    Division of Business & Finance  30,000
    Student Financial Aids Office  10,000  5,000
    President's Office  2,000
    University Personnel Services  12,500  5,000
    Summer Session  5,000
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E. Other additions (cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Development</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>General Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits on above</td>
<td>$ 14,500</td>
<td>$ 51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 111,500</td>
<td>$ 183,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,861,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF "UNDISTRIBUTED"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Base 1972-73</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>From Undistributed</th>
<th>Total Subject to Undistributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Books</td>
<td>$1,316,368</td>
<td>$ 128,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$1,694,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR &amp; A</td>
<td>558,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>901,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; general expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>243,824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total &quot;Undistributed&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 793,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Preliminary Budget Summary 1973-74

University Hospital

June 28-30, 1973

General

Starting Base 1972-73  Regent's Request  Proposed 1973-74

Estimated Expense

Starting base

Additions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional salaries</td>
<td>$9,798,318</td>
<td>549,000</td>
<td>496,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional salaries</td>
<td>$9,779,591</td>
<td>644,000</td>
<td>495,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expense</td>
<td>$9,338,042</td>
<td>653,000</td>
<td>653,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR &amp; A</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Savings</td>
<td>154,951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td>587,000</td>
<td>1,170,600</td>
<td>1,170,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Expense

$29,348,000

Estimated Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>$8,738,000</td>
<td>$10,599,000</td>
<td>$10,459,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20,610,000</td>
<td>21,198,000</td>
<td>21,721,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Income

$31,797,000

Special Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cardiac Inpatient Service</td>
<td>$206,800</td>
<td>134,700</td>
<td>389,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations

Salary increases - professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base salaries</td>
<td>$438,700</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td>496,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>$438,700</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td>496,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-professional salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base salaries</td>
<td>$438,700</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td>496,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>$438,700</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td>496,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General expense cost increase

Increase to $9,991,042 from $9,338,042

$653,000

Equipment cost increase

Increase to $333,000 from $317,000

$16,000

Special Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cardiac Inpatient Service</td>
<td>$206,800</td>
<td>134,700</td>
<td>389,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Costs Arising from University and Federal Government Policy and Programmatic Actions

1) FOASI Base and Rate Increases Act - Fringe Benefits

   Professional salaries                          $ 56,000

2) Equal Pay Act Anti-discrimination Ruling by Federal Agency
   Nonprofessional salaries - Custodian 1  $ 67,300
   Fringe benefits                              8,700

   Total:                                        76,000

3) Hospital Wage Budget - Holiday Policy Revision
   Nonprofessional salaries                    112,200
   Fringe benefits                              6,600

   Total:                                        118,800

(Because of the present modest personnel-to-patient ratio, the recently revised University holiday policy awarding employees two additional holidays per year will necessitate increased use of temporary employees to maintain an acceptable level of patient care.)

c) Costs Arising from Opening of the Southeast Wing and Other Recently Completed Capital Development Projects

1) Urological Nursing Unit - 5th Floor Southeast
   Professional salaries                        19,000
   Nonprofessional salaries                     30,600
   Fringe benefits                               6,700

   Total:                                        56,300

2) Environmental Maintenance Services
   Nonprofessional salaries                     67,500
   Fringe benefits                               8,800

   Total:                                        76,300

3) Medical Intensive Care Unit - All Medical Disciplines
   Professional salaries                        119,300
   Nonprofessional salaries                     48,050
   Fringe benefits                               23,550

   Total:                                        190,900

4) Laminar Flow Isolation Suite - Internal Medicine
   Nonprofessional salaries                     29,200
   Fringe benefits                               3,800

   Total:                                        33,000
Special Needs (continued)

d) Educational Program Enhancement Coordinate with
   Statewide Health Manpower Demand - Intern and Resident
   Physician Trainee and Medical and Paramedical Trainee
   Stipends (Includes Family Practice, Internal Medicine,
   Pathology, Pediatric, Surgery and Anesthesia Interns
   and Residents,)

   | Professional stipends | $165,600 |
   | Fringe benefits      |     8,700 |
   | Total                | $174,300 |

Other Income of $21,721,000 represents an increase of $1,111,000
over the 1972-73 budget. The increase will accrue from a rate
increase of approximately 3% which is well within the basic level

Percentage increases over 1972-73
   Starting base 1972-73 total budget 9.6%
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

PRELIMINARY BUDGET SUMMARY 1973-74

PSYCHOPATHIC HOSPITAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED EXPENSE</th>
<th>Starting 1972-73</th>
<th>Regent's Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting base</td>
<td>$1,745,726</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic salaries</td>
<td>885,368</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic salaries</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expense</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs charged to other funds</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated savings</td>
<td>101,094</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,948,000</td>
<td>$3,206,000</td>
<td>$3,158,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED INCOME</th>
<th>Starting 1972-73</th>
<th>Regent's Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>$2,278,000</td>
<td>$2,506,000</td>
<td>$2,458,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,948,000</td>
<td>$3,206,000</td>
<td>$3,158,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary increases - academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary increases - nonacademic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expense cost increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to $423,000 from $400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment - Increase to $17,000 from $16,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special needs increase</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Health Centers</td>
<td>$20,100</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Residency Training</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electroencephalography Resident</td>
<td>12,280</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOASI Changes - Rate Increase</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Delete Students</td>
<td>13,600-</td>
<td>13,600-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Estimated Savings</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RR & A - Increase to $16,000 from $15,000
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THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

PRELIMINARY BUDGET SUMMARY 1973-74

STATE BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED EXPENSE</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting base</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 987,000</td>
<td>$ 987,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional salary increases</td>
<td>$ 442,261</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional salary increases</td>
<td>293,061</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expense increase</td>
<td>242,140</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from expense credits to income</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Expense: $ 987,000 $ 1,074,000 $ 1,180,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED INCOME</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>$ 827,000</td>
<td>$ 909,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Income: $ 987,000 $ 1,074,000 $ 1,180,000

EXPLANATIONS

**Professional salary increases**

Base salaries | $ 23,846
Fringe benefits | 3,410
Total | $ 27,256

**Nonprofessional salary increases**

Base salaries | $ 17,754
Fringe benefits | 2,578
Total | $ 20,332

**General expense**

Reduction to $225,074 from $242,140 to balance budget | $ 17,066

**Equipment**

Increase to $15,000 from $14,000 | $ 1,000

**Transfer from expense credits to income**

Item previously handled as credit to expense now to be included in income | $ 4,462
Special needs

- Breath Alcohol Testing Program under contract with the Iowa Department of Public Safety. Previously this project was handled under a separate income account, but now has been incorporated in the regular laboratory operations. The program is supported by fee income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional salaries</td>
<td>$37,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional salaries</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>5,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expense</td>
<td>11,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Grants and contracts terminated during 1972-73 necessitating transfer of personnel to this budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional salaries</td>
<td>$40,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional salaries</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>6,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,460</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- An Effluent Quality Analysis Program was started in 1972-73 under an agreement with the Iowa Dept. of Environmental Quality. The program is supported by fees @ $5.00 per specimen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional salaries</td>
<td>$8,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional salaries</td>
<td>12,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>2,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,481</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Equipment modernization (as approved in legislative askings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- FOASI rate increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,410</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Other Income

Increased to $782,000 from $195,000 previously estimated due primarily to the additional income from the Iowa Department of Environmental Quality for an Effluent Quality Analysis Program and the Iowa Department of Public Safety for the Breath Alcohol Testing Program.
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

PRELIMINARY BUDGET SUMMARY 1973-74

HOSPITAL SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Base 1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74 Regent's Request</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting base</td>
<td>$823,432</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>39,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic salaries</td>
<td>$367,845</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic salaries</td>
<td>$424,223</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>23,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expense</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated savings</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Expense</strong></td>
<td>$1,613,000</td>
<td>$1,718,000</td>
<td>$1,698,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ESTIMATED INCOME**     |                       |                          |          |
| State appropriation      | $1,492,000            | $1,618,000               | $1,598,000|
| Other                    | 121,000               | 100,000                  | 100,000  |
| **Total Estimated Income** | $1,613,000         | $1,718,000               | $1,698,000|

**EXPLANATIONS**

Salary increases - academic

- Base salaries: $34,061
- Fringe benefits: $4,939
- Total: $39,000

Salary increases - nonacademic

- Base salaries: $15,721
- Fringe benefits: $2,279
- Total: $18,000

General expense cost increase - increase to $447,523 from $424,223

- Hourly wage increases: $10,300
- Other increases: $13,000
- Total: $23,300

Special needs

- FOASI-rate increase: $4,900
- FOASI-delete students: $2,200
- Total: $7,100

950
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PRELIMINARY BUDGET SUMMARY 1973-74
STATE SANATORIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED EXPENSE</th>
<th>Starting Base</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>Regent's Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting base</td>
<td>$2,179,000</td>
<td>$2,179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$192,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional salaries</td>
<td>$610,643</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional salaries</td>
<td>1,096,601</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expense</td>
<td>554,778</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR &amp; A</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated savings</td>
<td>187,222</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$192,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,179,000</td>
<td>$2,371,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPLANATIONS

Salary increases - professional
- Base salaries
- Fringe benefits
Salary increases - nonprofessional
- Base salaries
- Fringe benefits
General expense - Increase to $585,778 from $554,778
Equipment - Increase to $37,200 from $35,200
RR & A - Increase to $79,000 from $75,000
Special needs
- Rural Health Center - Staff salaries
- Fringe benefits
- General expense
FOASl rate changes
Adjustment in estimated savings to $191,542 from $187,222
B. **Iowa State University Preliminary Budget 1973-74.** President Parks stated that Iowa State University is very conscious of the categories for which money was asked of the Governor and legislature but that there is an exception in the case of funds allocated to faculty salary increases. Faculty salaries in the preliminary budget are $86,000 below the Governor's recommendation and $525,000 below the Regents' request. He pointed out that all the studies show that Iowa State University is farther behind in the non-academic salary category than the other institutions. He stated that he is pleased that the non-academic people are getting a substantial increase but is unhappy that they cannot give appropriate salary increases to academic personnel. He stated that the university's business is teaching and learning and that there is a need to provide an appropriate salary increase to the faculty. Regarding income items, Mr. Moore pointed out that $225,000 of federal funding (Bankhead-Jones) is now authorized for 1972-73 but whether it will continue next year is not certain. He stated that the General Assembly added an amount of $242,000 for federal funds income through the State Department of Public Instruction for which the university has received no official notification of the availability of these funds. The funding through the Department of Public Instruction would be for vocational education courses.

Last fall a comprehensive program review was conducted at Iowa State University as requested by Governor Ray for all state agencies. With reference to this program review Mr. Richey asked Dr. Parks whether any of the findings of that study were reflected in the proposed budget for 1973-74. Mr. Christensen responded that there are urgent needs for faculty members in architectural engineering, child development, physical education for women, journalism, sociology, landscape architecture, applied art, and biology. President Parks
emphasized that the university had been severe in squeezing resources else­where in the university to provide funds to meet the needs where the urgency is greatest. He added that not enough has been done for CIRAS (Center for Industrial Research and Service). He pointed out that Iowa State University has always had special responsibility to agriculture and CIRAS is an attempt to provide some extension service to industry to help serve small industry in Iowa. Regent Wallace pointed out that the emphasis of CIRAS is on industrial development and not on industrial promotion. He emphasized that the advisory board for CIRAS has the responsibility to see that CIRAS concentrates strictly on the business of service and research for Iowa industry and not in promotional areas. He commended the institution for the CIRAS contribu­tion. Regent Bailey pointed out that CIRAS has had representation on the Iowa Development Commission for quite a few years where their contribution is appreciated. The contribution of CIRAS is not only from the standpoint of technical and mechanical production problems but also from the standpoint of business policy and practices such as finance, pricing, and accounting.

The Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station preliminary budget of $5,853,000 includes an amount of $1,464,000 of federal funds which depends on congressional and presidential action. A reserve of $341,000 is proposed in the event that final action is at the level of the President's original request rather than the current recommendation of the House committee on appropriations. The unallocated reserve will include $120,000 in salaries for vacant positions, $211,000 in general expense items and approximately $10,000 in equipment.

Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics preliminary budget of $6,834,000 includes an amount of $3,179,000 of federal funds. The federal fund amount proposed represents an increase from $2,877,000 originally
proposed in the budget request and includes $365,000 of carryover funds, available as a result of increases in Smith-Lever funds for 1972-73. In response to a question about what would be done in the following year, President Parks indicated that the carryover funds would be used in 1973-74 and that probably a continuance would be obtained for 1974-75 which would mean a continuation of funding at the lowest level. Mr. Moore explained that the dramatic increase in non-academic staff salaries is due to a $98,000 item which previously has been in a federally funded restricted program budget and not due to increase in salaries. The funds are not particularly secure. If the funds are discontinued, the program would be discontinued. No tenured positions are involved. It was pointed out that this item would become a part of the starting base and that it didn't appear the logical time to incorporate this type of program into the general program when federal funding is questionable. Mr. Moore indicated that he would be willing to reconsider the matter. President Parks added that the program pertains to nutrition aid which is very well funded federally and has a great deal of support.

Following is a preliminary budget summary prepared by Iowa State University for each of the units for which appropriations were made.
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
General Program Operations  
General University  
Preliminary 1973-74 Budget  
(600's omitted)

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Base</th>
<th>Regents' Request</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting Base</td>
<td>$45,120</td>
<td>$45,120</td>
<td>$45,120</td>
<td>$45,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Adjustments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Base Adjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff Salaries</td>
<td>$29,548</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Staff Salaries</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Expense</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Library Books</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs, Replacements &amp; Alterations</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>652</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$45,120</td>
<td>$48,673</td>
<td>$47,171</td>
<td>$48,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Income:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td>33,491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>12,138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$48,013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Base</th>
<th>Regents' Request</th>
<th>Governor's Budget Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$5,574</td>
<td>$5,574</td>
<td>$5,574</td>
<td>$5,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Adjustments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff Salaries</td>
<td>$3,564</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Staff Salaries</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Expense</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,574</td>
<td>$5,926</td>
<td>$5,853</td>
<td>$5,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

**General Program Operations**

**Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture & Home Economics**

**Preliminary 1973-74 Budget**

(000's omitted)

#### Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Base</th>
<th>Regents' Request</th>
<th>Governor's Budget Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$5,057</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,717</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,814</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,552</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,834</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Income:**

- **State Appropriation**: 3,655
- **Federal Funds**: 3,179

**TOTAL**: $6,834
C. University of Northern Iowa Preliminary Budget 1973-74. President Kamerick made a brief statement in which he indicated that it is extremely important that the University of Northern Iowa have sufficient money to implement the Regents' merit program and that it is necessary to have enough money to provide faculty salary increases. Mr. Richey indicated that the appropriations per student amounted to $2,022, $1,687, $1,588 for the University of Iowa, Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa, respectively. He stated that the budget request was set forth before the anticipated drop in enrollment and that the board did not amend its budget request after the decline of 1,650 students from that set forth in the original budget request. He stated that there was no visible evidence of concerted action to change the direction of emphases in the budget, change staffing pattern, or change programs of the university in response to the substantial reduction in workload. Mr. Richey asked for the plan regarding change in program emphasis and staffing in response to the reduction in enrollment particularly in the College of Education. Mr. Stansbury indicated reductions in academic salaries due to the enrollment decline of $374,000 and that the actual student enrollment decline has not been as great as 1,650. Regarding academic matters, Mr. Martin indicated that the board would have an opportunity to consider the University of Northern Iowa plan on September 19. Regarding enrollment decline in elementary education, as an example, there may be only 40 students instead of 50 but still the same teacher would be required, he explained. In view of the accelerated growth in recent years, he stated that he would not expect a rapid and proportionate reduction in staff as enrollment declines. He stated that internal shifts have been made, that a faculty morale problem exists, that curriculum has an impact on the matter, and that the summer session can be adjusted and has been reduced.
President Kamerick indicated that the budget increase amounted to 5.1% over the 1972-73 budget and simply put back what was reduced due to tuition revenue loss because of drop in enrollment. He stated that UNI is not adding to the staff. Mr. Martin stated that no new programs have been established and the faculty will contract in size but not in proportion to the enrollment decline.

Regent Redeker expressed deep concern that the institution seemed to find it impossible to initiate new programs or introduce changes that would strengthen the institution. He stated that during the period when there was a rapid enrollment increase it was impossible to introduce significant changes but now that there is a period of enrollment decline, it would seem that the institution should not be in a static situation with the substantially lower workload. He stated that he would like to put the matter of enrollment decreases in a positive light and see the institution embark into other appropriate areas without requiring substantial amounts of additional support. Mr. Martin indicated some new career emphases and a possibility of venturing some internal changes. He stated that some programs such as business are being expanded, that there are no exotic programs which can be changed, and that the University of Northern Iowa has a predominantly young faculty with a high percentage on tenure. Regent Shaw stated that at some point it is necessary to "bite the bullet", that if tenured people are not needed they should be given notice. No person has the right to be paid in any job if the job isn't there. Mr. Martin pointed out that the English Department has had a rather sharp decline in enrollment but there are no idle people. He said that there is no surplus labor in any department, but that the problem could occur if enrollment declines continue. A board member stated that it has to
be a very serious problem. Mr. Martin explained that he could not consider reallocating more than a half dozen positions now but maybe more would be possible if the enrollment continues to decrease. Considerable discussion ensued on the matter of using the enrollment or workload decline as an opportunity to shift funds to improve the quality of programs in the institution.

It was stated that the University of Northern Iowa has a survey underway concerning its utilities needs and that a report would be available in the future.

Following is a preliminary budget summary prepared by the University of Northern Iowa.

GENERAL PROGRAM OPERATIONS
GENERAL UNIVERSITY

Summary

(000's omitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Base 1972-73</th>
<th>Proposed 1973-74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Base Adjustment^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-Admin. Salaries</td>
<td>10,606</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>11,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic Staff Salaries</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Expense</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip. &amp; Library Books</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs, Replacements &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td>893</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed Budget</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Less Estimated Income

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>4,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,266</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Appropriations

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL INCOME**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Starting Base Adjustment and Special Needs included in expense categories. Details may be found in Schedule 4 or Table II.

Includes net increase for Laboratory School.

**MOTION FOR THE THREE UNIVERSITIES:** Regent Petersen moved that the board approve the preliminary budgets for the three universities for the academic year of 1973-74. Regent Collison seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The board then considered the preliminary budgets for the two special schools.

D. **Iowa School for the Deaf Preliminary Budget 1973-74.**
Mr. Richey reported that cost per student at the Iowa School for the Deaf is $4,495 from the general fund not including Title I funds. He asked if it requires $50,000 additional funds for non-academic staff salaries to fund the Regents Pay Plan as adopted by the board rather than the $34,000 increase upon which the budget was based. He stated that if this is the case, the money would have to come out of equipment which reduces the equipment budget in half. He also asked if any salary savings have been assumed. Mr. Giangreco stated that the money is needed to fund the Regents Merit Pay Plan. He stated that in the area of non-academic salaries, an effort was made to meet the scale since ISD is the lowest paid institution, about 20% below others, that it is desired to raise the faculty salary base $100 to keep competitive, that equipment fund is low and new hearing equipment is needed, that the Title I program is questionable, that a large increase in general expense is expected for 1973-74, and that no bids are available for oil, gas or milk. Mr. Geasland explained that gradually they have increased the budget for equipment and RR & A and offset that by $16,000 for academic salary savings. Mr. Geasland stated that now it is desired to go back to the original approach since some of the items are questionable and that institutional income is up to $22,000 but income from the milk program ($7,000) might be cut out. He stated that a combination of present economic conditions and the Regents Merit Pay Plan have caused the tight budget.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved that the board approve the preliminary budget for the Iowa School for the Deaf for the academic year 1973-74. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Following is a preliminary budget summary prepared by Iowa School for the Deaf.
GENERAL PROGRAM OPERATIONS

Summary

(000's omitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Base</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff Salaries</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Staff Salaries</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Expense</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Library Books</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs, Replacements &amp; Alterations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Institutional Matching Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$1,713</td>
<td>$1,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Institutional Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Federal Gifts and Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Income</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations (Present &amp; Proposed)</td>
<td>$1,691</td>
<td>$1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Prior Year</td>
<td>$1,691</td>
<td>$1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Needed 1973-74 over 1972-73</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Needed 1974-75 over 1973-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special needs to transfer 6 positions from Title I Program was $49,000.00
This was deleted from our budget due to lack of funds
E. Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School Preliminary Budget 1973-74. President Redeker stated his interpretation of the board's action relative to the pay plan is that the board approved the Board Office pay plan proposal whereas Mr. Woodcock's budget presentation to the board incorporates the institutional pay plan proposal. If the board wishes to approve the budget proposal it would mean that the pay plan would need to be changed.

In presenting the preliminary budget Mr. Woodcock stated that he had worked very closely with the staff to reorganize and chart the structure of the school and to provide documentation on program plans for each individual child. He stated that the instructional services division has been added to the instructional program and that a teacher evaluation program has been established with criteria related to the contribution of the teacher toward curriculum development and toward matching media services to the child. Regarding the merit system, Mr. Woodcock stated that he feels that the institutional pay plan is a good program and that it stays within reasonable limits in terms of the Governor's recommendation. He stated that the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School merit system positions which relate to the same work as at the University of Northern Iowa should be on the same pay grade. One of the board members stated that it didn't seem possible to have a separate merit system for one of the institutions.

A board member asked if the rates for the carpenters and electricians had been resolved. Mr. Richey stated that the institutional recommendation is for a grade 21S and the Board Office 19S. The Board Office took into consideration the fact that carpenters and electricians at IBSSS lay out their own work and should be in a higher pay grade. He stated that in general the Board Office recommendation on the pay plan was quite liberal. The Board Office recommendation on the pay plan is related to the pay rates in both Waterloo and Cedar Rapids.
He recognized that considerable study would be required before the Board Office and the institution would be able to resolve the controversy. He stated that the institutional proposal provided a wage inequitable for the area and emphasized that the budget must be considered in connection with the merit pay plan. He stated that the cost per student is the highest of any institution and amounts to $8,877 per student for the 116 students not including the deaf-blind program but including federal Title I funds. Mr. Woodcock stated that the local survey data that was provided to the Board Office was not valid because it was not the result of a complete survey. Considerable discussion ensued regarding the controversy between the Board Office and the institution about pay grades and survey data.

One of the board members pointed out that the Iowa State University survey did not include Des Moines and the University of Iowa survey did not include Cedar Rapids and that it did not seem logical to relate Vinton to two larger cities when it was not done in the case of the two universities. In response to a question Mr. Woodcock indicated that federal funding for the deaf-blind program appeared to be very secure for the coming year. A board member stated that he had no question about the pay rates in Cedar Rapids and Waterloo but that without a survey of pay rates in the Vinton area the board did not comply with the requirements for the State Merit Commission and the State Executive Council.

MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved that the preliminary budget and the pay plan matter be deferred, that the present pay schedule be continued until the local survey can be completed and that any changes made be retroactive to July 1, 1973. The motion passed unanimously.

It was decided that the survey should be conducted in the same manner as for the other institutions except that organizations of 25 employees or more would
be included in the survey. The survey would be conducted by Mr. Volm and the institution.

Following is a preliminary budget summary prepared by Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School for each of the units for which appropriations were made.

### ANNUAL BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>81,711</td>
<td>97,367</td>
<td>100,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>395,573</td>
<td>409,529</td>
<td>417,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseparents</td>
<td>110,733</td>
<td>110,226</td>
<td>122,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Service</td>
<td>22,098</td>
<td>23,636</td>
<td>26,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>56,868</td>
<td>58,887</td>
<td>63,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>17,959</td>
<td>19,244</td>
<td>22,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings-Grounds</td>
<td>215,700</td>
<td>228,271</td>
<td>237,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>900,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>947,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>989,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>67,157</td>
<td>40,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>905,822</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,014,317</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,030,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OBJECT** | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | 730,096 | 767,402 | 807,820 |
| General Expense | 136,102 | 133,892 | 139,680 |
| Equipment | 16,199 | 21,428 | 17,000 |
| Less: Credit for Maintenance | (6,866) | (3,110) | (2,700) |
| Repairs, Replacements and Alterations | 25,111 | 27,548 | 28,000 |
| **Subtotal - Operating Expenditures** | **900,642** | **947,160** | **989,800** |
| Capital Improvements | 5,180 | 67,157 | 40,800 |
| **Total Expenditures** | **905,822** | **1,014,317** | **1,030,600** |

| **FUND** | | | |
| Operating Expenditures: | | | |
| Appropriation | 895,000 | 936,000 | 983,800 |
| Other General Education Funds | 5,642 | 11,160 | 6,000 |
| **Subtotal - Operating Expenditures** | **900,642** | **947,160** | **989,800** |
| Capital Improvements: | | | |
| Appropriation | 5,180 | 66,585 | 40,400 |
| Sales Tax Refund | | 572 | 400 |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | **905,822** | **1,014,317** | **1,030,600** |
EXECUTIVE SESSION. President Redeker announced there were two personnel matters to be discussed in Executive Session. On roll call vote on whether to go into Executive Session, the vote was as follows:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker

NAY: None

ABSENT: None

The board having voted in the affirmative by at least a 2/3 majority, resolved itself into Executive Session at 4:10 p.m., and arose therefrom at 6:00 p.m.

The following business pertaining to General or Miscellaneous items was transacted on Saturday, June 30, 1973.

PROPOSED BOARD OFFICE BUDGETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973-74. The board was requested to approve the Board Office budget of $184,640 as adjusted for revised statutory salary of the Executive Secretary.

The Board Office reported:

The budget for the Board Office for fiscal year 1973-74 is proposed at $184,640 with the understanding that it will be adjusted to reflect legislative action on the salary of the Executive Secretary. It is the understanding that any increase provided in the statutory salary will be matched by an appropriation for allocation to the Board for this purpose. The proposed budget is based on appropriations as contained in both the House and Senate appropriation bills for the Board of Regents. Those versions conform exactly with the Governor's budget recommendations.
The proposed budget for salaries and wages of $132,225 represents a 4.5% increase over the revised estimate for the current year. Each position is budgeted substantially as reflected in the Board's request to the Governor and Legislature and as the Governor recommended to the Legislature. The only changes are those necessary to put the Regents' Merit System employees on the appropriate pay step. The estimated savings from vacancies and turnover in personnel of $5,832 is probably conservative. The Steno I position at $3,600 will probably yield about $3,000 in savings after allowing for temporary help but the position is budgeted because it follows the pattern set forth by the State Comptroller's Office. It is probable that the position for Director of Research and Information will be vacant about two months with a consequent saving of about $3,000. It is also planned that Steno I budgeted at $5,340 will be used only a portion of the year. This position is the Receptionist-Secretary and has been a permanent position in the office for many years. Any savings in this position would be over and above that needed to reach the estimated saving of $5,832 that is assumed.

The budget for other expenses has been recast to reflect the changing pattern of expenditures between the various items. For example, office travel by personnel on the Board staff has been reduced by about $600 from the original budget estimate; telephone and telegraph expenses have been reduced to $450 while the estimate for general office expense for printing, paper, posters, etc., has been increased by about $2,000. Approximately $1,000 of the additional amount for this category is shifted from salaries and wages. This shift is possible because of changes in personnel in the spring of 1973 which affected estimated salaries for fiscal year 1973-74. The total budget proposed of $184,640 is $585 less than that provided in the Governor's recommendations. The expenses of that function are reimbursed by the institutions. The assessments to the institutions for this purpose in 1973-74 are estimated to be almost identical to the assessments originally anticipated for the current year. This was made possible by reduction of the budget in the printing category.

The equipment budget of $1,350 is for a calculator and an office copier. The calculator will not be ordered until the last quarter of the fiscal year.

The proposed budget for Board per diem and expenses of $26,365 is based on $40 per diem. If the level of expenditure of the current fiscal year is maintained except for the per diem rate, the Board will have about $2,000 in its account for contingencies. Board members have been quite conservative in the past about attending meetings and have often attended them at their own personal expense. This should not be necessary in 1973-74.

This proposed budget of $184,640 appears to be adequate to carry out the functions of the office. The General Assembly has provided an additional staff position in the second year of the biennium. The nature of the position will depend upon the needs of the Board for additional staff services.

MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved the board approve the Board Office budget of $184,640 as presented by the executive secretary and further that the salary of the executive secretary be set at $24,000 for 1973-74. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
The following budgets were presented for approval:

### PROPOSED BOARD OF REGENTS' OFFICE BUDGET - 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></th>
<th>1972-73 Budget</th>
<th>1972-73 Revised Estimate (Gross)</th>
<th>1973-74 Budget (Gross)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries &amp; Wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000*</td>
<td>$23,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Coordinator</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Officer</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>19,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Research &amp; Information</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>18,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to Executive Secretary</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>16,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary III</td>
<td>7,506</td>
<td>7,506</td>
<td>8,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steno III</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>4,941</td>
<td>6,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steno II</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steno I</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>5,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steno I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk III</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>4,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary &amp; Part-time</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Implementation &amp; Turnover</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(5,832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Salaries</strong></td>
<td>$120,730</td>
<td>$118,455</td>
<td>$123,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FICA</strong></td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPERS</strong></td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Insurance</strong></td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Insurance</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SALARIES &amp; WAGES</strong></td>
<td>$128,010</td>
<td>$126,453</td>
<td>$132,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Per Diem &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$18,316</td>
<td>$26,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Travel</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>5,907</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>16,769</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$45,800</td>
<td>$45,530</td>
<td>$52,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$173,810</td>
<td>$171,983</td>
<td>$184,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$173,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Reimbursement</td>
<td>28,020</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>$171,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO Reimbursement</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$184,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RECEIPTS</strong></td>
<td>$173,810</td>
<td>$171,983</td>
<td>$184,640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Salary shown at present level pending final action by Legislature. It is expected that any increase will be funded by separate appropriation.
### REGENTS' MERIT SYSTEM COORDINATOR BUDGET 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries &amp; Wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Coordinator</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steno II</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Salaries</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>$24,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FICA</strong></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPERS</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Insurance</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Insurance</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SALARIES &amp; WAGES</strong></td>
<td>$24,835</td>
<td>$25,005</td>
<td>$26,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$1,445</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expense</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Binding</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$4,425</td>
<td>$3,015</td>
<td>$2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$29,260</td>
<td>$28,020</td>
<td>$29,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUI 41.4%</strong></td>
<td>$12,100</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISU 36.1%</strong></td>
<td>10,560</td>
<td>10,115</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNI 16.0%</strong></td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISD 4.1%</strong></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IBSSS 2.4%</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RECEIPTS</strong></td>
<td>$29,260</td>
<td>$28,020</td>
<td>$29,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES OF APPRECIATION.** The following notes of appreciation among others were given to Regents Redeker, Perrin and Wallace whose terms of office expired June 30, 1973:
Two representatives from Iowa State University, Randy Kerhli, President of the Government of the Student Body, and Vice President Brian Gardner travelled to Iowa City to commend the retiring board members, Mr. Perrin, Mr. Redeker and Mr. Wallace, for the fine work and help they have given the students at Iowa State University during their terms in office.

President Boyd then expressed his appreciation to the retiring board members. Mr. Tom Eilers stated he would like to echo the sentiments of President Boyd and added he would like to thank the retiring members for the student body of the University of Iowa.

Regent Petersen spoke for the board in thanking the three retiring members for the high standards they set for the remaining members and stated the remaining members will make every effort to continue that kind of standard.
The following business pertaining to the University of Iowa was transacted on Thursday, June 28, 1973.

APPOINTMENT. President Boyd introduced to the board Robert G. Hering and requested approval effective immediately of the following appointment:

Robert G. Hering, Professor and Acting Dean, College of Engineering, to become Dean, effective immediately.

Professor Hering has been Acting Dean since September 1, 1972. He holds a B.S.M.E. from the University of Illinois, M.S.M.E. from the University of Southern California, and Ph.D. from Purdue University. He returned to the University of Illinois to teach in 1961 and progressed from assistant professor to full professor. He came to The University of Iowa in 1971 as Professor and Chairman, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Professor Hering's special area of teaching and research interest is in heat transfer and fluid dynamics, on which he has a number of publications. He has professional engineering experience with the Allison Division of General Motors and the Hughes Aircraft Company and as a consultant to other firms.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the appointment of Robert G. Hering to become Dean effective immediately. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HOSPITAL REVENUE BONDS--$10,000,000 SERIES SUI 1973.

The board took up for consideration the matter of providing for the advertisement and sale of $10,000,000 Hospital Building Revenue Bonds, Series SUI 1973.

MOTION: Whereupon Member Perrin introduced and caused to be read a resolution entitled "Resolution directing the advertisement and sale of $10,000,000 Hospital Revenue Bonds, Series 1973", and moved that said resolution be adopted. Member Baldridge seconded the motion and after due consideration the president put the question on the motion and, the roll being called, the following voted:
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
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AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker

NAY: None

Whereupon the president declared the motion duly carried and said resolution adopted.

The board then took up for consideration the matter of authorizing and issuing $10,000,000 Hospital Revenue Building Bonds, Series SUI 1973.

MOTION:

Whereupon Member Perrin introduced and caused to be read a resolution entitled "A Resolution authorizing and providing for the issuance and securing the payment of $10,000,000 Hospital Revenue Bonds, Series 1973, for the purpose of defraying the cost of constructing an addition to the general hospital on campus of the State University of Iowa", and moved that said resolution be adopted. Member Baldridge seconded the motion and after due consideration by the board the president put the question on the motion and upon the roll being called the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker

NAY: None

Whereupon the president declared the motion duly carried and said resolution adopted.

Complete copies of the above mentioned resolutions are on file in the Board Office with the official copy of these minutes.

The following business pertaining to the University of Iowa was transacted on Saturday, June 30, 1973.

DORMITORIES AND DINING SERVICES - AUTHORIZATION FOR PAYMENT OF MAID SALARY AND WAGE ADJUSTMENTS FROM DORMITORY SURPLUS FUND. The board was requested to authorize the University of Iowa to pay dormitory maid salaries and wages equalization adjustment for the fiscal years 1971-72 and 1972-73 from the Dormitory Surplus Fund.
MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved the board authorize the University of Iowa to pay dormitory maid salaries and wages equalization adjustment for the fiscal years 1971-72 and 1972-73 from the Dormitory Surplus Fund.

Ms. Clara Oleson, representing the University of Iowa Employee Association, was present for discussion. She commented that she supports the motion as presented above; however, this is the largest sex discrimination issue in the state and added that the board should not assume the motion will settle this issue. She further added that the board should give serious consideration to asking the legislature to establish contingency funds, considering U of I as a large business necessary of operating expenses. Ms. Oleson also stated the university would not be economically viable without the subsidized work of women.

Regent Shaw raised the question as to who pays this claim—the people of Iowa or the trust fund of the students. Mr. Chambers stated the consumer bears the added cost. He stated that they are trying to find ways to be more efficient and hold costs down.

The Board Office reported:

The equalization of pay for maids and custodians for the last two years has been reported previously to the board. The maids are generally on a seven-eighths time basis but the full-time annual starting rate in 1972-73 is $4,680; after six months it is $4,980. The custodian rate for the same time period is $5,940 to start, $6,120 after six months and $6,360 after one year of service.

The total cost for each of the fiscal years involved in the adjustments is not available as of this date but is being calculated. The number of people involved is not available but is being determined.

The surplus funds are estimated to be approximately $1.4 million as of June 30, 1973 before application of the proposed wage adjustment.
In response to question, a university official stated the amount of money involved is $158,300 for dormitories. Regent Wallace stated that if the maids had been paid properly in the first place, the sum wouldn't be that large.

VOTE ON MOTION: The motion passed unanimously.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of May 1973 were ratified.

APPOINTMENTS. The board was requested to approve the following appointments:

a. Wallace J. Tomasini, Professor and Acting Director, appointment as Director of the School of Art and Art History, effective Fall Semester, 1973-74.

Professor Tomasini holds A.B., A.M., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Michigan, and did post-doctoral study at the University of Florence and the New York University Institute of Fine Arts. He served as instructor in Art History at Finch College prior to his appointment as Assistant Professor at The University of Iowa in 1957. He has served as Acting Director during the 1972-73 academic year. Some of his special interests in scholarship and teaching have been in early Visigothic numismatics and in the social and economic status of Italian artists in the Renaissance.

b. Professor Reginald R. Cooper, M.D., appointment as Acting Head of the Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, effective July 1, 1973.

Professor Cooper holds his B.A. degree from West Virginia University and his M.D. from the Medical College of Virginia. He interned at The University of Iowa and completed residencies here in general and orthopaedic surgery in 1960. He returned to the University as Assistant Professor in Orthopaedics in July 1965. Professor Cooper is a Diplomate of the American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery, Fellow and presently member of the Board of Directors of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, as well as member of numerous other professional societies. He is President-Elect of the Orthopaedic Research Society and has been Secretary for the past three years and a recipient of the Kappa Delta award of the society.

A committee to conduct a search for a Head of the department has been appointed by Dean Eckstein.

Professor Cooper will be replacing Dr. Carroll B. Larson, who has served the University with great distinction in the post since 1950, and who asked to be relieved of leadership responsibilities of the department while continuing to teach.
c. Harley G. Feldick, M.D., staff physician in the Student Health Department, to become Acting Director, effective at once.

Doctor Feldick received his B.S. in 1942 and M.D. in 1945 from The University of Iowa. After military service at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Fargo, N.D., he was a Fellow in Surgery in Elkins, West Virginia. Since 1950 he has been in private practice in Buffalo Center, Iowa, until he joined Student Health in 1971.

d. Thomas H. Walz, appointment as Professor and Director, School of Social Work, College of Liberal Arts, effective August 20, 1972.

Professor Walz holds the B.A. from St. John's University, the Master of Social Work from St. Louis University, and the Ph.D. from Minnesota. After professional experience as a psychiatric social worker at St. Louis State Hospital and as Project Director with the Community Social Rehabilitation Center of Minneapolis, he served for two years as Director of a large Peace Corps project in Honduras, which included nurses and other health professionals as well as social workers. He has served on the faculty of the University of Minnesota since 1964. He is an Associate Professor and Executive Director of the Community Design Center of Minneapolis, a project which provides practical learning experience for students in a number of professional fields. He is the author of a number of books, monographs, and articles on a wide range of subjects, including Honduras, methods of social work education and the delivery of health care.

e. Clayton L. Ringgenberg to be Director, Institute of Public Affairs, effective July 1, 1973, replacing H. Dean Zenor, who will devote full time to his other post as Associate Dean, Extension and University Services.

Mr. Ringgenberg holds the B.A. from Cornell College, and M.S. in Government Management from the University of Denver. He did governmental research in Rhode Island and Massachusetts prior to joining the Institute of Public Affairs in 1952. He left in 1955 to become the first director of the Iowa Legislative Research Bureau. After six years there, he became Co-Director and Research Director of the League of Iowa Municipalities. He returned to the campus as Associate Director, Institute of Public Affairs, in 1965, the post he now holds. He took a leave of absence during 1969-70 to serve as Executive Assistant to Governor Ray. He is a trustee of Grandview College and has served on numerous boards and commissions in state and local government, and is presently a member of the Iowa City Charter Committee.

f. Leonard R. Brcka as Secretary of the University for 1973-74.

g. Ray B. Mossman as Treasurer of the University for 1973-74.

In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the above appointments approved.
RESIGNATION. The board was requested to accept the resignation of Robert E. Engel as Assistant to the President and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs to devote full time to work in the College of Education.

Mr. Thomas Eilers, Student Senate representative, complimented Mr. Engel for the University of Iowa students on his fine work. Regent Wallace also stated he is pleased Mr. Engel has stayed with the university and President Boyd added "we all have the same sentiments".

In absence of any objection, President Redeker declared the above resignation accepted by the board.

REORGANIZATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF CHILD BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT. The board was requested to grant approval of reorganization of the Institute of Child Behavior and Development.

The University of Iowa reported in part:

As a part of the regular process of review of academic programs, the Institute of Child Behavior and Development has been under review during the last two years. An internal review was conducted by the faculty of the Institute. In accord with the review procedure, the Provost appointed a Review Committee consisting of Professor Paul Blommers, Educational Psychology, Chairman; Professor Gladys Jenkins, Home Economics; Professor Isidore Gormezano, Psychology; Professor Kenneth Moll, Speech Pathology; and Professor Gerald Solomons, Pediatrics; with Professor Harold Stevenson of the University of Michigan, former Director of the Institute of Child Behavior at the University of Minnesota, as external member. As a result of these reviews, and of intensive discussions with faculty members in the Institute and in related departments and with administrative officers, it was the Provost's conclusion that a major administrative reorganization and reassignment of functions was desirable.

In recent years, the Institute has had four major functions: (1) basic research in the psychological, social and other development of the normal child; (2) graduate study leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. in Child Psychology; (3) graduate study leading to the M.A. in Pre-School Education; and (4) undergraduate study leading to the B.A. in Child Development. In association with all its functions but especially with the M.A. in Pre-School Education, the Institute has for many years operated
a laboratory pre-school, where from 60-100 children have been enrolled in half-day sessions throughout the year. Administratively, the Institute has reported directly to the Provost and has not been a part of the regular collegiate structure.

The reorganization recommended by the Provost hopes to maintain and extend vigorous academic programs in child psychology, child development, and pre-school education but operating through the established departments and colleges rather than through a free-standing unit. All faculty members will have their academic homes in a department and/or college and will participate in the broader academic programs in those fields. Research will be closely coordinated with undergraduate and graduate teaching in the related disciplines. The Institute will have very little budget or structure of its own but will become simply the coordinating agency for the teaching and research conducted in the various departments and colleges.

Under this plan, undergraduate and graduate study and associated research in child psychology and developmental psychology will become the responsibility of the Department of Psychology. A section of Developmental Psychology, parallel to the sections of General and Experimental Psychology, Clinical Psychology and Personality, Social Psychology, and Physiological Psychology, has been established in the Department of Psychology.

The functions of instruction and research in pre-school education, with the operation of laboratory pre-school facilities, will be transferred to the College of Education and consolidated with the established program in Early Childhood Education in that College. At the same time, the College of Education will take over responsibility for the experimental Day Care Center which has been operated by an interdisciplinary committee at Hawkeye Apartments. The hope of the College of Education is to establish and operate a comprehensive and integrated Early Childhood Education Center, with children of various ages enrolled in both half-day pre-school sessions and day-long day-care sessions in a portion of the University School building. Tuition will be charged to parents and the emphasis will be on provision of model programs for research in the theory and practice of early childhood education and for practicum teaching of University students. Though the responsibility of the entire Center will be that of the College of Education, there will be an interdisciplinary advisory committee, and efforts will be made to provide practicum opportunities for students and research opportunities for both faculty members and students from a variety of fields. Efforts will be made to disseminate the results of this research to people interested in day care and pre-school education throughout the state.

In addition to these major reallocations of functions, one faculty member will be transferred to the Social Psychology section of the Department of Sociology and one to the Division of Educational Psychology, Measurement and Statistics, where their research and teaching will strengthen and add a new dimension to the programs of those departments.
In the past all faculty members and teaching and research assistants in the Institute have been on 12-month appointments. They have also carried a heavier commitment to research and lesser commitment to teaching than that in other departments. Because of students in the existing programs, it will be necessary to maintain a full program in the Institute in the summer of 1973. But beginning in September 1973, all faculty members and graduate assistants formerly on the staff of the Institute will be on academic year appointments in their several departments and will carry the same kind of balanced responsibility for research and teaching, both undergraduate and graduate, as those in other departments.

Because of summer and other phase-out costs, there will be no budgetary savings in the first year of reorganized operation. In succeeding years, however, there should be opportunity for reallocation of resources to other programs.

Because of the importance of coordinating the research and teaching activities formerly in the Institute but now divided among several departments, and coordinating other activities concerning the development of the normal child which have not been the responsibility of the Institute, the Institute will be maintained with a director and an advisory committee appointed from the faculty of the Graduate College (i.e., all faculty members in the University with professorial appointments). The director and the committee will then have the function of advising University administrative officers and the administrative officers of all appropriate departments and colleges on course offerings and degree programs, in order to avoid duplication and provide appropriate opportunities for students. They will also work to stimulate and seek external support for appropriate interdisciplinary research.

We believe that with this reorganization the University will continue to exert strong leadership in the fields of child development and early childhood education, in which it has had an excellent reputation and an excellent record of achievement in the past.

Mr. Heffner, U of I, stated the university is very confident that with the reorganization they can continue to provide that excellent service under a somewhat different arrangement.

Regent Zumbach questioned Mr. Heffner as to who will be the director. Mr. Heffner replied the director is yet to be appointed and the advisory committee remains to be appointed.

MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved the Board approve the reorganization of the Institute of Child Behavior and Development. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.
Mr. Heffner stated to the board that functions in basic research and child psychology will be carried through by the psychology department. Very important work in early childhood education will be consolidated with the ongoing program in the college of education in this field.

Regent Collison responded it will be interesting to see how this department will function. "Child development people perhaps do not altogether go for the psychological emphasis," she stated.

Regent Zumbach stated he has talked with some U of I students who thought the reorganization is a very good idea.

VOTE ON MOTION: The motion passed unanimously.

NAMES FOR STRUCTURES. The board was requested to approve the name Trowbridge Hall to replace the name Dentistry Building on the building now being vacated by dentistry.

The University of Iowa reported:

Professor Arthur C. Trowbridge came to the University in 1911. He served as Chairman of the Geology Department from 1934 until his retirement in 1952. He was Emeritus Professor until his death at age 86 in 1971. Professor Trowbridge had many accomplishments in Geology, two of which include participation in the original detailed survey of the Mississippi Delta for the U.S. Corps of Engineers in 1922, and an international survey resulting in the discovery of an oil field in Iraq in 1925-26.

The university also reported to the board the designation of the house within the University Theatre building as The E. C. Mabie Theatre.

Professor Mabie was a moving spirit in the development of the theatre and directed in this house. He came to the University in 1920 and headed the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, originating with a single course, developing a full curriculum and a graduate program in Dramatic Arts. For a time, Iowa was the only institution offering a Ph.D. in playwriting. He served as department head until his death in 1956.
In absence of any objection, President Redeker declared the above new building name approved and acceptance of the report on the "Mabie" Theatre.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN JOURNALISM. The board was requested to defer action on this proposal and refer it to the Interinstitutional Committee on Educational Coordination prior to a request for board action.

In absence of objection, President Redeker deferred action on this proposal and referred it to the Interinstitutional Committee on Educational Coordination for review and recommendation.

WEST CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. The board was requested to approve the following projects, preliminary plans and budgets and in each case approve the physical plant department as engineer and inspection supervisor. It was noted that all three projects were, in a sense, interrelated.

A. Parking Lot 12 Redevelopment.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 61,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of funds:

- Parking Income $ 57,000
- University RR & A Fiscal Year 1974 4,000

**$ 61,000**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

With advent of the construction of University Hospitals North Tower Addition and the associated loss of patient and visitor parking, it is necessary that the existing Lot 12 West be altered and renovated to provide additional parking to replace this loss.
This project involves the remodeling of the existing Lot 12 West to allow conversion of the Hospital Parking Ramp and Lot 12 West into visitor and patient parking and removal of staff parking from these areas. This also includes the development of a traffic circulation pattern consistent with the moving of the main Hospital entrance to the south, as well as being compatible with the Armory Parking Lot development.

The actual work involves demolition, curb and gutter along the south edge, concrete sidewalks, asphaltic concrete driveways, topsoil spreading and seeding, and miscellaneous associated parking control services.

The charge to RR & A is for campus sidewalks related to the total area development, but not an integral part of the parking lot project.

Mr. Richard E. Gibson, Director, Facilities, Planning and Utilization, U of I, as part of his overall presentation on the three projects and relationships, stated the above project will cause removal of a number of staff parking meters. He said they are proposing to construct a parking lot south of the hospital road in the area immediately to the west of the armory. This would contain 370 parking spaces. As a result of these changes, south hospital road would be closed. All traffic will be routed to the main entrance. Cambus, only, will be permitted to travel south hospital road. Mr. Gibson added that the city has been consulted and the proposal meets with its approval. Mr. Gibson commented that a person will control gates on the road and take money for the parking facility.

Regent Wallace added that it will be a button operated system. A radio-activated system is definitely more expensive but a possibility in the future.

President Boyd stated that the gates will remain open on those Saturday afternoons featuring football games. President Boyd stated Melrose Avenue will be a main entrance to the city from the new interstate.

He said that the need for an emergency entrance on the south side of the hospital is imperative and that he planned to take quick action to place the entrance permanently on the south side.
B. Armory Parking Lot.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$75,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of funds:
- a) Parking Income $70,000
- b) University RR & A Fiscal Year 1974 $5,000

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

As a result of the conversion of the Hospital Parking Ramp and Lot 12 West into visitor and patient parking, there becomes a need to provide additional parking space to accommodate the displaced Medical Faculty and staff.

It is proposed that the area immediately west of the Armory be developed into a 370 space parking lot. This location was selected due to its proximity to the Hospital, as well as being compatible with desirable traffic flow patterns, both pedestrian and vehicular. Also, it is consistent with the anticipated growth of University Hospitals. The "land use" herein proposed has been reviewed and approved by the Campus Planners.

The project involves the construction of a rock-surfaced parking area including grading, storm sewer, curb and gutter around the perimeter, concrete driveway approaches, asphaltic concrete sidewalks, and miscellaneous associated parking control services.

The charge to RR & A is for campus sidewalks related to the total area development but not an integral part of the parking lot project.

C. Baseball Stadium Relocation.
This project is for the relocation of the 3,200 seat (approximately) varsity baseball stadium and playing field from its location next to the Field House to a location adjacent to the north end of the Recreation Building. This move will complete a long-range plan for consolidation of outdoor varsity athletic facilities in the vicinity of Kinnick Stadium and the Recreation Building. More importantly it will free play space for the exclusive use of Physical Education, Recreation and Intramural activities to replace the area to the north to be developed into parking space for Hospital staff (Armory Parking Lot). The availability of play space next to the Field House is important to Physical Education as locker facilities for P. E. classes are in the Field House and class schedules do not permit time-consuming movements to activity areas. The land use decisions involving the old and new sites of the baseball field have been approved by the campus planning consultants.

The actual work consists of installation of new bleacher foundations, dismantling and re-erection of the bleachers, construction of restrooms, lockers, demolition of existing stadium site, site improvement of the new field, including grading, seeding, field drainage, utilities, fencing, and auxiliary items.

Regent Perrin questioned the relocation of the baseball stadium and stated he objected using the $95,000 for this rather than for educational work. A member questioned why athletic funds are not involved, objecting to funding by income from Treasurer's Temporary Investments. Mr. Jolliffe replied the project is not for convenience of the athletic department. Regent Shaw and President Redeker asked whether the location of the field is now designed to take the sun out of the batter's eyes. Mr. Chambers responded that the alignment of the field is designed as far as possible to minimize the problem which had been prevalent in the old field.
President Redeker then brought up the question of lighting the baseball field. This was not seen as either financially feasible nor desirable from the standpoint of evening use.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved the board approve the above three projects, preliminary plans and designate the physical plant department as engineer and inspection supervisor for all three projects. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion. Prior to voting on the motion Mr. Baldridge requested division of the motion. The vote was as follows:
Division A (Parking Lot 12 Redevelopment)
All members voted aye.
Division B (Armory Parking Lot)
All members voted aye.
Division C (Baseball Stadium Relocation)
The motion passed with Mr. Baldridge voting nay.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. Executive Secretary reported the Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the period April 30 through June 15, 1973 had been filed with him, was in order, and was recommended for approval.

The following CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS were recommended for approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AWARDEE</th>
<th>TYPE OF CONTRACT</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities-Boiler No. 9, Contract 7 - Ash</td>
<td>AAA Mechanical Contractors, Inc., Iowa City, Iowa</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>$41,113.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling System Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research Center Roof Replacement</td>
<td>Cedar Rapids Roofing Co., Inc., Cedar Rapids, IA</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>29,757.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Laboratories Animal Quarters Air Conditioning</td>
<td>AAA Mechanical Contractors, Inc., Iowa City, Iowa</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>29,937.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Building - Repair &amp; Waterproof Concrete Roof Deck</td>
<td>Western Waterproofing Co., Inc., Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>23,490.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Hall - West Wing, Renovate Ground, First and Third Floors  
Dunlap & Sons, Inc., Iowa City, Iowa  
General  
82,950.00

University Hospital - Radiology Remodeling  
Don Gannon Construction Co., General  
Iowa City, Iowa  
37,489.00

University Hospital - Radiology Remodeling  
Hubbard Jackson Electric Co., Iowa City, Iowa  
Electrical  
16,450.00

University Hospital - Radiology Remodeling  
Mulford Plumbing & Htg., Inc., Iowa City, Iowa  
Piping  
16,600.00

Remodel 2nd Floor  
University Schools for Pre-School Relocation  
Dunlap & Sons, Iowa City  
General  
68,895.00

West Campus Storm Sewer Modifications  
Gjellefald Constructors, Inc., Forest City, Ia.  
General  
82,200.00

Armory Parking Lot  
Iowa Road Builders Co., Des Moines, Iowa  
General  
64,737.65

Fieldhouse - Grand Avenue Connection  
Iowa Road Builders Co., Des Moines, Iowa  
General  
17,481.20

The board was also requested to declare Gerard Electric Inc., Iowa City, Iowa, an unqualified bidder for purposes of bidding on the general contract - East Hall - West Wing - Renovate Ground, First and Third Floors and return bid security submitted in recognition that the bid so submitted was done through honest error.

The following letter to Mr. Jolliffe from Duane Nollsch, Director, Physical Plant Department, U of I, explains the above request:

Gerard Electric, Inc. submitted the apparent low bid on the above referenced project ($22,676.00), but through an honest mistake bid on the electrical portion only of the remodeling project. This was so indicated on the exterior of the sealed envelope containing the bid documents.

Attached herewith is a copy of a letter received from Gerard Electric, Inc. confirming their status as an Electrical Contractor and that their bid was for electrical construction only.
It is our recommendation that Gerard Electric, Inc. be considered an unqualified bidder on this project and that their bid security in the form of a Certified Check be returned to them.

The board was requested to reject all bids received on the Ventilating and Air Conditioning contract - University Hospital - Radiology Remodeling, and specifically to reject the incorrectly submitted bid of R. M. Boggs, Inc., Iowa City and, further, to direct the university to accomplish the Ventilating and Air Conditioning contract by competitive quotation and purchase order.

The university reported in part:

Specifications called for separate bids for the Piping and for the Ventilating and Air Conditioning. R. M. Boggs, Inc., Iowa City, Ia., submitted a bid of $21,900 to cover both the Piping and the Ventilating and Air Conditioning. Therefore, this bid is not in accordance with specifications; and it is recommended that it be rejected, and that the Ventilating and Air Conditioning work, estimated to cost $5,000, be accomplished by competitive quotation and purchase order.

The rejection of all bids received June 12, 1973 on the Relocation of Kilns project and abandonment of the project was recommended.

The university reported:

The low bid is approximately double the amount of $50,000 budgeted for construction. From an analysis of the low bid, it is apparent that inadequate provision was made in the original estimate for the unstable soil conditions at the site, requiring more extensive and costly construction of foundations and footings. Because of the high cost, it is recommended that all bids be rejected and that the project be abandoned. Studies will be continued in an effort to find an alternative solution to the problem at less cost.

Bids received were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burger Construction Co., Iowa City, Ia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Building Services Co., Coralville, Ia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmer Construction Co., Des Moines, Ia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. McMurray stated that the correct interpretation of the word "abandon" in this case is that the project is being abandoned as presently drawn. The university intends to continue to study this need and pose a different solution.

The board was requested to ratify award of contract made by the Vice President for Business and Finance to Gordon Russell Trucking Company, Iowa City, Iowa for $21,337 for Demolition of East Hall Annex and to waive an irregularity. The single bidder failed to submit equal opportunity data with his bid as required by specifications. The firm, however, is and has been on file in the Compliance Office.

The following PURCHASE ORDERS FOR EQUIPMENT (funded by 1970 sale of Academic Revenue Bonds) were recommended for approval:

Dental Science Building Equipment ratification of orders totaling $88,216.72. Awards made to 66 different vendors. With these orders, some $4,891,191.69 in orders will have been approved and ratified by the board since the December 1970 sale of which $2,641,285.78 will have been for the Dental Science Building.

The following FINAL REPORT was specifically brought to the attention of the board:
GENERAL HOSPITAL ADDITION  
(Project Terminated)

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

Hospital Building Usage Fund $1,664,755.77

EXPENDITURES:

Preliminary Planning-Architects Office $26,448.16
Soil Investigation 14,448.40
Architect's Fee-Skidmore, Owings & Merrill 1,208,859.21
Share of Chilled Water Plant Cost 415,000.00

Total Expenditures $1,664,755.77

The following REVISED PROJECT BUDGETS were recommended for approval:

REMODEL SECOND FLOOR UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS FOR PRE-SCHOOL RELOCATION

REVISED BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preliminary</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and supervision</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>66,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Estimated sales tax refunds</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University RR &amp; A - 1973</td>
<td>$51,700</td>
<td>$72,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University RR &amp; A - 1974</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPLANATION

The purpose and overall concept of the project is unchanged from the original proposal. An analysis of the low bid indicates that no errors were made and therefore the budget increase is due to an unrealistically low original estimate. Cost reduction of $2,350 will be made by changing several items in the project as follows:
1) Delete entrance signs  
2) Delete locking cable on lockers  
3) Delete graphics around drinking fountains and at classroom entrance doors  
4) Change painting from three coats to spot prime and two coats  

These changes will be accomplished through the process of issuing change orders to the successful bidder.

WEST CAMPUS STORM SEWER MODIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preliminary</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer Construction</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$98,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$119,500</td>
<td>$133,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Funds:  
a) North Tower Hospital Addition $61,000  
b) University RR & A 58,500

$119,500 $133,022

EXPLANATION

The construction portion of the budget is increased by $3,522 to cover the recommended contract award of $82,200 plus other miscellaneous related items of less than $10,000 each to be accomplished by quotations and purchase orders and by Physical Plant forces.

The contingency item is increased by $10,000 because of the uncertainties involved in this type of underground work where presently unplatted utility lines may exist.

The following NEW PROJECTS were recommended for approval:
UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL - RADIOLOGY REMODELING

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>(6,700)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>72,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material furnished by owner</td>
<td>(1,550)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,804</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charged to Account D480, therefore not included in the total.


PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project consists of remodeling areas in Diagnostic Radiology located on the seventh floor of the General Hospital and the installation of new X-ray apparatus and associated supporting equipment. The work to be accomplished includes the installation of intricate electrical and control systems, radiology support services, air conditioning, exhaust system, and the necessary facility improvements. This project has been coordinated with the planning of the Radiology expansion in the North Tower Project. Completion of the project will assure the continued and even greater excellence of the hospital's radiology diagnostic capability.

The University Architect's office is designated as the architect and inspection supervisor.
NUTRITION OFFICE REMODELING

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General construction</td>
<td>$8,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical construction</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor covering</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustical ceilings</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC construction</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping construction</td>
<td>2,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner furnished materials</td>
<td>(1,615)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>(1,200)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,282</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charged to Account D480, therefore not included in total

Source of funds: University Hospitals Building Usage Fund
Y985-1010

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project consists of remodeling the former Coffee Shop to provide offices for Dietary Services. The work to be accomplished includes relocation of walls; revising the heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems; installation of floor covering, wall partitions, and acoustical ceilings; and associated electrical construction. Completion of the project will provide a more functional, centralized office area.

Inasmuch as no single portion of the cost will exceed $10,000, work will be accomplished by the Physical Plant department or by competitive quotations and purchase order, or by a combination of these.

The University Architect's office is designated as the architect and inspection supervisor.
CARDOLOGY PATIENT AND SUPPORT ROOMS REMODELING

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>$3,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General construction</td>
<td>9,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical construction</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical construction</td>
<td>5,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing construction</td>
<td>8,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor covering, acoustical ceiling and painting</td>
<td>6,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications installation</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials furnished by owner</td>
<td>3,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$43,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Funds:
University Hospital Building Usage
Fund Y985-0804 $43,312

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project consists of remodeling areas adjoining the new surgical cardiology suite located on the third floor of the General Hospital. The work to be accomplished includes relocation of walls, the addition of new patient and nursing bathroom facilities, doors, electrical and mechanical equipment, floor covering, acoustical ceilings, and painting. Completion of the project will provide four new two bed patient rooms, a new patient service kitchen, a nurses lounge and locker/bathroom, a nutrition office and a nursing office.

Inasmuch as no single portion of the cost will exceed $10,000, work will be accomplished by the Physical Plant department or by competitive quotations and purchase order, or by a combination of these.

The University Architect's office is designated as the architect and inspection supervisor.
**SOUTH LOBBY REMODELING**

**PRELIMINARY BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Supervision</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Construction</td>
<td>$9,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Construction</td>
<td>$8,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Construction</td>
<td>$4,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Construction</td>
<td>$3,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>$2,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustical Ceiling</td>
<td>$4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Doors (Supplied by Owner)</td>
<td>(9,164)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework (Supplied by Owner)</td>
<td>(11,490)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,155</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charged to Account D480, therefore not included in the total.

Source of Funds: University Hospitals Building Usage Fund Y985-0803

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This project consists of remodeling the South Lobby and Admissions Office on the first floor of the General Hospital. The work to be accomplished includes construction of a new entrance, acoustical ceilings, lighting, walls, doors and painting. Completion of the project will provide more convenient patient, visitor and staff ingress and egress; an improved admitting area; and a new information station which will replace the North Tower Lobby station.

Inasmuch as no single portion of the cost will exceed $10,000, work will be accomplished by the Physical Plant department or by competitive quotations and purchase order, or by a combination of these.

The University Architect's office is designated as the architect and inspection supervisor.
REMODEL: SECOND FLOOR UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS FOR PRE-SCHOOL RELOCATION

Preliminary Budget

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and supervision</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of funds: University RR&A - 1973 $51,700
University RR&A - 1974 5,300

Project Description

The purpose of this project is to provide an educational laboratory wherein students, staff and children may participate in a practicum experience in early childhood education. In harmony with the desire to develop a sequential and integrated program in the preschool years, this laboratory will provide a setting for the physical, social, emotional and intellectual development of children aged 0 to 5. In addition, the laboratory will provide a substantial number of students with practicum experiences, serve as a model for public and private child care centers and permit the carrying-on of research activities of faculty members which involve children of pre-school age, including applied research centering on the task of quality child care in an institutional setting.

The present pre-school operation is located in two converted residences, and a converted shed, the ages of which are not known. Not only are these structures in a generally delapidated condition they are incapable of being brought up to recently adopted standards for pre-schools at a reasonable cost. These structures will be razed in the near future.

The project includes the second floor of the University Schools building and the playground to the northeast. Work will include some minor demolition and new partitions, a new lay-in ceiling with recessed lighting, new floor covering in most of the area and a new fence on the west side of the playground. It will also include a new smoke detection fire alarm system, new doors, the replacement of nine sinks and eight water closets with children's height fixtures and repainting of all the rooms. There will also be some cabinetry and a new dishwasher in the kitchen.

The Physical Plant Department is designated as the architect and inspection supervisor.
ORTHOPAEDIC INPATIENT REMODELING

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General construction</td>
<td>$50,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping construction</td>
<td>$21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation construction</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical construction</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner furnished materials</td>
<td>$(17,400)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>$(4,400)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,705</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charged to Account D480, therefore not included in the total

Source of Funds: University Hospitals Building Usage Fund Y985-1009

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project consists of remodeling the southwest patient ward of Children's Hospital. The work to be accomplished includes construction of new walls, acoustical ceilings, lighting, doors; air conditioning; plumbing and medical gas service system; exhaust system and electrical service distribution. Completion of the project will provide a new orthopaedic inpatient unit comprised of eight two bed rooms and one private room, seven patient bathrooms, one wheelchair patient toilet, and ancillary facilities.

The University Architect's office is designated as the architect and inspection supervisor.

Mr. Richey stated that during session Representative Kreamer asked for a 20-year report on hospital building projects. He added that he will summarize the Kreamer report and send to board members. He then questioned what the hospital plans are for the coming year in the way of remodeling.

Dr. Hardin, U of I, stated a considerable amount of remodeling will be done. Forty-nine projects are currently foreseen—the list of projects will
be furnished to the board at an early date, he stated.

Regent Petersen then queried as to the appearance of the outside of the North Tower Project. President Boyd stated he was still concerned about two matters: appearance of the North Tower and practical aspects of the interior court. Extensive discussion ensued. President Boyd noted that at an early date he would bring the matter of the facade and the courtyard to the board for detailed discussion.

Regent Collison questioned how the university from a safety standpoint planned to locate the pre-school function on the second floor of the university school building. Mr. Gibson replied that the function will actually be located at ground level and that in fact the location selected for this function in this building is the only location which will meet fire and safety standards.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved the board approve the Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the period April 30 through June 15, 1973; the construction contracts as shown above be awarded; the purchase orders for equipment for Dental Sciences Building be approved; the two revised project budgets be approved, the new projects be approved; Gerard Electric, Inc., Iowa City, Iowa be declared an unqualified bidder for purposes of bidding on the general contract - East Hall - West Wing - Renovate Ground, First and Third Floors, and return bid security submitted, as recognition that the bid so submitted was done so through honest error; all bids received on the Ventilating and Air Conditioning contract - University Hospital Radiology Remodeling, be rejected and specifically reject the incorrectly submitted bid of R. M. Boggs, Inc., Iowa City, and direct the university to accomplish the Ventilating and Air Conditioning contract by competitive quotation and purchase order; all bids received June 12, 1973 on the Relocation of Kilns project be rejected and the project
be abandoned; the irregularity in bidding be waived on the East Hall Annex Demolition Project and the board ratify award of contract made by the Vice President for Business and Finance to Gordon Russell Trucking Co., Iowa City, Iowa in the amount of $21,337; and authorize Executive Secretary to sign all necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perrin and passed unanimously.

1973-74 TRAFFIC AND PARKING REGULATIONS. The board was requested to approve the Motor Vehicle and Bicycle Regulations, 1973-74, for the University of Iowa.

The Board Office reported that all universities have filed their rules in accordance with Departmental Rules requirements. The revisions submitted do not change the substance of the material already filed. The language in the Code however makes it necessary that the board approve all traffic and parking regulations for the institutions prior to the institutions enforcing said regulations.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the Motor Vehicle and Bicycle Regulations, 1973-74, for the University of Iowa. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

A complete file on the Motor Vehicle and Bicycle Regulations, 1973-74, is kept at the Board Office.

APPROVAL OF 1972-73 BUDGET INCREASE FOR GENERAL UNIVERSITY. The board was requested to approve a 1972-73 budget increase of $219,575.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase in Estimated Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>$84,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursed Indirect Costs</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Budget Increase $219,575
During the fuel oil crisis last winter, the University released to the state a quantity of #2 fuel oil and accepted #6 fuel oil instead. The additional cost to the University to use the lower grade fuel was $84,575, and the University has requested reimbursement of this additional expense from state funds.

Funds made available from additional income through reimbursement of indirect costs under Federal and Non-Federal grants and contracts will be used to cover the cost of the following additional needs:

- Law Library Books $50,000
- General Library Books $35,000
- Instructional Equipment $50,000
- **Total** $135,000

The Board Office reported that the state funds as mentioned are for the additional cost of lower grade fuel which was in response to the Governor's request. The corresponding additional estimated costs for 1973-74 and 1974-75 are $236,000 and $319,000, respectively, which were included in the Governor's budget recommendations and the appropriations for the coming biennium.

**MOTION:** Mrs. Collison moved the board approve the 1972-73 budget increase for general university. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**BUDGET CEILING ADJUSTMENT 1972-73, Psychopathic Hospital.** The board was requested to approve a $60,000 budget ceiling adjustment.

A letter to Mr. Jolliffe from George Winokur, M.D., Director of the Hospital, read as follows:

The continuing trend of a higher ratio of paying patients at Psychopathic Hospital has increased our income to a greater figure than originally budgeted. We are requesting that the 1972-73 budget be adjusted upward by $60,000.00 as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F820 Pay Patients</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$271,000</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We request that this be allocated to the following expense accounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Budget 1972</th>
<th>Budget 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F212 Patient Meals</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F070 Equipment Unappropriated</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F090 RRA-Unappropriated</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in meals reflects a projected 10% increase in patient days. The increase in equipment will be used for furniture replacement in patient and office areas. The increased R.R.A. budget will be used in painting and general renovation.

MOTION: Mrs. Collison moved the board approve the 1972-73 budget increase for Psychopathic Hospital as shown above. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

REVISION OF CLASSIFICATION AS A RESIDENT FOR FEE PURPOSES. The board was requested to approve a revision of the Classification as a Resident for Fee Purposes.

The following amendments were proposed (new words are underlined and deletions are lined through):

20. Classification as a Resident for Fee Purposes (Regents 11-19-64, 5-13-65, 10-13-67). A student enrolled in the Graduate College, or the College of Law, the College of Dentistry or the College of Medicine, who holds a University teaching or research appointment of quarter-time or above, and who is below the rank of assistant professor, and resident physicians and dentists and dietetic interns in the hospitals are assessed the resident student fees for the terms during which they hold the appointment, and for any adjacent summer sessions during which they are registered. This includes graduate students appointed to Graduate College fellowships or to research assistantships from federal or non-federal grants and contracts. It does not include, however, those graduate students who hold traineeships under training grants.
Non-resident students enrolled in the Graduate College or the College of Law who hold teaching or research appointments of quarter-time or more, now pay resident tuition. The same consideration should be extended to students enrolled in the Colleges of Medicine and Dentistry. A few such students holding master's degrees in allied health fields will serve as teaching assistants.

Resident physicians and dentists in the hospitals, as well as dietetic interns, are sometimes registered in master's degree programs in the Graduate College, although the University of Iowa has discontinued the practice of awarding the Ph.D. in clinical medical specialties and is reducing the number of master's programs in these areas. (An exception to this trend is the new master's program in pathology.) In dentistry there is a trend toward graduate degrees in clinical specialties. In both medicine and dentistry the graduate degree is usually sought after completion of the professional degree program. Because these persons perform essential services in University programs while they are advanced students in a clinical setting, they seem entitled to the same consideration as graduate teaching and research assistants.

The Board Office reported that the proposal to classify as a resident for fee purposes students enrolled in the College of Dentistry or College of Medicine who are resident physicians and dentists and dietetic interns in the hospitals would result in some reduction in revenue. Non-resident rate of $1,600 for academic year less $870 for resident rate would amount to $730 per student reduction in the revenue. At present there are only four students to which the new proposed policy would apply so the total revenue reduction would only amount to about $2,900 at this time.

Regent Zumbach asked whether the above is consistent with the policies of all three state institutions. Mr. Heffner stated that at the University of Iowa this is an extension of existing policy.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the above revision of the Classification as a Resident for Fee Purposes. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

CHANGES IN STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE DISTRIBUTION. The board was requested to approve the following changes in student activity fee distribution, effective with 1973 summer session.
Allocate to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sem. Summer</td>
<td>Sem. Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Publications</td>
<td>$2.00 $1.00</td>
<td>$2.00 $1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of I Student Association Senate</td>
<td>1.35 --</td>
<td>1.18 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of I Collegiate Associations Council</td>
<td>.45 --</td>
<td>.62 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambus</td>
<td>1.40 --</td>
<td>2.37 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Course</td>
<td>.28 --</td>
<td>.28 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Arts Theater</td>
<td>.65 --</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Opera and Dance Theater</td>
<td>.02 .15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band-Highlander Trips</td>
<td>.15 .15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Class Memorial</td>
<td>.05 .25</td>
<td>.05 .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.50</strong> $1.55 **</td>
<td><strong>$6.50</strong> $1.55 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board Office reported:

The University of Iowa tuition and fees in the amount of $620 per academic year includes the amount of $53 per academic year for fees which are utilized for student publications, Recreation Building, Memorial Union activities, Memorial Union Building, Auditorium Building and student activities. The amount for student publications and student activities is $13 per academic year or $6.50 per semester which is the subject of this docket item.

The allocation to the various purposes has been accomplished by a process in which the student senate considered the needs and submitted a recommendation. Then the Committee on Tuition and Fees consisting of administration, faculty and student members developed a final proposed allocation. The student senate voted to have activities pertaining to academic departments supported by those academic departments. Students felt that more support for Cambus is appropriate. These views are reflected in the proposed allocations. You may note that the fee for the summer session of $1.55 is approximately one-fourth the semester rate of $6.50 whereas the summer session is approximately half as long as the regular semester. However, this difference is offset by the fact that the summer session is less active than the regular academic year with regard to those areas supported by the fees discussed herein. It is recommended that the proposal be approved.

Mr. Heffner said that these decisions had been reached relative to those programs formerly funded by student activity fees but which now are proposed to be dropped from such funding. The cost of the Dramatic Arts Theater,
which is an important aspect of speech and drama program, will be shifted to general funds. The summer opera program will also be supported from the general fund. Band-Highlander trips will be funded from reallocated student service funds. Senior Class Memorial will be dropped. This decision was reached with the concurrence of the Alumni Association.

President Boyd stated the students recommend a decision which would relieve him of administrative responsibilities in allocating student fees. President Boyd stated it is quite clear that he cannot relieve himself of this duty and added that legal advice would be necessary as to whether a person has such authority.

Mr. Eilers, Student Senate representative, stated the students at U of I are trying to bring more of the student activity fee under their direct control through a more direct allocation procedure. President Boyd commented that there are some funds which have been frozen somewhat into a mold.

President Boyd stated the only thing he felt he has been relieved of with regard to his responsibility as president has been the removal of the merit employees from under his responsibility. He stated this was removed from the campus by legislation. Regent Wallace commented that the Board of Regents can only delegate authority to the president and the faculty and cannot delegate any authority to the students.

There was additional discussion as to the allocation process at Iowa State and Northern Iowa. It was determined that this matter should be docketed at an early date.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the above changes in student activity fee distribution. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE SCHEDULE FOR PRE-SCHOOL LABORATORIES. The board was requested to approve the following proposed schedule of charges for Pre-School Laboratories:

Present Schedule of Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hawkeye Day Care Center</th>
<th>$50 a month per child (includes lunches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool (half-day)</td>
<td>$60 per semester $20 per summer session (plus snack charge of $9 per semester and $3.50 per summer session)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Schedule of Charges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Care Children</th>
<th>$50 a month per child (plus meal charges)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Children (half-day)</td>
<td>$25 a month per child (plus snack charges)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Iowa reported:

The requested fee changes for Child Care as well as for Preschool children at the Early Childhood Education Center are predicated upon the new and expanded care and educational programs. Whereas the present Hawkeye Day Care program utilizes volunteer aides to supplement a small professional staff, the new program intends to utilize a larger professional staff in a new educational configuration of greater consequence. In addition, the Preschool classes will be extended two and one-half hours per week. These changes in operation, coupled to a supervised and balanced meal program represent an increase in costs which is reflected in the increased charges. Notwithstanding the possible effect of wage-price guidelines on our tuition and fee structure, we request approval of these new rates. We shall abide by any price guidelines. We believe, however, that potential enrollees in our programs should be advised of our new fee schedules even though initial charges, as dictated by federal guidelines, may be lower.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the proposed schedule of charges for pre-school laboratories. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
Regent Collison asked as to how many children are involved in pre-school activities. Mr. Heffner responded by saying 84 children are currently attending. Sixty of these children are on the day care operation and 24 are in pre-school (half days). The child must be 4½ years of age before entering. The program will have some relationship to the way kindergartens are run but will not include kindergarten experience, per se.

TENANT PROPERTY RENTALS. The board was requested to approve the following tenant property rentals for the year September 1, 1973 through August 31, 1974. The list contains a total of 159 University of Iowa tenant rentals, a net decrease of 6 from last year.

Iowa City Residences - 14
This figure remained the same through the 1972-73 period. The university proposes to increase rents on six of the units, the largest increase being $20 per month.

Pre-school and Day Care Centers - 7
This figure remained the same through the 1972-73 period. Monthly rates are unchanged.

Iowa City Apartments and Duplexes - 45
This is an increase of six from the 1972-73 period. The university plans rent increases for the duplexes for three units of $10 per month.

Oakdale Residences - 93
This figure remained the same through the 1972-73 period. Monthly rates are unchanged.

The following changes in tenant property facilities were made since September 1, 1972:

Iowa City Residences
Delete 503 South Madison Street - to be razed
Add 302 Melrose Avenue - purchased during 1972-73

Iowa City Apartments and Duplexes
Add 417 South Capitol Street (6 apartments) - purchased during 1972-73
President Boyd singled out the seven pre-school and day care centers for special consideration. He noted that the university desires to execute these leases as early as possible and would be making two changes in the leases from what the board had originally approved. Because of changing fire and safety requirements the university believes that some $5,700 will need to be expended to bring these buildings up to current safety standards. The university is unclear as to the source of these funds at this time. Permission is requested to approve the leases at this meeting with a report made to the board at the next meeting as to the source of funds. The university proposed that it pay for liability insurance under the lease rather than payment of such insurance being handled by the operators of the centers. Extensive discussion ensued.

Regent Collison requested a report be made to the board on numbers of individuals availing themselves of these centers. President Boyd stated that such a report would be made to the board at an early date.

In response to question, Dean Hubbard responded that these centers are basically run for children of faculty, students and staff but there are some non-affiliated people who avail themselves of this service.

Discussion then turned to how the rentals had been and would be funded under the leases. Mr. Tom Eilers and Mr. Rod Miller, representing day care centers, joined in discussion. President Boyd reiterated that his intent in bringing this matter to the board was to specify changes contemplated in the lease arrangement prior to the time the board approved the tenant property rentals for the year.

Mr. Miller stated he felt day care centers are quite far behind on their rent. Matching funds haven't been coming in like they are supposed to.
MOTION: Mrs. Collison moved the board approve the tenant property rentals for the year September 1, 1973 through August 31, 1974. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion. On roll call, the following voted:
AYE: Bailey, Biadridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker
NAY: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF EASTMENT. The board was requested to approve the following easement:

WHEREAS, the State of Iowa holds title to the following real estate located in Polk County, Florida, for the use and benefit of the State University of Iowa under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Regents, to-wit:

The Northeast Quarter (NE¼) of the Northwest Quarter (NW¼) of Section Six (6), Township Twenty-nine (29) South, Range Twenty-six (26) East,

and

WHEREAS, the TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY, a Florida Corporation, requests an easement over a portion of the above described tract of land for the purpose of constructing electrical lines, supporting structures and necessary appurtenances thereto, to serve a 40 horsepower engine located on the above described tract; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the proper care of the citrus fruit grove located on the above described tract that said grove be irrigated and that electrical power be furnished to operate the equipment providing the irrigation.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Iowa State Board of Regents for the use and benefit of the State University of Iowa (hereinafter referred to as the Grantor) in consideration of one dollar and other valuable considerations recited herein hereby grants unto the TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY (hereinafter referred to as the Grantee), the following easement, subject to these terms, covenants and conditions, to-wit:

1. Location: The easement herein granted shall be located upon and limited to a strip of land 15 feet wide, the centerline being described as follows:

Beginning at a point 617 feet South of the Northeast corner of the Northeast ¼ of the Northwest ¼ of Section 6, Township 29 South, Range 26 East, thence running West a distance of 585 feet.

2. Use: Said premises shall be used by the Grantee for the purposes of constructing, operating, maintaining and replacing on and removing from said premises, in connection with the Grantee's conduct of its business, an installation described as lines of wires, supporting structures and necessary appurtenances thereto, together with the right of ingress and egress to and from the same, and for no other purpose.
3. **Access**: Grantee's entrance upon the Grantor's premises for the purpose of constructing on, or servicing said easement, or for the repair or removal of the same shall be over reasonable routes of access designated by the agents or representatives of the State University of Iowa managing the premises, and any parts of said premises damaged in the course thereof shall be promptly replaced or restored by the Grantee.

4. **Excavations**: All ditches, trenches and other excavations shall be firmly filled and maintained in such manner as to present no hazard or obstacle to Grantor's use of the premises for other purposes.

5. **Liability**: Grantee covenants to indemnify and save the Grantor, the State University of Iowa, and its tenants, employees, officials, guests and invitees lawfully using said premises, harmless from any and all damages arising from the Grantee's use of the premises under the rights herein granted, except such as may be due to unavoidable casualty beyond the Grantee's control and without its fault or such as Grantee may be exempt from under the laws of Florida. Damages to crops, fences or other property of the University or its tenants during original construction and subsequent maintenance, repair and use of the premises under this agreement shall be promptly compensated for by Grantee.

6. **Rights Reserved**: The Grantor reserves to itself and to the State University of Iowa the right to the full use of said premises for any purpose it sees fit which does not interfere with Grantee's rights herein granted.

7. **Consideration Agreement**: It is agreed and understood that the consideration for this grant are the facts that the electrical transmission lines to be relocated, constructed and used in the easement tract are to serve the irrigation facilities and equipment of the Grantor's citrus fruit grove located on the premises.

8. **Duration**: This easement is granted and all rights hereunder shall endure for such period of time as they are required and used for the electrical transmission facilities herein described. Whenever said purpose and use shall cease, all rights granted herein shall terminate and revert to the Grantor.

9. **Assignment Prohibited**: This grant is to the TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY only and cannot be assigned in whole or in part to any other party without written consent of the Grantor.

Each and all of the above terms, covenants and conditions are of the essence hereof and the Grantee, by accepting this instrument, covenants to comply and perform as so specified; the Grantee's failure to do so shall entitle the Grantor to terminate all rights hereunder by serving a written notice upon the Grantee specifying its defaults, and if the Grantee fails to fully comply as obligated herein within one year after said notice, all of its rights, title and interest hereunder shall cease and terminate and the Grantor shall be entitled to full possession of the premises.
MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved the board approve the above easement. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and on roll call the following voted:
AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker
NAY: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried.

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY. The board was requested to approve the purchase of the 100 Block of West Harrison Street.

Present Owner
Central Ready-Mixed Concrete Company

Legal Description
Lots 5 and 6 in Block 4 in that part of Iowa City, Iowa, laid out by the commissioners of Johnson County, Iowa, as the County Seat of said county subject to easements and restrictions of record.

General Description
The land area is 24,000 square feet, zoned M-1 (Light Industrial). On the property are located three buildings consisting of 5,117 square feet of space. The buildings were used to house Ready-Mix trucks and all have large overhead doors. The buildings are further described as follows:

Concrete Block Building: This building is a typical concrete block structure with no interior partitions, a concrete floor, a hot-water heating system and two overhead doors. The condition is judged to be fair.

Older Steel Building: This building is attached to the concrete block building and is steel frame with corrugated metal siding, a concrete floor and two overhead doors. The condition is judged to be fair.

Newer Steel Building: This is a typical Butler type steel building with insulated walls and ceilings, concrete floor, a suspended forced-air gas furnace and four overhead doors. The condition is judged to be fair.

The buildings are located in the Southeast corner of the land area, thus providing interim usage of both buildings and land.
Purchase Price ($88,000 and $95,000)

The purchase price is $95,000 payable upon approval of the Board of Regents and the Executive Council of the State of Iowa and the balance on possession and on delivery of a warranty deed and abstract of good merchantable title.

Availability of Funds

Funds for this purchase are available from unexpended balances in the Income from Treasurer's Temporary Investments.

Need for Purchase

The property is located within the immediate campus boundaries and is bounded on two sides by University owned property and on two sides by utility owned property (Crandic Railroad). Acquisition of this property together with Lots 7 and 8 (Dane - see Docket item B-10b) will complete ownership of the entire block bounded by Madison, Harrison, Front and Court Streets. The property has been used as part of a Ready-Mix Concrete business and should be purchased now by the University while available now at a reasonable price. While the need for the property is based on land location, the land and buildings will provide urgently needed and excellent storage facilities for various University needs.

Failure to purchase and control this property would no doubt result in its sale and development in accordance with the M-1 Light Industrial Zoning. This development would result in an increase in the future acquisition cost of this property.

Regent Bailey questioned Mr. Jolliffe as to the worth of the buildings on the property. Mr. Jolliffe replied they are worth about $72,000 on the basis of land value of $3/sq.ft.

MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved the board approve the purchase of property of the 100 Block of West Harrison Street in Iowa City, Iowa.

Mrs. Collison seconded the motion. On roll call the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redecker

NAY: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY. The board was requested to approve the purchase of the 100 Block of West Court Street in Iowa City, Iowa.
Present Owner
George R. Dane

Legal Description
Lots 7 and 8 in Block 4 in that part of Iowa City, Iowa known as the County Seat of Johnson County, Iowa, according to the recorded plat thereof, except beginning at a point on the West boundary line of said Lot 8, 15 feet South of the Northwest corner thereof; running thence North 15 feet to the Northwest corner of said Lot 8; thence East along the North boundary of said Lot 8, 15 feet; thence in a Southwesterly direction to the place of the beginning.

General Description
The land area is 23,887.5 square feet, zoned M-1 (Light Industrial). On the land are located six (6) buildings totaling 12,047 square feet of storage space. The buildings are individually described as follows:

Butler Building: (40' x 120') This is a typical steel Butler Building with concrete floor, insulated double panelled walls, two overhead heaters and 5 large overhead doors. This building is in good condition.

Mail Room Building: (22' x 36' with a 16' x 22' garage) The building is a one-story frame structure presently housing our Campus Mail Service. A rental of $110.00 per month plus utilities has been paid to the present owner for the lease of this property. This structure is old and judged to be in fair condition.

Large Wood Frame Building: (35' x 80') This building was used for grain storage but is presently used for storage by a local tire company. The wood frame building has a dirt floor and is considered to be in fair condition.

Wood Frame Building: (24' x 64') This building is a dry storage wood frame structure with concrete floor. It is presently used to store a local bank's records. The condition of this property is considered to be good.

Shed: (12' x 20') This is a wood frame building, dirt floor, ideal for use as a garage, general condition is fair.

Metal Quonset Building: This building is a typical steel quonset structure with concrete floor. The building is used for storage and is considered to be in fair condition.

Purchase Price ($118,000 and $125,000)
The purchase price is $120,000, payable $20,000 upon approval of the Board of Regents and the Executive Council of the State of Iowa and the balance in five equal annual installments with interest at 5% on the unpaid balance and upon possession and delivery of a warranty deed and abstract of good merchantable title.
Availability of Funds

Funds for this purchase are available from unexpended balances in the Income from Treasurer's Temporary Investments.

Need for Purchase

The property is located within the immediate campus boundaries and specifically in an area bounded on two sides by University owned property and on two sides by utility owned property (Crandic Railroad). This property acquisition, together with Lots 5 and 6 (Central Ready-Mixed Concrete Co. - See Docket item B-10a), will allow the University to complete ownership of the entire block bounded by Madison, Harrison, Front and Court Streets. While the need for the property is based on land location, the land and buildings will provide urgently needed and excellent storage facilities for various University needs. It should be purchased now while available at a price of $5,000 below the top appraisal and at terms favorable to the University of Iowa.

Failure to purchase and control this property would no doubt result in its sale and development in accordance with the M-1 Light Industrial Zoning. This development would result in an increase in the future acquisition cost of this property.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the purchase of the 100 Block of West Court Street in Iowa City, Iowa. Mr. Baldridge seconded the motion. On roll call the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redecker

NAY: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

Mr. Richey called attention to the overall policy whereby the university rates land for acquisition purposes. He suggested that the university review its land acquisition policy in light of any changes which had occurred since its initial adoption including a stable enrollment picture to determine if the university should continue to acquire as much land as might be required under the present policy. President Boyd stated this was a reasonable request and the university would undertake such a review.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET. The preliminary budgets for University of Iowa for 1973-74 are presented in the general section of these minutes.
BUILDINGS TO BE RAZED. The board was requested to authorize the university to raze five structures.

For the past several months the Facilities Committee has been studying the question of space to be razed at the three universities. This study has included visual inspection of all buildings suggested by the institutions as being eligible for razing by 1985. At the last meeting of the committee members took action for purposes of planning to attempt to raze some 900,000 gross square feet by 1985. This represents some 12% of academic administrative space currently in use at the three universities. Most of this space cannot be razed until appropriations for replacement space are provided by the Iowa Legislature.

The University of Iowa is proposing to raze some 15,000 net assignable square feet in these five buildings or some 17,000 gross square feet. The university is to be commended for its efforts to take buildings out of service and raze same when such buildings are no longer needed and continued use of the structure could only be possible through costly renovation and continued high operating cost. The largest structure of these five is the Navy Stores which constitutes slightly over 11,000 gross square feet of the total. The University of Iowa has presented to the Facilities Committee a Space to Be Razed list totaling slightly over 500,000 gross square feet. The list before the Board at this meeting will enable the university to make a start toward razing antiquated space but significant dents in meeting the overall plan for razing space will require continued legislative appropriations to the universities for new construction through 1983. The Facilities Committee will present the results of its efforts in modeling academic administrative space to the board this fall. A significant part of that presentation will be devoted to the question of razed space.

The University of Iowa reported:

Reassignments of space during the coming months will result in the vacation of the following structures. In keeping with the University objective of discontinuance of use of as much temporary and converted type space as is possible and reasonable, the University plans to raze the listed structures. In all instances the University is able to get along without the space in question and except for very marginal uses none of the space is suitable for continued use without unreasonable expenditure of funds.

29 W. Market St. (Bldg. 105)

This converted residence, most recently occupied by the College of Dentistry, is now vacant. Extensive modifications of the space for Dentistry make the house unsuitable for new occupants without extensive renovation which is not warranted due to the generally poor condition of the house. The house is no longer suitable for the programs of the University.
403 S. Capitol (Bldg. 294)

This converted residence was most recently utilized as Art Department faculty studio space. It was vacated upon the advice of Physical Plant due to its dangerous structural condition. It is no longer safe to use nor worth repair. The house is no longer suitable for the programs of the University.

Iowa Mountaineers Temporary Building (Bldg. 107) and Old Radio Research (Bldg. 25)

The Iowa Mountaineers Temporary, constructed in the mid-forties, was most recently used as storage space for the Mountaineers, a student organization, and for other marginal storage activities. The building is a wooden frame type structure. Old Radio Research, constructed in 1925, and also a wood frame structure, is physically connected to the Mountaineers Temporary. It has most recently been used for marginal storage activities. As the space is no longer suitable for University programs, it is proposed that these two buildings be razed at the same time Navy Stores "E", located next to them, is razed.

Navy Stores "E" (Bldg. 117)

This building, a wood frame construction warehouse, was constructed during World War II as part of the Navy Pre-Flight program. Its most recent use has been as warehouse space for the Dormitory System. This warehouse function is now being performed in the Hawkeye Apartments area and the building is no longer needed. It is proposed that this building, along with the two discussed above, be razed for the purpose of clearing this type of structure from the west dormitory area of the campus. These buildings are also in the immediate area of the South Park Married Housing Temporaries which will be vacated and razed this summer. Removal of this building, the two buildings discussed above and the South Park units will result in removal of all temporary and wooden structures from this area of the campus.

Gilmore Hall Temporaries D & E (Bldgs. 923 and 924)

These metal World War II Barracks units will be vacated this summer by Campus Security. Their condition is such that they should be removed immediately. They are no longer suitable for University programs.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the board authorize the university to raze the five above-named structures and moved that the board compliment university officials on their environmental improvement program. Mr. Baldridge seconded the motion and on roll call the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redecker
NAY: None
ABSENT: None

The motion carried.
Regent Bailey asked how the HEFC study rated these particular buildings.

Mr. Gibson stated that he did not believe the study rated buildings of the nature that were being posed for razing in this meeting.

**UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL RATE INCREASES 1973-74.** The board was requested to approve a rate increase of 3% for the University Hospital.

John W. Colloton, Director and Assistant Vice President for Health Affairs, U of I, explained the proposal by memorandum:

_The appropriation element of the 1973-74 University Hospital income budget is that amount of the 1973-75 biennial appropriation recommended by the Governor for 1973-74 allocation, while the increase in budgeted revenue from non-indigent patients ("Other Income") is the anticipated accrual from an increase in rates of not more than three percent to be effected during the forthcoming fiscal year. In accord with the "ratio of charges to cost" reimbursement principles of Medicare legislation, the increased earnings will not be generated through an "across the board" percentage increase, but rather will emanate from variable increases applied to specific individual services. The variability will be based upon departmental cost studies, recently updated by our Controller, which indicate the need for increasing the rates of some services while holding others at current charge levels._

_To assure the absolute compatibility of the rate increase with Federal Phase III Economic Stabilization Program regulations applicable to the Health Science Industry, the timing of the effectuation of the rate increase will be held in abeyance for approximately the first quarter of the fiscal year until such time as all regulation and service volume parameters are crystallized. Based on presently anticipated volumes of service, enactment of the rate increase in this manner will result in accrual of revenue adequate to earn the proposed paying patient income budget. The 1973-74 University Hospital per diem rate, as reflected on the attached exhibit, will continue to be the lowest in effect in any comparable University-teaching hospital in the midwest._
### AVERAGE PER DIEM CHARGES OF
#### UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER HOSPITAL</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>REPORTED* 1972-73</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED* 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$204.00</td>
<td>$216.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cleveland</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>181.80</td>
<td>204.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>179.21</td>
<td>190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>166.72</td>
<td>172.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>154.31</td>
<td>163.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Indiana</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>156.83</td>
<td>158.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>128.28</td>
<td>139.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa City</td>
<td>122.70</td>
<td>126.50**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on a March 1973 survey of member hospitals

**Based on a 3% rate increase

**MOTION:** Mr. Perrin moved the board approve the 3% rate increase for the University Hospital. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The Board Office reported that it is proposed the rate increase be applied after the end of the first quarter subject to Phase Four Guidelines.

**WESTSIDE CHILLED WATER PLANT ADDITION - PHASE II.** The board was requested to approve the project, preliminary plans and budget and designate the Physical Plant as inspection supervisor.

The Board Office reported that it was extremely doubtful that this project can be financed from appropriations for capital for the 1973-75 biennium.
because the legislature has line itemed most of the $10 million that is being appropriated and is expressing legislative intent for most of the funds that are not specifically earmarked. Consequently, the board's flexibility is quite limited. The university will have to recommend to the board a satisfactory source of funding other than state appropriations if this project is to be approved.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; supervision</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site development</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,210,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of funds: (To be recommended at the Regents' meeting)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The present capacity of the Chilled Water Plant is 4500 tons of air conditioning, and it serves a connected design load of 6000 tons including the Dental Building, Basic Science Building, Nursing Building and the Health Science Library. The probability of all the connected buildings requiring full cooling capacity simultaneously is less than 100%. Satisfactory performance would normally require the ratio of cooling capacity to design connected load to be 80% to 85%. This ratio for the existing system is 75%.

It is proposed to expand the capacity of the central plant in order to increase this diversity ratio and to provide an additional 850 tons of cooling for the Hospital North Tower Addition. The expansion has been planned to include a base bid plus an add alternate.

The base plan includes the addition of a 2500-ton cooling tower to match existing towers, a 54' x 64' machine room extension to house equipment and the addition of a 960-ton high pressure absorber type chiller. The equipment room extension is designed with adequate foundations to support a future parking ramp above. This plan will raise the plant output to 5460 tons of cooling and the connected load will be 6850 tons. The system diversity ratio will become 80%.
The add alternate consists of an additional 960-ton high pressure absorber and auxiliary equipment. The base plan plus the alternate would increase the plant capacity to 6420 tons of cooling. This would allow the connection of about 500 tons of future load, in addition to the Hospital North Tower load, while still maintaining a desirable diversity ratio of 85% for the system. This extra cooling capacity would, for example, absorb the load in the General and Children's Hospitals now being served by well water cooling. Recommendation for the add alternate will be dependent on availability of funds.

A cooling tower with excess capacity is planned because this is the most logical increment in building toward the ultimate expansion of the plant to 12,000 tons capacity. Similarly, the machine room size is somewhat larger than needed for this phase but best fits the plan for future expansion.

Mr. Jolliffe suggested that the source of funds be income from earnings on Treasurer's Temporary Investments. Mr. Richey stated that the Board Office, as part of its responsibilities relative to recommending allocations of capital appropriations, will also be examining how the other institutions could utilize such funds as income earnings from Treasurer's Temporary Investments to meet some of their capital needs.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the above project, preliminary plans and budget and designate the Physical Plant as inspection supervisor. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

MEDICAL LABORATORIES - REMODEL ROOMS 200-204. The board was requested to approve the project, preliminary plans and budget and the selection of Physical Plant department as architect and inspection supervisor.
PRELIMINARY BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; supervision</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General construction</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating, ventilating &amp; air conditioning</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet work</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$169,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of funds: Pearson Gift for Heart Research - Account Q460

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed remodeling project of the southeast wing, second floor, Medical Laboratories, for the Cardiovascular Division's Research Laboratories, will ensure the continued advancement of scientific investigation into the regulation of the circulation in different pathological states. Expanding programs of research encompassing neurological examinations of vascular activity, lipid research in primates, mechanics of cardiac muscle and major artery motion, the definition of cardiac motion and pathology via echocardiography, studies on cardiac muscle exercise and extended efforts into the determinants of vascular reactivity make it necessary to expand and improve facilities. Current space is inadequate in size, design and is spatially too widespread.

This proposal will bring together the research laboratories of nine (9) Cardiovascular Division faculty members in a facility designed especially for research using laboratory animals with centrally located core data, x-ray and animal modules. The single facility will encourage the exchange of technical knowledge and ideas, special equipment and analyses while providing much needed space.

The project includes demolition of walls, construction of new walls, new doors, ceilings, lighting, floor covering, painting, installation of new air conditioning and air handling systems and installation of Hamilton laboratory equipment.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the board approve the above project, preliminary plans and budget and the selection of Physical Plant department as architect and inspection supervisor. Mr. Baldridge seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
LEASE OF PROPERTY. The board was requested to approve the following lease at 2830 University Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa:

Owner - Landlord
Drake University

Property
Classroom and office space (1,650 sq. ft.) located in the wood frame building at 2830 University Avenue, to include:
   a) Janitorial service
   b) All utilities except telephone
   c) Equipment as specified in Exhibit "A"
   d) Use of audio-visual equipment
   e) Library privileges for any faculty or students

Term
One (1) year, commencing on the 1st day of July 1973 and ending at midnight on the 30th day of June 1974.

Rental
Tenant agrees to pay landlord as rental for said term, $445.42 per month, in advance beginning on the 1st day of July 1973, for a full term rental of $5,345.00. Rental payments will be charged to the University of Iowa property rental fund.

Use of Property
Tenant agrees during the term of this lease to use and occupy the leased premises as classroom and office space for the instruction of applied social work practice and as a social work training center on the Drake University campus.

Need for Lease Property
(See attached Exhibit "B")

Comments
The rental rate and terms of this lease agreement appear to be fair and equitable.

The University of Iowa reported:
1973-74 RENTAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN DRAKE UNIVERSITY, DES MOINES, IOWA, AND
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY, IOWA,
COVERING THE PERIOD: July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>1974-1975 ANNUAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space Rental</td>
<td>$4,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Renovation</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning (1968)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning (1971)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing Table</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Typewriter</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Typewriter Service Agreement</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original equipment listing is on file at both Universities.
Rent is due Drake University, and payable by the University
of Iowa, monthly at the rate of $445.42. Space and equipment
are located at 2830 University Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa.

In 1967 the Iowa School of Social Work changed its M.S.W. program from a
two-academic-year program to a continuous eighteen-month program. In the fall
of 1972, the continuous program was shortened to a sixteen-month program. Major
reasons for the initial change in the curriculum calendar were:
1. To meet demands for increasing graduate enrollment in the Iowa School of Social Work by developing a single placement rather than a double placement for student experience, and

2. To meet demands for making graduate social work education more accessible to persons from Central Iowa.

In order to accomplish the above, it was necessary to find adequate classroom and office space plus library facilities to use in Des Moines, Iowa. After considerable discussions with University of Iowa administration, Drake University administration and with private social work agencies in Des Moines, it was agreed to rent space and facilities from Drake University to accommodate approximately twenty-five students, one full-time faculty member, one-half time secretary, and commuting faculty teaching on a part-time basis. This facility was and is currently referred to as the Social Work Educational Center in Des Moines.

Entering graduate students who are assigned to a practicum agency in the Des Moines area, spend only the first semester on the Iowa City campus. The remaining twelve months are spent in their practicum agency concurrent with classes at the Des Moines Educational Center.

In addition to space and equipment needs, located at 2830 University Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa, Drake University also provides library services and use of audio-visual equipment for faculty or students who are employed by or enrolled in the Iowa School of Social Work. These services are necessary to a program such as ours.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the lease at 2830 University Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. On roll call the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach Redeker
NAY: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried.
APPROVAL OF LEASE. The board was requested to approve the following lease:

Owner - Landlord  
Marycrest College

Property  
Office space in West Hall consisting of approximately 1,000 sq. ft. to include:
  a) Janitorial service
  b) All utilities (including telephones--one unrestricted line and three phones)
  c) Equipment--desks, chairs, tables & miscellaneous office items
  d) Use of audio-visual equipment and reproduction equipment
  e) Library privileges for any faculty or students who are employed by or enrolled in the School of Social Work, University of Iowa
  f) Air conditioning for (3) rooms (106, 108 and 112)

Term  
One (1) year commencing July 1, 1973 and ending at midnight on the 30th day of June 1974.

Rental  
Tenant agrees to pay Landlord as rental for said term $250.00 per month, in advance, on the first day of each month thereafter during the term of this lease, for a full term rental of $3,000.00.

Use of Property  
Tenant agrees during the term of this lease to use and occupy the leased premises as office space for the instruction of applied social work practice and the social work training center on the Marycrest College campus.

Need for Lease Property  
(see attached letter from Prof. Katherine Kruse)

Comments  
The rental rate and terms of this lease appear to be fair and equitable. Rental costs will be charged to an HEW grant for Social and Rehabilitation Service.

MOTION:  
Mr. Bailey moved the above lease be approved.
Mrs. Collison seconded the motion and on roll call the following voted:
AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker
NAY: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried.
The following business pertaining to Iowa State University was transacted on Friday, June 29, 1973.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of May 1973 were ratified.

APPOINTMENT OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS. The board was requested to approve the following appointments:

Charlotte E. Roderuck (Mary B. Welch Distinguished Professor in Home Economics; Associate Dean, College of Home Economics; Associate Director of Home Economics Research Institute; and Assistant Director of Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station. Salary will be as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity, effective September 1, 1973).

Solon A. Ewing (Professor and Head of the Department of Animal Science, College of Agriculture. His salary will be as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity, effective August 1, 1973).

Robert E. McCarley (Professor and Chairman of the Department of Chemistry, College of Sciences and Humanities, and Division Chief, Ames Laboratory, Institute for Atomic Research. The appointment as chairman to be effective July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1977, unless reappointed. Salary as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity).

Agatha L. Huepenbecker (Professor and Head of the Department of Textiles and Clothing, College of Home Economics. Salary will be as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity, effective September 1, 1973).

Jorgen S. Rasmussen (Professor and Chairman, Department of Political Science, College of Sciences and Humanities. The chairmanship to be effective for the period September 1, 1973, through June 30, 1977. Salary as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity).
Merwin D. Dougal (Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, College of Engineering; Director, Iowa State Water Resources Research Institute. Salary will be as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity, effective July 1, 1973).

Arthur E. Cott (Professor and Acting Chairman, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics, and Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station. He will serve only until a chairman is selected. The appointment is effective July 1, 1973, salary as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity).

Neal R. Cholvin (Professor and Acting Chairman, Department of Veterinary Physiology and Pharmacology, College of Veterinary Medicine. He will serve only until a chairman is selected. The appointment is effective July 1, 1973, salary as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity).

The board was also requested to approve the renewal of the following appointment:

Oscar E. Tauber, Professor and Chairman, Department of Entomology and Wildlife, College of Agriculture, and Department of Zoology and Entomology, College of Sciences and Humanities, to serve as acting chairman effective July 1, 1973, until such time as a chairman is appointed. Salary as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the above appointments and the renewal of appointment. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ELIMINATION OF DEPARTMENT OF HYGIENE. The board was requested to authorize the elimination of the Department of Hygiene, College of Sciences and Humanities and to transfer the academic program administered within the department to the Department of Physical Education for Men.

Transfer of the Department of Hygiene, College of Sciences and Humanities, to the Department of Physical Education for Men involves the transfer of one
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professor, reassignment of duties for the part-time head and elimination of current expenses in the amount of approximately $5,000.

It is felt that the program will be enhanced by incorporating it within the Department of Physical Education for Men. It is expected that administrative costs will also be significantly reduced by the proposed change.

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the board authorize the elimination of the Department of Hygiene, College of Sciences and Humanities and to transfer the academic program administered within the department to the Department of Physical Education for Men. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion.

Regent Petersen stated she assumed that there are women as well as men in the Department of Hygiene and questioned what would happen to the women when the program becomes part of the Department of Physical Education for Men. Mr. Christensen replied that there is no problem--women are welcome.

Mrs. Collison questioned the type of curriculum to be offered in the Department of Physical Education for Men and Mr. Christensen said the university is reviewing the whole area of physical education including the area of hygiene.

VOTE ON MOTION: The motion passed unanimously.

MEMBERSHIP IN GENERAL FACULTY. The board was requested to authorize the expansion of membership in the General Faculty to include assistant professors.

The General Faculty is the legislative body of the faculty responsible to the president. It usually meets once a quarter on the call of the president to discuss and determine general educational policies and procedures which concern requirements for admission to the university or colleges as well as
requirements for graduation, the relations among colleges, revisions in curricula, and to recommend candidates for diplomas, degrees and certificates to be conferred by the president. In response to question, the University of Iowa stated that all ranks are in the General Faculty; at UNI, instructors are included.

MOTION: Mr. Perrin moved the board authorize the expansion of membership in the General Faculty to include assistant professors. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NAMING OF UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS. The board was requested to authorize the Chemistry Building to be named "Henry Gilman Hall," the Research Building to be named the "Frank H. Spedding Hall," and the auditorium in Kildee Hall to be named the "Jay L. Lush Auditorium." These names have been recommended to the administration by the appropriate faculty committee.

The three men to be honored by this action are three of the nation's most distinguished scientists. They are all members of the National Academy of Sciences. Election to membership in the Academy is one of the highest honors that can come to an American scientist. The only other member of the Academy in Iowa is Dr. James Van Allen at the University of Iowa. Dr. Gilman, an organic chemist, was elected to Academy membership in 1945; Dr. Spedding, a physical chemist, in 1952; and Dr. Lush, a geneticist, in 1967. Detailed biographical statements on each person were provided.

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the board grant authorization to name the Chemistry Building the "Henry Gilman Hall," the Research Building the "Frank H. Spedding Hall," and the auditorium in Kildee Hall the "Jay L. Lush Auditorium." Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion and it carried.
GENERAL REMODELING - 64th G.A. AND 64th G.A. BOND AUTHORIZATION - DAIRY INDUSTRY, RENOVATE AUDITORIUM. The board was requested to ratify board action taken by telephone poll on June 15 to reject the single bid received for the general construction portion of the renovation of the auditorium dairy industry building and direct Iowa State University to proceed with the project using physical plant work force to complete construction of the general portion.

Following the receipt of only one bid for the general construction work for this project, the board approved at the May meeting the accepting of the low bid for the mechanical and the electrical portion of the project since the bids in these two areas were considered acceptable. The board further approved additional study of the single bid for the general construction work. Subsequently, a detailed estimate was made by Iowa State University of the cost for the general construction work. This estimate totaled $17,245, which was $2,805 over the preliminary estimate made seven months ago and $31,145 under the amount of the single bid received. Consequently, it is recommended that the single general construction bid be rejected and that the general construction work for this project be carried out by the physical plant personnel.

To enable Iowa State to proceed as rapidly as possible on this project so that the project could be completed by the beginning of the fall quarter and so that the bidder could be notified of the board's intent, the Board was polled by telephone on this matter on Wednesday, June 15. All board members were contacted with the exception of Regents Baldridge and Zumbach. All board members contacted were unanimous in approving the action recommended above. The contractor who submitted the bid on the project has been notified and the university is proceeding to complete the project using the physical plant work force.
# Project Budget

## Construction Contracts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Bid</th>
<th>Tax Refund</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical</strong></td>
<td>Proctor Plumbing &amp; Heating Inc.</td>
<td>$22,890</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$22,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical</strong></td>
<td>Johnson Electric Company, Inc.</td>
<td>$13,670</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$36,100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Physical Plant Work

- **General Construction**
  - 17,250
- **Fixed Equipment**
  - 2,900
- **Installation of Audio System**
  - 1,000
- **Seat Removal and Carpeting**
  - 1,400

- **Seating (purchased from Omaha School Equipment, Inc.)**
  - 9,350

- **Inspection**
  - 500

- **Contingencies and Miscellaneous**
  - 2,500

## Net Project Budget

- **$71,000**

## Source of Funds:

- **64th G.A. and 64th G.A. Bonds**
  - **$71,000**

## MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the board ratify its action taken by telephone poll on June 15 to reject the single bid received for the general construction portion of the renovation of the auditorium dairy industry building and direct Iowa State University to proceed with the project using physical plant work force to complete construction of the general portion, also approve the above project budget. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the above actions approved.
TENANT PROPERTY LEASES. The board was requested to approve the following tenant property leases effective July 1, 1973 for 1973-74:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Rent</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Engineering Research Farm - Howard Price</td>
<td>$756</td>
<td>$756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticultural Farm South - Harry Price</td>
<td>$945</td>
<td>$945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hub - Memorial Union</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, in each case, the annual rental figures are the same as for the 1972-73 fiscal year.

Regent Bailey asked about the size of the farms involved. Mr. Moore stated that the property leased is just the residence on land owned and operated by the university.

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the three above-named tenant property leases be approved for 1973-74. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and on roll call vote the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker
NAY: None
ABSENT: None

The motion passed unanimously.

REVISION TO MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH NORTH DAKOTA FOR THE TRAINING OF VETERINARY MEDICINE STUDENTS. The board was requested to approve a revised agreement with the State Board of Higher Education of North Dakota for the training of veterinary medicine students.

This agreement provides that Iowa State University will accept three students who are certified by the state of North Dakota for the sum of $4,000 annually for each student enrolled under the contract. In addition, each student will
pay the registration fee assessed residents of the state of Iowa. The num-
ber of non-resident veterinary medicine students enrolled at Iowa State
University will not be currently increased.

Mr. Moore stated that contracts with other states extend back to the one with
Nebraska. He stated that negotiations in this area have been conducted now
for several years by Mr. Madden and Dean Baker. When the Nebraska contract
was negotiated, they were successful in increasing the rate from $1,800 to
$4,000 per year per student. This was done to provide a guidepost for sub-
sequent contracts. Contracts in other states are usually associated with
quotas, he said. In these cases, however, no quota is involved. Contracts
are with Oregon, Nebraska, South Dakota and North Dakota.

Regent Baldridge raised the question as to the actual percentage of out-of-
state students attending the school and Mr. Christensen replied that roughly
20% of the students are from out of state but the percentage is now increas-
ing because of the contract arrangements.

Regent Shaw asked Mr. Christensen whether Wisconsin has an arrangement with
Minnesota for veterinary medicine students since Wisconsin has no school,
itself. Mr. Christensen replied he didn't believe they did nor have they
sought this kind of arrangement with Minnesota.

Regent Petersen asked Mr. Moore how long the agreements run. Mr. Moore
replied they are terminable by advance notice of one year by either party
with the provision that those students involved will continue to the end of
their education.

In response to question from Regent Collison, President Parks stated that
both men and women are admitted to the College of Veterinary Medicine. The
selection committee receives the names of the applicants by first initial and last name so it is impossible to differentiate man or woman by first initial. It was suggested that the university's affirmative action statement be sent to the four states involved in these agreements. This action was agreed to by President Parks.

MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved the board approve the revised agreement with the State Board of Higher Education of North Dakota for the training of veterinary medicine students. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

AREA EXTENSION OFFICE LEASE RENEWAL - WATERLOO. The board was requested to approve a five-year agreement for office space between Community Mortgage and Investment Company of Waterloo, Iowa and the State Board of Regents acting as the governing body of Iowa State University and its Cooperative Extension Service.

The Extension Service would continue to occupy space in the same location at an increased cost of $259.20 per year. All of the conditions and provisions of the lease would be extended to cover the period from September 1, 1973 to August 31, 1978. The lease agreement provides for 2,592 square feet of office space at a cost of $2.99 per square foot or an annual rate of $7,759.20.

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the board approve a five-year lease for office space in a building at Fletcher Avenue and Highway 63, Waterloo, Iowa, between Community Mortgage and Investment Company of Waterloo, Iowa and the State Board of Regents acting as the governing body of Iowa State University and its Cooperative Extension Service. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and on roll call vote the following voted:
STEAM GENERATOR NO. 4 AND AUXILIARY EQUIPMENT - 65th G.A. CAPITAL APPROPRIATION.

A. Project Description and Approval of Project. The board was requested to approve the Steam Generator No. 4 and Auxiliary Equipment Project.

The project, for which an appropriation of $2,500,000 has been provided, involves the replacement of an old steam generator in the present university heating plant. The old generator is 40 years of age and has a capacity of 40,000 pounds per hour. The major reasons for its replacement are age, safety and the need for more generating capacity. The major reason for its replacement at this time, however, is that the new steam generator can replace the old one in the same location within the building without a major addition to the heating plant.

Iowa State University reported:

A description of the project and the steps required for its completion are as follows:

1. The design and installation of a new 150,000 pounds per hour steam generating unit.

2. The design and installation of stack particulate removal equipment units on this generator.

3. The planning of all of the structural changes and the removal of the existing unit.

4. The design and the installation of the appropriate coal and ash handling equipment units.

5. The design and installation of the necessary electric wiring.

6. The design and installation of all the necessary piping, equipment, pumps, valves, etc.
It is necessary to secure project approval at this time in order to complete the specifications and take bids on the unit for a contract award to be recommended to the Board of Regents at its September, 1973 meeting.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved the board approve the project and project description for Steam Generator No. 4 and Auxiliary Equipment. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

B. Approval of Contract for Engineering Services. The board was requested to approve a contract for engineering services with Brown Engineering Company, Des Moines, Iowa.

It was proposed that the contract for engineering design services for the above project between the State Board of Regents and the Brown Engineering Company of Des Moines, Iowa, be approved in the standard form with the following specific provisions:

1. The engineering firm shall be compensated for its design services on this project at a rate not to exceed $22.50 per hour for partners' time on the project, plus all the direct payroll costs for the time of the engineers, technicians, and draftsmen of the firm applied to this project, times a multiplier of 2.1 to be applied to all direct payroll costs except the partners' time. These payments as just described will be complete compensation for all professional and personal services of the engineering firm on this project and also includes telephone and telegraph charges, stenographic and duplicating services.

2. Travel and living expenses incurred by company personnel engaged in performance of work on the project while away from the office of the engineering firm, and the clerical time spent in the typing of the specifications and reports will be charged to the project on a net cost basis only (the multiplier will not be applied).

3. No charges other than those listed in Steps 1 and 2 above will be made by the engineering firm for the services rendered under this contract. All of the engineering services necessary for this project will be completed under the terms of this contract and the total cost for all services necessary for the project will not exceed, $150,000.
4. The University will provide the engineering firm with a soil analysis at the installation site.

5. The Physical Plant Department will provide the clerk of the works for this project at the expense of the University.

MOTION: Mr. Perrin moved the board approve a contract for Engineering Services with Brown Engineering Company, Des Moines, Iowa, as described above. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

STEAM GENERATOR NO. 3, AUXILIARY EQUIPMENT GENERAL UTILITIES EXTENSION - 64th G.A. BOND AUTHORIZATION - REVISED PROJECT BUDGET. The board was requested to approve an increase of $250,000 for the project budget for Steam Generator No. 3, said increase to be funded from overhead reimbursement for use of facilities. With this increase the total project budget will be $2,700,000. The university reported:

When the Engineering Service Contract was submitted to the Board for approval in September, 1971 it was proposed to include the installation of dust collecting equipment on two of the existing steam generators in addition to the installation of the new Steam Generator No. 3 and Auxiliary Equipment. In April, 1972 the University submitted to the Iowa Air Pollution Control Commission an emission reduction program and was issued a variance with a stipulation that dust collectors be installed on four of the existing steam generators by December, 1973 and that Steam Generator No. 4 be replaced by 1975.

Brown Engineering was then directed to prepare plans and specifications for the installation of dust collectors on the four existing steam generators. The low bids received for the installation of the new Steam Generator No. 3 were less than the estimate and it was conceivable that we could accomplish the installation of the four dust collectors within the original project budget. However, the most recent bids received for the installation of the dust collectors requires that the project budget be increased by $250,000 in order to accomplish the installation. The alternative to this increase in the project budget would be to reject the bids and revise the plans and specifications for the installation of only two dust collectors which could be done within the original project budget. This alternative does not seem advisable in that we would immediately be in violation of the air pollution regulations and subject to court action.
Mr. Richey questioned Mr. Moore as to how money gets into the overhead reimbursement from facilities fund and whether this is a separate fund for capital. Mr. Moore replied that when they collect overhead on research contracts these overhead reimbursements are based on certain factors. The money for facilities is placed in a separate fund.

Mr. Richey stated to the Board that the Board Office is trying to get a look at all of these funds. Capital needs will be before the board in July. Since we are short in terms of direct capital appropriations for urgent capital needs, other funds such as these might be used to alleviate the problem.

Revised Project Budget

Bids received June 7, 1973

Accounts: 502-64-03 (PL)
502-64-04 (PL)
503-64-04 (PL)

Construction Contracts:
Division I - Steam Generator (Previously Awarded)
Fuel Economy Engineering Co., base bid $1,049,621
1/Add voluntary Alternate No. 3 33,770
Deduct Change Order No. 1 -625
Deduct Tax Refund -18,000 $1,064,766 PL-0301

Division II - Structural (Previously Awarded)
Abell-Howe Co., base bid 241,888
Add Change Order No. 1 7,789
Deduct Tax Refund -3,024 246,653 PL-0302

Division III - Mechanical Equipment, Piping and Erection - Phase I (Previously Awarded)
Winger Contracting Co., base bid 549,000
Deduct Alternate No. 2 -100,000
Deduct Alternate No. 3B -3,500
Deduct Tax Refund -5,569 439,931 PL-0303

Division IV - Mechanical Equipment, Piping and Erection - Phase II
2/Abell-Howe Co., base bid 449,533
Deduct Tax Refund -5,619 443,914 PL-0304

Equipment Contracts:
Division IV - Mechanical Equipment, Piping and Erection - Phase II (Previously Awarded)
Universal Oil Products Co. Alternate No. 1 66,745 PL-0308
1036
Reserved for future contracts 219,780
Legal and Administrative 15,000  PL-0307
Engineering Services 140,000  PL-0309
Resident Inspection 16,000  PL-0310
Testing, Boring, etc. 5,000  PL-0311
Contingencies, Miscellaneous 42,211  PL-0312

Total $2,700,000

Source of Funds:
64th G.A. Academic Revenue Bonds 502-64-03 $2,300,000
64th G.A. Academic Revenue Bonds 502-64-04 150,000
Overhead Reimbursement for Use of Facilities 500-00-11 250,000

$2,700,000

1/Addition of a two-stage in lieu of a single-stage dust collection system.
2/Recommended for award at this time.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve an increase of $250,000 for the project budget for Steam Generator No. 3, said increase to be funded from overhead reimbursement for use of facilities. Mr. Baldridge seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DISPOSAL OF FIVE CAMPUS BUILDINGS. The board was requested to authorize the razing of five structures.

The Board Office reported as follows:

Iowa State University requests authority to raze five structures totaling slightly over 17,000 gross square feet. The Facilities Committee in its review of space which should be razed at Iowa State University by 1985 has agreed that some 463,000 gross square feet should be razed by that date. Very little of this space can physically be razed until replacement space is provided. If the plan is to be met by 1985 legislative appropriations will have to provide for replacement space each biennium through 1983.

Iowa State University is to be commended for making the difficult decision to raze these five structures at this time. The easy decision would be to continue usage of these buildings despite the costly repairs that would be necessary to fit the buildings to new tenants and despite the continuation of high operating costs incurred in operating buildings of this type. Three of the five buildings on the list are able to be razed at this time because replacement space has been provided and will soon be occupied. Temporary Building G can be razed because of the pending completion of Classroom and Office Building No. 3; Building A and Aerospace Laboratory can be razed because of the impending completion of the Physical Plant Shops and Stores Building. The Clubhouse can be razed because of its replacement by a new Clubhouse. The docket memorandum notes that the Dairy Farm House will be replaced by a mobile home.
Aerospace Laboratory

Date of construction: 1898
Gross square feet: 4,476

Dairy Farm House

Date of construction: 1907
Gross square feet: 888

Temporary Building "G"

Date of construction: Relocated in 1947 from Sioux City Air Base
Gross square feet: 7,745

Building "A"

Date of construction: 1898
Gross square feet: 2,893

Club House

Date of construction: 1938
Gross square feet: 1,526

Regent Wallace remarked "it's high time" these buildings are disposed of.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board authorize Iowa State University to raze five structures as named above. Mr. Baldridge seconded the motion and on roll call vote the following voted:
AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker
NAY: None
ABSENT: None

RENOVATION OF STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES BUILDING INTO A STUDENT SERVICES BUILDING. The board was requested to approve and authorize Iowa State University to secure architectural services for renovation of Student Health Services Building into a "Student Services Building."

Iowa State University reported:
The proposed renovation is being proposed following a two year feasibility study of converting the building into a Student Services Building. As such it is proposed that the building would house Student Health Service, Student Counseling Service, the Dean of Students office and the Environmental Health division (This small division is not necessarily related to student services). The renovation would provide for an expansion of the outpatient medical capability primarily by increasing the number of examination rooms from nine to sixteen. The present hospital facility which includes a 40 bed capacity, operating facilities and X-Ray facilities would be reduced to a hospital bay with a normal capacity of 8 beds and a peak capacity of 12 beds.

The feasibility study indicates that the third floor of the present Student Health Services Building can be converted for use by the Student Counseling Service, that the east wing of the second floor can be converted for the use of the Dean of Students' staff and the Environmental Health Service, while the west wing would remain in service as the hospital bay. The first floor and the ground floor would continue in its present use for student outpatient health service with the minor renovations required to increase the capability of that service.

The proposed renovation plan would accomplish several major objectives:

1. Improve the Student Health Services provided at Iowa State University by expanding the outpatient clinical service.

2. Consolidate in one building those major student services associated with the personal health and welfare of the individual student. This consolidation into one physical location of activities which are now scattered in several locations on the campus will substantially ease the handling and the referral of student cases wherein help from more than one of the previously mentioned service areas is indicated. It also brings into close proximity all of the activities of student services with the exception of the admissions and records activities which are located in nearby Beardshear Hall.

3. Completion of the proposed plan would provide improved and permanent housing for the staff and faculty performing these student services. The Dean of Students and his staff are now housed on the fifth floor of Memorial Union, and student counseling is located in a temporary wooden barracks building (Building H) attached to Beardshear Hall.

4. The present annual current rental payment made to the Memorial Union for the use of the fifth floor will be discontinued. ($18,000)

5. Another ancient temporary building (Building H) would be torn down. This wood frame structure, along with Building G, is located west of Beardshear Hall. Building H is physically attached to Beardshear Hall and as such constitutes a major fire hazard.
Firm estimates of the cost of the renovation can be determined with the assistance of an architectural firm. The architectural firm will provide the University with these cost estimates before continuing the project. Tentative plans are to finance the project, if possible, from funds paid to the University as rental fees for space occupied, principally from the Ames Laboratory of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. The funding of this project with these rental fees is appropriate since the project will reduce rental fees expended by the University.

The terms of a proposed contract with an architectural firm would be provided for approval of the Board of Regents at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Moore provided further explanation and background on this matter.

Regent Zumbach stated that some students at Iowa State University did not realize that this item would be discussed at this particular board meeting. He expressed concern that the students were not properly notified relative to timing of board action and added that it would be good if this type of docket item were brought up during the regular school year rather than during the summer months.

President Parks responded to Regent Zumbach by stating that all action can't be stopped during the summer months--projects have to be brought in. He also stated the board's meetings are open and dockets are available in the school library for interested students.

Regent Petersen pointed out that student counselling is to be in the same building as the student health and that we must be careful that counselling does not go to only those people who are "sick". She reemphasized that there is no disgrace in counselling and hoped that students also realize this.

Regent Collison stated that all of the health services are more or less geared toward health maintenance and asked whether faculty get some services. President Parks responded by saying they do not.
MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve and authorize Iowa State University to secure architectural services for renovation of Student Health Services Building into a "Student Services Building." Mr. Baldridge seconded the motion.

Regent Baldridge stated to the board that no source of funding was specified for this project and he assumed the project will be before the board again at a future date.

President Redeker stated that at this meeting we are approving the project. The point was made that the only valid reason to disapprove the next step of project funding would be if costs were out of line. He also stated that when a project is brought to the board for approval, expenditures can be made by the institution. They have a right to believe the board would then approve funding at a later date.

Regent Perrin stated, however, that we have stopped a project on other occasions and that the door should be left open for the board to approve or disapprove at the next step. He stated "many things change in the middle".

Regent Bailey questioned whether x-ray facilities are being eliminated and Mr. Moore, ISU, stated that x-ray service will still be available.

VOTE ON MOTION: The motion passed unanimously.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET. The preliminary budget for Iowa State University for 1973-74 is presented in the general section of these minutes.

VEENKER MEMORIAL GOLF COURSE - PARTIAL RELOCATION. The board was requested to approve a contract to advance Building Systems, Incorporated, Ames, Iowa for a maintenance shed.
Iowa State University reported:

At the May, 1973, Board meeting the University recommended that the bids for the maintenance shed be rejected since they were far in excess of the funds available for this purpose, and the Board concurred. The University agreed to recommend to the Board at the June, 1973, meeting an alternative solution for the construction of the maintenance shed.

The original specifications called for a building of 3,750 square feet with an additional 750 square feet to be roofed only. In addition, they called for more extensive foundations and a floor slab. The low bid received for this building was $23,300 compared to a preliminary estimate of $15,000.

The University has negotiated with the three low bidders on the project for the construction of a smaller building, which totals 3,000 square feet and is of somewhat lesser quality than that originally specified, and has received the following quotations:

- Advance Building Systems, Inc. $11,675
- Henningsen Steel Products, Inc. $13,000
- R. Friedrich & Sons, Inc. $12,675

**VEENKER MEMORIAL GOLF COURSE - PARTIAL RELOCATION**

**REVISED PROJECT BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Clubhouse Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>503-00-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siedelmann Construction Co., base bid</td>
<td>$37,882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Change Order No. 1</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>PA-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less tax refund</td>
<td>- 551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$37,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road, Parking Lot and Surfacing Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Road Builders Company, base bid</td>
<td>$38,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less tax refund</td>
<td>- 230</td>
<td>PA-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38,482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Shed Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/Advanced Building Systems, Inc., base bid</td>
<td>$11,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less tax refund</td>
<td>- 146</td>
<td>PA-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Golf Clubhouse - Physical Plant Expense
- Site work: 9,500
- Utilities Relocation and Extension: 117,928
- Design: 25,000
- Equipment: 10,000
- Contingencies and Miscellaneous: 25,000
- Payment for loss of Pammel Court units: 10,000
- Total: 23,317
- Other: 10,000
- Net Project Budget: 10,000
- PA-2001: 9,500
- PA-2002: 117,928
- PA-2003: 25,000
- PA-2004: 10,000
- PA-2005: 10,000
- PA-2006: 23,317
- PA-2007: 10,000

Source of Funds:
City of Ames
- Sale of land for right-of-way: $29,700
- Damages: 57,867
- Golf course relocation: 205,861
- Total: $293,428

1/Recommended for award at this time.

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the board approve a contract to Advance Building Systems, Incorporated for the maintenance shed and approve the revised project budget. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion and it was approved.

APPOINTMENT OF SAMUEL A. McDOWELL AS TREASURER. The board was requested to approve the reappointment of Samuel A. McDowell as treasurer for Iowa State University for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973.

In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the appointment of Samuel A. McDowell approved as stated above.

APPOINTMENT OF BERNARD O. RANDOL AS SECRETARY. The board was requested to approve the reappointment of Bernard O. Randol, Controller, to be the secretary for Iowa State University for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973.

In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the appointment approved as stated above.
REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. Executive Secretary Richey reported the Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the period May 10 through June 28, 1973 had been filed with him and was in order.

The following CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT was recommended for approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AWARDEE</th>
<th>TYPE OF CONTRACT</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam Generator No. 3 - Dust Collectors</td>
<td>Abell-Howe Company, Cedar Rapids, Iowa</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>$449,533.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board Office reported:

On May 17, the Board Office revised the equal employment opportunity specification to read:

Each bidder shall file with his bid a completed Board of Regents Equal Opportunity Data Reporting Form as included in the specifications or shall certify on the Certificate of Reporting, included herewith, that he has, since July 1, 1972, filed an Equal Employment Opportunity Data Reporting Form with the Board of Regents Equal Opportunity Compliance Office.

The institutions were instructed to include the above item, the Data Form and the Certificate of Reporting in all specifications and to issue an addendum for all outstanding specifications.

To the best of our knowledge, this instruction was followed in all instances except one. ISU informed this office by phone on Monday, July 25, that they had failed to issue an addendum enclosing the above EEO data on the Steam Generator No. 3 - Dust Collectors project. Therefore, none of the firms who submitted bids submitted the EEO data with their bid.

It is our intent to monitor more closely inclusion of EEO requirements in all specifications. Failure of a bidder to submit EEO data with his bid shall constitute an irregularity/unusual circumstance which will be duly reported on the bid tab for each project and reported to the Board in our report(s) on the Capital Register.

In this instance, Abell-Howe has been on file in the Compliance Office. We recommend holding blameless the bidders on this project and proceed to award the contract to the low bidder.
The following PURCHASE ORDERS FOR EQUIPMENT funded by academic revenue bonds were recommended for approval:

Classroom and Office Building No. 3 equipment totaling $2,045.05. Awards are being made to two firms as follows:

- Dictaphone Corporation, Des Moines, Iowa $1,511.02
- University Bookstore, Ames, Iowa 533.03

A total of $250,000 is budgeted for equipping of this building. With the two awards above, $135,241.75 will have been expended.

The following REVISED PROJECT BUDGET was recommended for approval:

**VETERINARY MEDICINE FACILITIES-PHASE I & II**

Revised Project Budget

Bids received April 27, 1972 and June 20, 1973

Accounts: 500-62-12(PJ)
200-64-02(PL)
501-64-02(PL)
502-64-02(PL)
503-64-02(PL)

Construction Contracts:

**General Construction**

- Thompson-Klinger, a joint venture, Phase I $5,203,640
- Add Alternate No. 1 (Phase II) 4,419,887
- Add Alternate No. 2 147,000
- Add Alternate No. 3 60,000
- Less Tax Refund -122,882 $9,707,645 PL-0201

**Mechanical Construction**

- The Waldinger Corporation, Phase I $3,639,350
- Add Alternate No. 1 (Phase II) 2,587,600
- Add Alternate No. 2 24,900
- Add Alternate No. 3 1,600
- Less Tax Refund -78,168 $6,175,282 PL-0202

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
June 28-30, 1973
Electrical Construction

Meisner Electric, Inc. Phase I 832,260
Add Alternate No. 1 (Phase II) 586,648
Add Alternate No. 2 22,700
Add Alternate No. 3 250
Less Tax Refund -18,023 $1,423,835 PL-0203
Total Construction Contracts 17,306,762

Built-in Equipment Contracts:

Fixed Equipment Work

Kewaunee Technical Furniture Co. Phase I 393,550
Add Alternate No. 1 (Phase II) 320,765 $714,315 PL-0204

Site Improvements and Utility Connections

Previously Awarded (Project Budget 1/15/71) $14,240 PJ-1212
Soil Stabilization 350,000 PL-0217
Landscaping 50,000 PL-0205
Drives and Walks 10,000 PL-0216
Utility Connections 230,000 PL-0206 $654,240

Preliminary Site Clearance 35,000 PL-0214
Surveys and Testing 8,000 PL-0211
Architectural-Engineering Fees 1,040,000 PL-0209
Resident Inspection 100,000 PL-0210
Legal and Administrative 25,000 PL-0207
Contingencies and Miscellaneous 209,800 PL-0212

Net Project Budget $20,093,117

Source of Funds:

62nd G.A. Capital Appropriation 500-62-12 $750,000
64th G.A. Capital Appropriation 500-64-02 2,400,000
Public Health Service, Title VII Grant 501-64-02 6,827,115
Capitation Grant 501-64-02 303,835
64th G.A. Academic Revenue Bonds 502-64-02 9,620,000
Parking Permit Fees 503-64-02 192,167 Total $20,093,117
The following NEW PROJECT funded by Athletic Council funds was recommended for approval:

CLYDE WILLIAMS FIELD--LATERAL BRACING OF SOUTH STADIUM ADDITION. Estimated project cost is $9,000. This is a project recommended after study by engineers. Purpose would be to eliminate the side sway in the south stadium. It is anticipated that a contract for $8,200.00 will be let by purchase orders or quotation.

MOTION:

Mrs. Petersen moved the board approve the Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the period May 10 through June 28, 1973; the construction contract as shown above be awarded; the purchase orders for equipment as shown above be ratified; the revised project budget as shown above be approved; the new project as shown above be approved; the Executive Secretary be authorized to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wallace and passed unanimously.

MEATS LABORATORY. In response to a letter received from the Iowa Cattlemen's Association on funding available for a new Meats Laboratory, President Parks stated that the Meats Laboratory was considered separately by the legislature. He expressed fear, however, that the Meats Laboratory may not receive the needed funds. He stated Iowa State University listed three priorities:

1. Steam Generator
2. Design Center
3. Meats Laboratory

President Parks stated the steam generator was funded (line itemed) but the House and Senate passed over the Design Center and indicated the Meats Laboratory to be higher priority than the Design Center. He stated the university never indicated that the Meats Laboratory was a higher priority than the Design Center but there is a lot of statewide interest in the Meats Laboratory. A classroom building such as the Design Center does not arouse the degree of interest although it may be more important.
Mr. Richey stated that capital appropriations for the 1973-75 biennium were $10,000,000. The legislature provided line item appropriations of $4,000,000 to the University of Northern Iowa, $2,500,000 for Iowa State University for steam generator and $3,500,000 for miscellaneous other projects. Mr. Richey stated that the board had flexibility in the utilization of the $3,500,000 because it does not contain a line item for any purpose. Some last minute maneuvering during the legislative process attempted to show that the $3,500,000 would be used both for the Meats Laboratory and for the fire loss at the University of Northern Iowa. A proviso in the bill states that first consideration should be given to fire losses in utilizing the $3,500,000 amount. Mr. Richey reported that he stated to the legislators involved that they should take specific action concerning the Meats Laboratory and the University of Northern Iowa fire loss rather than put the board on the spot. He further reported that the legislators were informed that unless the funds were specifically line itemed, the board would have discretion in allocating them to specific projects.

President Parks noted that if the state sees fit not to build the lab out of appropriated funds, and the legislature had given some indication of this, the burden to fund should not be put on the board and the university.
The following business pertaining to the University of Northern Iowa was transacted on Saturday, June 30, 1973.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of May 1973 were ratified.

MOTOR VEHICLES AND BICYCLE REGULATIONS, 1973-74. The Board was requested to approve the Motor Vehicle and Bicycle Regulations, 1973-74, for the University of Northern Iowa.

The regulations do not change the substance of the rules already filed. The language in the Code, however, makes it necessary that the board approve all traffic and parking regulations for the institutions prior to the institutions enforcing of said regulations.

A complete copy of the Motor Vehicle and Bicycle Regulations, 1973-74, is on file in the board office.

MOTION: Mr. Perrin moved the board approve the Motor Vehicle and Bicycle Regulations, 1973-74, for the University of Northern Iowa. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION. The board was requested to approve the merging of the Division of Business and Finance and the Division of Technical Services into a new division entitled Division of Administrative Services.

The board office reported that the responsibilities of the Division of Administrative Services would include planning, data processing, and the Bureau of Research and Examination from the Division of Technical Services.
and would include staff personnel, accounting, purchasing, payroll, and physical plant from the Division of Business and Finance. Clearly there are numerous interrelationships between the functions performed by technical services and business and finance. Consolidation of these activities would be beneficial.

MOTION: Mr. Baldridge moved the board approve the merging of the Division of Business and Finance and the Division of Technical Services into a new division entitled Division of Administrative Services. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPOINTMENTS. The board was requested to approve the following appointments:

Dr. Robert Stansbury, Assistant to the President, to the position of Vice-President for Administrative Services, with faculty rank as Associate Professor of Education, at a salary to be established in the 1973-74 budget, effective July 1, 1973. In this position, Dr. Stansbury will be the chief fiscal officer of the university.

Dr. Bruce Whylie Anderson as Head of the Department of Economics and Associate Professor of Economics. Dr. Anderson is currently the Acting Head of the Department of Economics. He has been a faculty member at the University of Northern Iowa since 1966 and Acting Head since 1969.

In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the above appointments approved.

SEERLEY FOUNDATION LOAN FUND. The board was requested to accept transfer of the assets of the Seerley Foundation of the Alumni Association of the State College of Iowa, Inc. for the continued use by the University of Northern Iowa as a student loan fund. The university reported:
The assets of the Seerley Foundation of the Alumni Association of State College of Iowa (now University of Northern Iowa) have been carried on the financial books and records of the University of Northern Iowa as the Seerley Loan Fund. The Board of Directors of the Seerley Foundation has set broad guidelines for the use of the loan fund. Within these guidelines the loan fund has been administered by the University as one of its student loan funds.

In April 1972 the Board of Directors of the Seerley Foundation voted to dissolve the corporation and to turn its assets over to the State Board of Regents conditioned for the perpetual use of the University of Northern Iowa. A copy of the instrument of conveyance of the assets of the dissolved foundation to the State Board of Regents conditioned for the perpetual use of the University of Northern Iowa is attached. Articles of Dissolution of the Seerley Foundation Corporation have been filed with the Secretary of State of the State of Iowa and the Corporation has been legally dissolved.

The Board of Regents is requested to accept the transfer of the assets of the Seerley Foundation for the continued use of the University of Northern Iowa. The assets will continue to appear on the financial records of the University as the Seerley Loan Fund. The Seerley Loan Fund will continue to be administered by the University as one of its student loan funds.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved the board accept transfer of the assets of the Seerley Foundation of the Alumni Association of the State College of Iowa, Inc. for the continued use by the University of Northern Iowa as a student loan fund. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

TENANT PROPERTY RENTALS - 1973-74. The board was requested to approve the following rentals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Monthly Rental</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rownd Farmhouse</td>
<td>J. J. Schurman</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1223 West 22nd Street</td>
<td>L. Jernigan</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1228 West 22nd Street</td>
<td>Thomas Moore</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2425 Hudson Road</td>
<td>William Tufford</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1234 West 22nd Street</td>
<td>Mrs. Ruth Hayes</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2218 Campus Street</td>
<td>D. Denton</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 1227 West 23rd Street</td>
<td>Terry Williams</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 1227 1/2 West 23rd Street</td>
<td>Mary Brinker</td>
<td>98.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Garage - West 23rd Street</td>
<td>Pam Azzolin</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Garage - West 23rd Street</td>
<td>Don Steffen</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Perrin moved the board approve the tenant property rentals as listed above. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and on roll call the voting was as follows:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker.

NAY: None.

ABSENT: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

CONTRACT WITH ALLEN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL. The board was requested to approve a one-year contract for coursework to be offered during the school year 1973-74 by the University of Northern Iowa to student nurses in connection with the nurses training program of the Allen Memorial Hospital.

The board office reported that annually since 1958 the board has approved contracts for courses of work offered to student nurses in connection with the hospital's nurses training program. The charges are the same as approved for the current year. There are slight changes made in the coursework offered. For example, during the fall semester two one hour courses dealing with physiological psychology and social process are dropped and a three-hour introductory psychology course is substituted. During the spring semester a one semester hour course in reflex operant conditioning is added.
CONTRACT

This contract made and entered into by and between the Iowa State Board of Regents, governing body of the University of Northern Iowa, and the Allen Memorial Hospital of Waterloo, Iowa, for course work to be offered by the University to student nurses in connection with the Nurse Training Program of the Allen Memorial Hospital. The contract covers the school year 1973-74.

For the course work offered, the University will charge the Allen Memorial Hospital as follows:

**Fall semester, 1973-74**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Iowa Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry for Nurses</td>
<td>84:041</td>
<td>84:031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy and Physiology I</td>
<td>84:031</td>
<td>40:008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Psychology</td>
<td>40:008</td>
<td>Laboratory fee ($10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 10 hours per student</td>
<td>$310.00</td>
<td>$510.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring semester, 1974**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Iowa Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy and Physiology II</td>
<td>84:032</td>
<td>98:058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Sociology</td>
<td>98:058</td>
<td>84:033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Microbiology</td>
<td>84:033</td>
<td>Laboratory fee ($10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 9 hours per student</td>
<td>$310.00</td>
<td>$510.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application fee: To be paid once by each student at time of first admission to the University. $10.00

Mr. Jennings, UNI, stated that the non-resident semester fee will be changed from $510 to $560.

Mrs. Collison moved the board approve a one-year contract for coursework to be offered during the school year 1973-74 by the University of Northern Iowa to student nurses in connection with the nurses training program of the Allen Memorial Hospital. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
PRELIMINARY BUDGET. The preliminary budget material for 1973-74 for the University of Northern Iowa is contained in the general section of these minutes.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. Executive Secretary reported the Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the period May 9 through June 20, 1973, has been filed with him, was in order, and approval was recommended.

The following construction contracts were recommended for approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Type of Contract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Hall Parking Lot Extension</td>
<td>MEPCO Inc., Waterloo, Iowa</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$102,257.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Service to Biological Research and Small Animal Bldg.</td>
<td>Young Plumbing and Heating, Waterloo, Iowa</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>112,490.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following purchase order for equipment was recommended for approval:

- Education Building - Unit II
  - Awarded recommended to three different vendors.
  - $15,394

The following revised project budgets were recommended for approval:

**CAMPBELL HALL PARKING LOT EXTENSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Project Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Expenditures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of funds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory Surplus Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEAM SERVICE TO BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND SMALL ANIMAL BLDG.  $112,490.00

This is a $130,000 project approved by the board March 1973. This budget shows no budget increase but changes the source of funding as follows: The original budget contemplated funding of $58,915 from academic revenue bond funds. The revised budget would drop this source of funding and shift the entire amount to 63rd G.A., unallocated. The entire project would then be funded from 63rd G.A. funds.

The following new project was submitted for approval:

BOILER REPAIR - HEATING PLANT #1

Project Description

Work under this project includes the furnishing and installation of new shafts, grate drives and bearings on the BROS travel grate stoker on boiler #1. This boiler was originally installed in 1950 and its continued operation is vital in meeting our steam generation requirements.

This is an equipment repair project. There is only a single source of supply since the drawings and patterns for this equipment are the property of the company which supplied the equipment. Work will be accomplished by quotation and purchase order.

Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Pertaining to the Campbell Hall Parking Lot Extension, the board office reported that this was a $90,000 project approved by the board in March 1973, providing new parking space for 226 vehicles. The register contains a revised project budget increasing the project by $31,000 to a total of $121,000. The additional $31,000 would come from Dormitory Surplus Fund. One could question why the Dormitory Surplus Fund is required to take the entire burden of the $31,000 increase when the original project budget contemplated a division of contract cost between University Reserve Parking ($45,000) and Dormitory Surplus Fund ($45,000). This parking lot would serve Education I, Education II, Health Service, Lawther Hall and Campbell Hall. Since the lot will serve three academic buildings and two dormitory buildings it would appear that more funds should come from Reserve Parking rather than the approach.
Mr. Richey restated that the additional cost increase is not being shared by University Reserve Parking and Dormitory Surplus Fund but rather Dormitory Surplus Fund is carrying all the additional expense.

Mr. Wallace stated he presumed more parking would be needed for the educational buildings rather than for the residence halls and questioned the way the funding is proposed to be covered. Mr. Hansmeier of the university stated parking hasn't been provided for the residence halls - students just park around 23rd Street.

Regent Bailey stated it was a matter of integrity of which funds would be used. The Dormitory Surplus Funds were unearmarked, so should be used.

Mr. Richey stated the main concern was the real need for the facility. He added that bonds are outstanding for which those surplus funds could be used if not for this facility. He added, however, he was not objecting to the facility but raising the question of need.

Regent Shaw stated that possibly cars would not be as evident in the next few years and questioned the need for the parking. Mr. Stansbury emphasized that this parking addition is vitally needed. Regent Shaw raised the question as to over-building. Regent Perrin added that the money might be more needed in areas other than parking. President Kamerick stated that with a 1200-bed dorm with no parking facility this leads to congestion and as the number of students with cars has grown, the streets around the university are enormously overcrowded.

MOTION: Mrs. Peterson moved the board approve the Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the period.
HEARING PROCEDURES AND FACULTY CONSTITUTION. The board was requested to
1) approve, with recommended changes, a procedure for imposing disciplinary
sanctions, short of dismissal, on a faculty member; 2) approve, with recom-
mended changes, a procedure for dismissal of a faculty member for reasons
other than his inability to qualify for tenure; and 3) approve, with recom-
mended changes, the faculty constitution.

President Kamerick introduced the following persons from the University of
Northern Iowa who were present for discussion: James Stewart, president,
UNI Student Association; James Maas, former president, UNI Student Associ-
ation; Howard Jones, former chairman, University Faculty Senate; George
Poage, immediate past chairman, University Faculty; Thomas Thompson, acting
chairman, University Faculty Senate; James Martin, representative, Adminis-
trative Council, in an affirmative position; Thomas Hansmeier, representative,
Administrative Council.

A. A Statement on Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility. The
board was presented the following for information. This statement was
initially presented to the board on May 13 and 14, 1973.
The basic functions of the university are the advancement and dissemination of learning, the development of critical intelligence, creative talent, aesthetic sensibility and moral awareness in its students, and the training of citizens and professional workers for the society of which the university is a part.

The indispensable condition for the successful discharge of these functions is an atmosphere of intellectual freedom. Unless he is free to pursue the quest for knowledge and understanding, wherever it may lead, and to report and discuss his findings, whatever they may be, the university faculty member cannot properly perform his work. The university, therefore, must provide such an atmosphere of intellectual freedom for its faculty. The faculty, in turn, must uphold this freedom in all its actions.

Freedom entails responsibilities. Every faculty member must accept the responsibilities which are concomitant with the freedom which he enjoys. Those responsibilities are: (1) to scholarship, (2) to his students, (3) to his colleagues, (4) to the university, and (5) to the larger community which the university serves.

I. Responsibilities to Scholarship

The faculty member's responsibilities to scholarship derive from the university's commitment to truth and the advancement of learning. As a member of the university, each faculty member has the obligation to do his part in pushing forward the horizons of knowledge. To the extent that his teaching duties allow, he may be expected to contribute to the research and scholarship in his field. Specifically:

1. He must strive to keep abreast of the research and scholarship that is being carried forward elsewhere in the academic world. He is committed, by this obligation, to a lifetime of study, for new knowledge is constantly being added to the store which mankind has already accumulated, and old knowledge is constantly being supplanted or revised or reinterpreted.

2. He must constantly seek to improve his scholarly skills and to develop new ones. His own work should exemplify the best professional techniques and the highest professional standards which modern research and scholarship have devised.

3. In a world where research and scholarship are becoming increasingly technical and collective, he must be careful to acknowledge the help he has received from students and colleagues and to identify their contributions to his achievement.

4. The faculty member has the responsibility of being unfailingly honest in his research and teaching. He must, of course, refrain from deliberate distortion or misrepresentation, and he must take regular precautions against the common causes of error. Since he can never be certain that what he believes to be truth is indeed true, he should avoid categorical and dogmatic assertion.
5. **There are times** when the national security requires that certain research be carried on in secret and requires further that the results of that research be classified as secret or confidential. In these circumstances, it is proper for the university, or for a faculty member of the university to carry on secret research and to permit the results of that research to be classified. In all other circumstances, however, secrecy of research and classification of knowledge are incompatible with the university's commitment to the advancement of learning, and the university should not contract for any such research, whether with government or with private industry, and no faculty member should participate in any such research.

6. In **ordinary contract research**, where the national security is not involved, the faculty member's responsibility to scholarship remains unqualified. His task is to seek and report the truth, not to marshal the evidence for a preconceived judgment. If there are any pressures upon him to accept non-scholarly limitations upon his enquiry, or to ignore or suppress any of his findings, he should renounce the work in hand or else resign his academic position. So long as he remains a faculty member, his commitment to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth must not be compromised.

7. As a **private individual**, acting wholly outside his university connections, the faculty member may, of course, make whatever arrangements he may wish with whatever persons or organizations might want to engage his services.

8. The canons of objectivity in research do not abrogate the researcher's moral obligations to his fellow man. When the object of study is a human being, the researcher must do everything in his power to protect and preserve the dignity of the person or persons he is studying.

II. **Responsibilities to Students**

As a teacher, the faculty member has the responsibility for creating in his classroom or laboratory and in his relations with students a climate that stimulates and encourages the student's endeavors to learn. To the best of his ability, he exemplifies high scholarly standards, and he respects and fosters the student's freedom to choose and pursue his own goals.

1. The teacher has the obligation to make clear the objectives of the course or program, to establish requirements, to set standards of achievement, and to evaluate the student's performance.

2. The student is entitled to the same intellectual freedom which the teacher himself enjoys. The teacher must respect that freedom. He may not impose restraints upon the student's search for or consideration of diverse or contrary opinion.

3. The student's freedom to learn must be protected from assault by others. Repressive or disruptive actions on the part of some students must not be permitted to interfere with the learning activities of other students.

4. The teacher has the obligation of meeting his classes as scheduled or, when circumstances prevent this, of making appropriate alternative arrangements.
5. The teacher has the obligation of teaching his courses in a manner that is consistent with the course description published in the catalogue. He must not persistently intrude into his classes such materials or such personal views as have no relation to the subject matter of the course.

6. On controversial issues within the scope of the course, the full range of opinion should be presented. When the teacher presents his own views on these issues, he should always identify them as such.

7. The distinction between established fact and speculative opinion must be maintained as clearly as possible. Wherever values and judgments constitute part of the subject matter, they should be identified as such.

8. The teacher owes to the student and to the university a fair and impartial evaluation of the student's work. Such evaluation should be consistent with the standards of the institution and must not be influenced by such factors as religion, race, sex, or political views, or be based on the student's agreement with the teacher's opinions on matters of controversy within the discipline.

9. The teacher has certain obligations as the intellectual guide and counselor to his students. He should make himself reasonably available to his students and should publicize the times and places of his availability.

10. In advising a student, the teacher must take every reasonable precaution to insure that the information he hands out is accurate. The progress of a student toward the achievement of his academic goals must not be thwarted or retarded because the teacher has neglected his obligations as an adviser or counselor.

11. Advising or counseling students sometimes results in confidential disclosures by the student to the teacher. These confidences must be scrupulously respected.

12. A student must never be used for the teacher's personal or private gain. If a student makes any contribution to the teacher's work, such contribution must be fully acknowledged.

III. Responsibilities to Colleagues

The faculty member's responsibilities to his colleagues derive from their membership in the community of scholars.

1. The faculty member must respect the freedom of inquiry of his associates and, when necessary, defend it from assault by others.

2. He must avoid any interference with the work of his colleagues.

3. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, he must show due respect for his colleague's opinions. In expressing disagreement, he must refrain from personal denigration or vilification.
4. He must always acknowledge his colleagues' contribution to his work.

5. When called upon by appropriate authority to evaluate a colleague, the faculty member must be candid in his reply. He must, however, be careful to confine his judgment to professionally relevant matter.

IV. Responsibilities to the University

The faculty member's primary responsibility to his university is to seek to realize his maximum potential as an effective scholar and teacher. In addition to the work of instruction and research or scholarship, his duties may from time to time include service on committees, attendance at meetings, participation in group deliberations, and participation in academic ceremonies. Further:

1. Where he intends it or not, the faculty member is often perceived as a representative of his university. He must be conscious of this, and he should exercise his rights and freedoms as a private person with reasonable regard for the possibility of confusion between his professional status and his status as a private citizen.

2. When a faculty member acts or speaks primarily as a private citizen, he should exercise reasonable care to insure that his action or speech is seen as his own and not as that of an official representative or spokesman of the university.

3. The faculty member must never attempt to exploit his standing within the university for private or personal gain. He may, on appropriate occasions, cite his connection with the university, but only for the purposes of identification. He must not permit the impression to prevail that the university in any way sponsors his private activities.

4. University facilities, equipment, supplies, etc. may not be used for personal or private business except when and as authorized by the university.

5. Effective faculty participation in the governance of the university promotes academic freedom and the goals of the institution. Each faculty member should, to the best of his ability, participate in the university's decision-making processes. He should accept a fair share of the faculty's responsibility for the day to day operation of the university.

6. The faculty member must determine the amount and character of any work or other activity that he may pursue outside the university with due regard to his paramount responsibilities within the university.

7. During periods of disturbance or high tension on campus, the faculty member should do all he can to prevent acts of destruction or violence.

8. The faculty member has the duty of constant effort to insure that the regulations of the university are designed to achieve the university's goals and that they shall be in accord with the principles of academic freedom.
Recognizing the importance of order within the institution, the responsible faculty member observes the regulations of the university, but in no way abdicates his right to attempt to reform those regulations by any appropriate orderly means.

V. Responsibility to the Community

As a member of his community, the faculty member has the rights and prerogatives, the obligations and the duties of any citizen. These include the right to join political or other associations, to convene and conduct public meetings, and to publicize his opinions on political and social issues. His status as faculty member in no way detracts from his status as citizen in the larger community outside the university.

Because academic freedom has traditionally included the faculty member's full freedom as a citizen, most faculty members face no irresolvable conflicts between the claims of politics, social action, and conscience on the one hand and the claims and expectations of their students, colleagues, and institutions on the other. However, if such conflicts become acute, and the faculty member's attentions to his obligations as a citizen and moral agent preclude the fulfillment of substantial academic obligations, he cannot escape the responsibility of choice, but should either request a leave of absence or resign his academic position.

The board noted that it had previously accepted the above statement. No further action was necessary.

B. A Procedure for Imposing Disciplinary Sanctions, Short of Dismissal

on a Faculty Member. President Kamerick reported by memorandum the following:

Subsequent to the action of the board relative to faculty ethics, I asked the Faculty Senate to develop the procedure as requested by the Regents. Several changes of personnel delayed a response, but eventually a committee developed a draft of the procedure, described in the following pages. The procedure was approved by the Faculty Senate on April 17, 1972, and was approved by the University Faculty with a few minor amendments on May 15, 1972.

There were some complexities which needed to be sorted out. First, you will note this is a procedure for imposing disciplinary sanctions short of dismissal. As mentioned earlier, there is another procedure, which existed much earlier, to be invoked when dismissal is being sought. There is yet another procedure for grievances, established some four or five years ago. In the summer of 1972, I drafted an agenda item for submission to the Board, and I asked the counsel to the university, Mr. Leo Baker, to examine the document prepared by the faculty on this matter, my own suggestions for change (based for the most part on the clear conflict with the "Uniform Rules of Personal Conduct" as revised by the Board in June, 1971), and two other procedures. His letter of response is included with this Docket item and is labeled III-A. My inquiry of him, among other things, was directed to insuring the requirements of due process were met.
The agenda item was not submitted to the Board at that time because of the continuing development of the Faculty Constitution and the need to guarantee consistency among documents being submitted to you.

Mr. Baker has suggested two changes in Section V and a change in Section VII. He has also reviewed the rewritten Section VI and the changes in Section VIII which are labeled as presidential recommendations, Option 2. These are suggested in order to make this document consistent with the Regents' Rules. A quite similar action was approved by the Regents with respect to the University of Iowa at the May, 1973, meeting.

To make this whole matter clear, then, there is no recommendation for a change in the first four sections. In Section V, Mr. Baker has recommended that we define the burden of proof resting upon the provost. He has also suggested in this same section that the third paragraph may produce a violation of due process. (The other options are set forth in the document itself.)

The following letter to President Kamerick from Leo M. Baker, legal counsel, UNI, was also reviewed by the board in its consideration of the proposed procedures:

I have reviewed the Procedure for Imposing Discipline Upon a Faculty Member, dated May 15, 1972, and make the following observations regarding this procedure:

1. In Section II, I have struck "such-and-such" as being rather a poor choice of words.

2. In Section V, I have added the language, "and the charges must be supported by a preponderance of the evidence." The proposed draft merely states the burden of proof shall rest upon the provost. There are varying degrees of proof. In a criminal case, it is beyond a reasonable doubt. In a civil case, it is a preponderance of the evidence. In my opinion, this hearing would be in the nature of a civil proceeding, and it should be clearly understood the burden which the provost must satisfy. This is substantially the same language as in the Approved Hearing Examiner Procedures.

3. In Section V, page 4, third paragraph, commencing "In the event...", I would strike that last sentence. It is quite possible either party may discover a document at the last minute which is material to the hearing, and if this is the case, the document should be admitted. If there is an element of surprise involved in the introduction of a written statement or document, the hearing can always be adjourned for consideration of the document. To exclude written evidence just because it fails to comply with the 3-day time limit, may produce a violation of due process.
4. In Section VII, I would make certain the sanction does satisfy the requirements of the Regents Rules of Personal Conduct. Your last suggestion may resolve the problem, but I think it should be crystal clear that the Regents Rules of Personal Conduct do control. What I have specifically in mind is a violation of a Regents Rule of Personal Conduct which is found to be of a serious nature. In Section 3(a) of the Regents Rules, it states that if the violation is of a serious nature or has contributed to a substantial disruption of the orderly process of the university, the sanction shall be a suspension for not less than one academic year. Under those circumstances, you, as President, would have no choice but to suspend for the minimum period.

The document as presented read as follows:

This procedure is for use in those cases in which the administration seeks formally to invoke disciplinary sanctions short of dismissal upon a faculty member who is alleged to have violated a provision of the Regents' Rules of Conduct, the Statement on Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility, or the established regulations of the university. It is a procedure for determining, as nearly as possible, the true facts of the case, for evaluating the seriousness of the violation (if, in fact, such violation did occur), and for determining what sanctions, if any, are to be imposed. The procedure is designed to insure that these determinations and this evaluation shall take place in accordance with the requirements of due process.

I

When, on the basis of informal inquiry into the alleged misconduct of some member of the faculty, the provost of the university concludes that the formal imposition of a disciplinary sanction is necessary or desirable, he may initiate this procedure by writing a letter to the faculty member (copy to the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee), formally charging him with misconduct. In this letter, the provost shall

1. cite the specific provision of the Regents' Rules of Conduct, the Statement on Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility, or the established regulations of the university alleged to have been violated;

2. briefly describe the act, and the circumstances surrounding the act, which constitutes the alleged violation; and

3. stipulate the sanction which the university intends to impose.

II

Upon receipt of the provost's letter, the accused faculty member may do one of two things:

1. He may acknowledge the misconduct and accept the proposed sanction. This can be done in two ways:
a. The faculty member may, within five class days from the date of the provost's letter, send a letter of acknowledgement and acceptance to the provost; or

b. the faculty member may do nothing.

However the faculty member may choose to act, the provost may, six class days after the date of his initiatory letter, in a letter to the president (copies to the accused faculty member and to the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee), recommend that such-and-such sanction be imposed.

The president shall, within ten class days from the date of the provost's letter of recommendation, act upon this recommendation, (a) accepting, (b) accepting with meliorative modification, or (c) rejecting the recommendation. The president's action shall be set forth in a letter to the provost (copies to the accused faculty member and to the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee). The president's action closes the case.

2. He may, in a letter written to the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee (copy to the provost) within five class days from the date of the provost's initiatory letter, deny the charge, or protest the sanction and request a hearing before the Faculty Disciplinary Committee.

If the faculty member requests a hearing on the charges, the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee shall make arrangements for such a hearing, to be held at some mutually agreeable time within fifteen class days from the date on which the faculty member sent his letter to the chairman, unless, by written mutual agreement between the provost and the accused faculty member, a later date is chosen.

III

The hearing shall be held before the Faculty Disciplinary Committee, which shall consist of five faculty members chosen from the Panel on Faculty Conduct.

The Panel on Faculty Conduct shall consist of fifteen faculty members, elected for five-year terms by the faculty at large from a list of nominees prepared by the Committee on Committees, the terms to be staggered so that one fifth of the total number shall expire each year. Members of the panel shall be indefinitely eligible for renomination and reelection.

The Committee on Committees shall choose its nominees so as to obtain a reasonably fair distribution of panel members among the several colleges and the noncollegiate faculty. The committee shall be especially solicitous to see to it that all instructional ranks are represented on the panel. If possible, the panel should at all times include at least two members from each instructional rank.

The Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall be chosen from the Panel on Faculty Conduct in the following manner. The entire list of names on the panel shall be submitted to the provost and to the faculty member who is being charged, and each of these two persons shall have the right to strike as many as five names from the list. The
The chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee shall choose the five members of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee from whatever names remain after this process has been completed. The Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall elect one of its own members to serve as chairman.

IV

The hearing shall be open unless the faculty member requests, in writing, that it be closed. Even in a closed hearing, however, each party to the dispute shall be permitted to designate as many as three persons who shall be admitted as observers.

The persons officially authorized to be present at the hearing shall be:

1. The members of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee.

2. The provost (or his designated representative) and an adviser or counsel.

3. The accused faculty member and his adviser or counsel and a representative from each of such voluntary faculty welfare organizations as the faculty member may choose to designate.

4. Witnesses for both parties.

5. A recorder or recorders, designated by the chairman of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee.

6. Designated observers.

7. Such other observers as the chairman of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee may, with the concurrence of a majority of the committee, choose to invite.

A tape recording and/or a verbatim transcript shall be made. After the case is closed, the tape and/or the transcript shall be placed in the custody of the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee, who shall keep it (them) in a safe place for two years, after which it (they) may be destroyed. During this time, all parties to the dispute shall have reasonable access to the tape and/or the transcript and shall be permitted, at their own expense, to make copies thereof.

The chairman of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall rule on all procedural matters, and such matters may, at the chairman's discretion, be discussed off the record. The rulings of the chairman may be appealed to the entire committee, and a majority vote of the committee shall sustain the appeal. If the appeal fails to win a majority, the ruling of the chairman shall prevail.

The chairman shall have authority, subject to appeal to the entire committee, to exclude from the hearing any person who disrupts the proceedings, and any person who refuses to obey the order of the chairman to leave the hearing room shall be deemed in violation of university regulations. If the chairman deems it necessary to close the hearing in order to avoid continued disruption, he may, with the approval of a majority of the committee, close the hearing.
In the hearing, the burden of proof shall rest upon the provost (or his designated representative), and his evidence, including written statements and the testimony of witnesses, shall therefore be presented first.

The accused faculty member and/or his counsel shall be permitted to cross-examine the provost (or his designated representative) and to cross-examine each witness at the conclusion of his testimony.

The members of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall be permitted to ask questions at any time.

In the event that the provost fails to meet the burden of proof placed upon him, the committee shall dismiss the charges without requiring the presentation of a defense.

The accused faculty member shall then be permitted to present his evidence, including written statements and the testimony of witnesses, and, again, cross-examination by the opposite party, and questions from the members of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee, shall be permitted.

In the presentation of evidence, strict conformity with the legal rules of evidence shall not be required, but the chairman of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall have authority to rule, subject to appeal to the entire committee, on the admissibility of evidence. In the event that written statements or documents are offered in evidence, this evidence shall be admitted only if it has been distributed, at least three class days prior to the hearing, to the members of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee and to the opposite party in the dispute.

After completion of the presentation of evidence by both parties, each party shall be permitted a rebuttal and/or a summary statement.

After completion of the summary statements, the hearing shall be terminated.

In the hearing, the burden of proof shall rest upon the provost (or his designated representative), and the charges must be supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The provost's evidence, including written statements and the testimony of witnesses, shall therefore be presented first.

The accused faculty member and/or his counsel shall be permitted to cross-examine the provost (or his designated representative) and to cross-examine each witness at the conclusion of his testimony.

The members of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall be permitted to ask questions at any time.
In the event that the provost fails to meet the burden of proof placed upon him, the committee shall recommend to the President the charges be dismissed without requiring the presentation of a defense.

The accused faculty member shall then be permitted to present his evidence, including written statements and the testimony of witnesses, and, again, cross-examination by the opposite party, and questions from the members of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee, shall be permitted.

In the presentation of evidence, strict conformity with the legal rules of evidence shall not be required, but the chairman of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall have authority to rule, subject to appeal to the entire committee on the admissibility of evidence.

After completion of the presentation of evidence by both parties, each party shall be permitted a rebuttal and/or a summary statement.

After completion of the summary statements, the hearing shall be terminated.

VI

Option 1 (Faculty)

Within five class days after the termination of the hearing, the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall render its decision. The committee may

1. consent to the sanction proposed by the provost; or
2. reject the proposed sanction, but consent to a lesser sanction; or
3. recognize the violation but find that no sanction is in fact appropriate; or
4. dismiss the charges. (In this event, the case is closed with the announcement of this decision.)

The committee shall announce its decision in a letter addressed to the president, the provost, and the accused faculty member (copy to the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee).

In the event that the committee's decision is to consent to a sanction, the president shall allow six class days to elapse before he takes action. If he receives no appeal from the accused faculty member during those six class days, he may then act. Within the next five class days, he may

1. impose the sanction consented to by the committee,
2. impose a lesser sanction, or
3. dismiss the charges.

The president's action closes the case.
Option 2 (President)

Within five class days after the termination of the hearing the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall make its recommendation. The committee may

1. consent to the sanction proposed by the provost; or
2. reject the proposed sanction, but consent to a lesser sanction; or
3. recognize the violation but find that no sanction is in fact appropriate; or
4. recommend dismissal of the charges.

The committee shall announce its recommendation in a letter addressed to the president, the provost, and the accused faculty member (copy to the chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee).

In the event that the committee's recommendation is to consent to a sanction, the president shall allow six class days to lapse before he takes action. If he receives no appeal from the accused faculty member during those six class days, he may then act. Within the next five class days, he may

1. impose the sanction consented to by the committee,
2. impose a different sanction, or
3. dismiss the charges.

The president's action closes the on-campus case, but this action may be appealed to the Board of Regents.

VII

Option 1 (Faculty)

The sanctions which may be proposed by the provost and consented to by the Faculty Disciplinary Committee are:

Option 2 (President)

The sanctions which may be proposed by the provost and recommended by the Faculty Disciplinary Committee shall conform to the requirements of the Regents' Rules of Personal Conduct, and they are:

1. A letter of censure from the president, to be placed in the faculty member's permanent file.
2. Monetary damages in reparation for whatever financial loss the university may have incurred as a result of the faculty member's misconduct.
3. Suspension, without pay, for a period of time not to exceed two years.
4. A combination of any two or more of the above.
Option 1 (Faculty)

The decision of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee may be appealed to the president in a letter written by the faculty member within five class days after the rendering of the decision. The president shall act upon the appeal within five class days.

Option 2 (President)

The recommendation of the Faculty Disciplinary Committee may be appealed to the president in a letter written by the faculty member or the provost within five class days after the issuance of the recommendation. The president shall act upon the appeal within five class days.

The president's action may, with the consent of the Board, be appealed to the Board of Regents. The decision of the Board of Regents shall be, so far as the university is concerned, final. The faculty member may, of course, seek relief in the civil courts.

Addition (President)

Should questions arise concerning conflicts of this document with the Regents' Rules of Personal Conduct, the Regents' Rules of Personal Conduct take precedence over the provisions of this policy.

Regent Petersen stated that all the recommendations in the president's options leave the responsibility of the president where it should be - with the president.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved the board approve the "Procedure for Imposing Discipline upon a Faculty Member as Adopted by the Faculty" using the president's option in each instance including the additional paragraph at the end and also including the recommended changes by Leo M. Baker. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

C. Procedure for Handling Faculty Dismissal Cases. The board was requested to approve, with recommended changes, the following:
The following procedure is adopted for the handling of cases in which the issue is whether a faculty member should be discharged from employment. It is a dismissal procedure, applying primarily to the dismissal of faculty members with tenure. It applies to faculty members on probationary or temporary appointment only in the event that the dismissal under consideration should come before the expiration of the term of appointment. It is not a grievance procedure, which is to say that failure to grant promotions, leaves of absence, salary increases, or renewals of term appointments is not a basis for invoking this procedure. It is designed to serve the best interests of, and to be fair to, both the individual concerned and the university.

This procedure recognizes the statutory power of the State Board of Regents to employ and to discharge members of the faculty of this university. The establishment of a procedure for handling dismissal cases is an attempt to provide a reasonable means of furnishing to the Regents a sound basis for their decision and to provide reasonable guarantees of compliance with enlightened standards of academic due process, especially as these are enunciated in the "1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure" by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, and promulgated in the "Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings," adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in November, 1957, and by the Association of American Colleges at its annual meeting in January, 1958.

1. "Out of Court" Settlement

If a question of fitness arises regarding a faculty member who has tenure or whose term of appointment as a faculty member has not expired, every effort should be made to settle it "out of court." That is, before any formal action is taken, conscientious attempts should be made to adjust the matter in conversations between the faculty member concerned and his department head or his dean. If these fail, there should be at least one relatively informal conference of the faculty member, the dean, or head of his department, and a representative of the Provost. To this conference the faculty member should have the privilege of bringing a colleague of his own choosing.

2. Preliminary Investigation

If agreement cannot be reached "out of court," the Provost should request the Faculty Welfare Committee to appoint a committee of three, at least one of whom is a member of the Faculty Welfare Committee, to inquire quickly and informally into the affair and to decide whether in their opinion formal proceedings are justified. If in reporting to the Provost this committee recommends such proceedings, or if the Provost, regardless of the committee's recommendations, wishes them, formal proceedings should begin.

3. Written Statements

Formal proceedings should begin by a written set of specifications from the Provost outlining with reasonable particularity the grounds for proposed dismissal, and stating as fully as may be the facts relied on for dismissal, and the names of witnesses to these facts, together with references to any rules or regulations.
allegedly broken. In addition, the specifications should outline in detail the procedure to be followed and should inform the faculty member concerning his procedural rights. If he wishes to contest the charges against him, the faculty member should reply in writing, answering each of the charges. He should be given sufficient time to prepare his reply, in no case fewer than twenty class days or more than thirty class days from the time he receives the formal charges. If he chooses, the faculty member may waive his right to a formal hearing, and allow his written statement to constitute his defense.

4. Formation of the Hearing Committee

As soon as the Provost sends formal charges to the faculty member concerned, he should inform the chairman of the Senate, and that body shall immediately set in motion the procedure described below for selection of a group of five faculty members to act as a hearing committee. These shall be persons of objectivity and competence who are high in the regard of the faculty as a whole. No member should be chosen from the Senate or from the preliminary committee of three. Except in unusual circumstances, no member of the accused's department should serve on this committee. The hearing committee should elect its own chairman.

a. Within five days the Provost of the University and the Chairman of the Senate shall each (without consultation with one another) present in writing to the Senate the names of twenty-five faculty members who they feel would make a fair judgment of all the facts pertinent to the case. In compiling the list, each should keep in mind the restrictions on membership for the hearing committee described above. Neither list should contain more than five members of any department or bureau. If the Chairman of the Senate is a member of the accused's department, the Vice-Chairman shall submit this list.

b. The elected members of the Senate (exclusive of the officer who submitted the list of twenty-five names) shall select, by secret ballot, a total of twenty-five faculty members from the lists submitted to them. If the first ballot does not provide a consensus of twenty-five names, or if more than five names are from any one department or bureau, subsequent ballots may be cast.

c. One copy of this list must be submitted to the faculty member and one copy to the Provost (or other administrative officer responsible for the general supervision of the work of the faculty member and responsible for initiating the dismissal recommendation). The Provost of the university (or other administrative officer responsible for the general supervision of the work of the faculty member and responsible for initiating the dismissal recommendation) and the faculty member may strike off the names of not more than 10 individuals on the list who, in their judgment, should not serve on the committee. In addition, each may check the names of five or more individuals whom he would recommend as suitable members of the committee. These lists are to be signed and returned to the Senate.

d. After receiving the two lists the elected members of the Senate shall designate a committee of five consisting of those who have been recommended by both the department head and the faculty member as indicated by their checks on the lists. If the number of names checked by both the department head and the faculty member is less than five, additional names will be chosen from those names that have not been crossed off by either party.
5. The Hearing

First, the hearing committee should consider the formal charges and the faculty member's reply. If the faculty member has waived his right to a formal hearing, the committee should decide, on the basis of available information, whether or not the person concerned should be removed. If a hearing is not waived, it should be set for as early a date as is practicable. Hearings will ordinarily be open, but the accused shall have the right to request a closed meeting. In such case, the hearing committee shall make the final decision as to whether the hearing shall be open or closed. If the committee denies the accused's request for a closed hearing, it shall file a memorandum decision as part of the record in the case, giving reasons for the said denial. (Mr. Baker has recommended that the last sentence of this paragraph be struck. The last sentence reads, "The hearing may be public or private, depending upon the committee's decision after consulting the Provost and the faculty member concerned.")

In case the facts are in dispute, the committee should determine the order of proof. The burden of proof should be on the administration, as the moving party, and the charges must be supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The Provost, or his representative, should be allowed to attend throughout the hearing and to assist in developing the case. However, the committee should normally conduct the questioning of witnesses and may request such additional evidence as the case seems to require. The accused should have the right to counsel, whose functions in developing the case parallel those of the Provost or his representative. The administration and the accused should have the right (Mr. Baker has recommended that three words be struck here. The three words are: "within reasonable limits.") to question orally all witnesses appearing before the committee. While formal rules of evidence and court procedure are not necessary, the committee establishing its own, the accused should have the right to confront adverse witnesses unless unusual circumstances cause the committee to decide otherwise. In every instance in which the committee does decide otherwise, all of the evidence and the identity of the witness must be disclosed to the accused.

All evidence should be duly recorded.

After the evidence is presented, the administration and the accused should be allowed a reasonable time to sum up and make oral arguments; the committee may, if it likes, require written briefs. When the committee is satisfied that each side has had its full say, it should make its findings of fact and recommendations in private conference.

The hearing committee should make explicit findings on each of the formal charges presented, and should give reasons for each finding. The faculty member and the Provost should immediately be given a copy of the findings of fact and recommendations, together with a transcript of the record if requested. No publicity should be given out about the hearing or about the committee's action until it is final; then, only the President should have the authority to make the formal announcement of the committee's findings and recommendations. (It is recommended the following sentence be added to this paragraph: "The President will review the recommendation, giving great weight to the judgment of the committee, and will transmit it to the Board of Regents, stating his concurrence or disapproval.")
6. The Regents' Decision

Since the Board of Regents has the final power in matters of dismissal, it may choose to review the case. If a decision has been reached to dismiss a faculty member with tenure, or terminate during its term the appointment of a faculty member without tenure, the Board shall grant any request for review. While the Board will determine the procedure to be followed at such a review, the faculty member shall on request have a right to be heard orally, as specified in the Regents Procedural Guide.

7. Suspension of the Faculty Member

Suspension of the faculty member during the proceedings involving him is justified only if immediate harm to himself or others is threatened by his continuance. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay.

The following letter to the Board of Regents from President Kamerick summarizes changes the president requested for approval and which already had been incorporated into the document:

In November, 1959, the Faculty Senate at the University of Northern Iowa developed a "Procedure for Handling Faculty Dismissal Cases," as it was called. This procedure was approved by the Board of Regents in December, 1959. In 1967, several modifications to this procedure were written into the Faculty Manual, but insofar as I am able to ascertain from consulting the minutes of the Board of Regents, these recommendations were not submitted to the Board for approval.

Therefore, these changes and others are being submitted now for your approval. In addition to that, the changes recommended by Mr. Baker on page two of his communication are also being recommended for approval, in order to safeguard due process and define more clearly the burden of proof. Third, the adoption of a procedure for imposing discipline short of dismissal on faculty members does mean that someone will need to decide which of the procedures should be invoked. It is likely that that decision should rest with the same person, namely the provost of the university, and that change has been incorporated.

I believe it's fair to say that nothing substantive has been changed in making these recommendations to you and in many cases the changes amount to little more than the corrections of terminology. Probably, then, there is no need for options. However, in describing these suggested changes where they amount to more than terminology (for example, one sentence has been recommended for deletion by Mr. Baker) this is pointed out. He has also defined more precisely the nature of the proof to be demanded, and this is pointed out. One line has been added to provide for transmittal of the committee recommendation to the Regents, and the paragraph on the Regents' review has been slightly altered to bring it into conformity with the Regents' Procedural Guide.
In summary, then, the changes are:

1. The Provost has been substituted for the President throughout the document.

2. The burden of proof has been defined.

3. Regular transmittal to the Board has been written into the procedure.

4. The Section on Hearing Procedure has been brought into conformity with the Procedural Guide.

President Kamerick stated to the board that the above procedure is for dismissal for both faculty members who hold tenure and for those who do not hold tenure.

Mr. Baker, by letter to President Kamerick, noted:

Concerning the Procedure for Handling Faculty Dismissal Cases, I observe as follows:

1. Section 320(5) would be better if the hearing were open, unless the faculty member requests in writing that it be closed. The language could be substantially the same as the opening of Section IV of the Procedure for Imposing Discipline. I am not sure of the reason for the last sentence of the first paragraph of 5, and would recommend it be struck.

2. In the second paragraph of 5, I have added the language concerning preponderance of the evidence in the same manner I recommended it in the Procedure for Imposing Discipline. If you do not add this language, there is a question as to the exact burden of proof being placed upon the administration.

3. In that same second paragraph, in the sentence dealing with the right to question the witnesses, I would recommend the words "within reasonable limits" be struck. Both parties should have the unlimited right to question witnesses, so long as the questioning is material to the hearing. If the questioning becomes irrelevant or immaterial, I believe the chairman of the committee would have the implied right to prohibit those questions.
MOTION TO AMEND PROCEDURE: Mr. Shaw moved the document be amended in the first sentence of the preamble, adding "for cause" following the words "from employment". Mr. Wallace seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Discussion then centered on the following language of Section 5 of the procedure entitled The Hearing: "While formal rules of evidence and court procedure are not necessary, the committee establishing its own, the accused should have the right to confront adverse witnesses unless unusual circumstances cause the committee to decide otherwise. In every instance in which the committee does decide otherwise, all the evidence and the identity of the witness must be disclosed to the accused."

Regent Zumbach stated that the right to cross examine your accusers is very important. Mrs. Petersen noted that they do have the right except in very unusual circumstances.

Regent Wallace suggested the board add "this decision of the committee may be appealed to the president" before the last sentence of the above. Regent Shaw stated the board must be careful, however, in inserting this statement in this place only. Mr. Martin, UNI, stated that if we pressed the president of the university with too many procedural appeals before the entire case is transmitted for his review, some might allege that his judgment had been tainted. Mrs. Petersen added that she felt the board wanted a workable procedure and if we give that right of appeal on every single matter of procedure, people could obstruct anything. Mr. Jones, UNI, stated that the committee is made up of five faculty members who are willing to fall over backward to protect the rights of the accused. Mr. Posge, UNI, also concurred with Mr. Thompson and Mr. Jones. Extensive discussion was held on this point.
MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the "Procedure for Handling Faculty Dismissal Cases" as amended with presidential changes. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

D. Constitution of the Faculty of the University of Northern Iowa. The board was requested to approve, with recommended changes, the following faculty constitution. President Kamerick, by way of letter to the Board of Regents, stated his recommended changes in the constitution.

From previous correspondence in which you have shared, you know that members of the faculty at the University of Northern Iowa have been engaged for some time in drafting a constitution. Prior to my own arrival on campus, a Constitution Committee was formed in 1970 (apparently in consequence of local and national events) and since that time has worked very diligently to produce a constitution for the faculty.

The constitution has gone through several stages of refinement and is now presented to the Regents. Accompanying the constitution are several communications, some critical and some only informative.

More than a year ago I wrote to the faculty as follows:

As must be obvious, a faculty constitution as comprehensive as this inevitably defines not only the role of the faculty in university governance but also, by one means or another, partially defines the role available to other constituencies, principally the students, the administration, and, to a lesser degree, the governing board.

Thus, a decent regard for democracy requires that those who are affected by actions have, at a minimum, the opportunity to comment. I have a letter from the President of the Student Senate asking that the Student Senate be provided an opportunity to comment on the final document before it is presented to the Board of Regents. This opportunity will be provided to the Student Senate, to the Administrative Council, and to the collegiate administrations, deans, and department heads. However, the final document, as (and if) approved by the faculty, will be sent to the Board along with Student Senate, Administrative Council, and collegiate administration recommendations. I shall write a covering letter, as normally required.

You will find some of the correspondence referred to above, following the Faculty Constitution. You will also find there a faculty-wide expression of opinions on the Constitution conducted by our Institute for Social Research.
As a preliminary comment, perhaps it should be mentioned that faculty meetings at the University of Northern Iowa are not ceremonial meetings as is frequently the case with universities of this size. Matters decided by the Faculty Senate can be recalled from the Faculty Senate upon petition of thirty faculty members and presented to Faculty Meetings for decision. Thus, it is probably accurate to characterize the Faculty Senate as a "weak" Senate, at least in the sense that the Faculty has not delegated to the Senate final decision-making power. Meetings of the entire university faculty are regular and frequent by comparison with other universities of similar size, and most major issues inevitably are brought to faculty meetings for decision rather than remaining with the Senate. Thus, a couple of the options suggested by me are made in recognition of this fact.

There are, however, relatively few places in which I have a different recommendation to offer than the faculty. I shall describe these in this covering letter, and they shall be distinguished as Options 1 and Options 2 in the Constitution. Option 1 will be the faculty recommendation; Option 2 will be the President's recommendation. For convenience, I have made recommendations by page number from front to back.

The first such listing of alternatives occurs on page 6. Here there is a difference of opinion about the quorum necessary for a regular meeting.

Option 1 (Faculty)

9.5 Quorum: Regular Meeting. A quorum for a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty for which notice has been sent at least one week in advance shall consist of those faculty members present.

9.6 Quorum: Special Meetings. A quorum for a special meeting of the faculty shall consist of 25% of the membership of the university faculty as listed in the then current faculty roster.

Option 2 (President)

9.5 A quorum for any meeting of the faculty shall consist of twenty-five percent of the membership of the university faculty as listed in the then current faculty roster.

9.6 would then be deleted.

On page 7, Article IV, Sections 3.3, 3.31, and 3.32, it is recommended the following words be inserted in each. The inserted words are in italics.

...uniform procedures which have the approval of the University Faculty Senate and the President and which in each case....

On page 9, Article IV, Sections 4.6, 4.61, and 4.62, a similar change is recommended. The inserted words are in italics.
On pages 7 and 9 a difference of opinion arises concerning nominations for administrative positions. In both instances the faculty recommendation is that not more than three names for such positions be sent forward to the appropriate administrative officer. My recommendation would be on both page 7 and 9, Article IV, 3.33 and 4.63, that the words at least three be substituted for not more than three. The reason for this is that the stipulation of not more than three seems to be an undesirable restriction on search committees, who may wish to nominate four or five. Furthermore, not everyone in the race is always running, and this may not be apparent initially. Some greater flexibility is desirable for search committees and administrators, particularly since the first or second choices may not be available.

On page 10, it is my recommendation that a section be added, marked 5.1, titled Plebiscite or Poll. This recommendation would replace nothing. It would read:

If a comprehensive assessment of faculty opinion is deemed necessary or desirable, the President may conduct, or cause to be conducted, a plebiscite of the faculty to ascertain majority conviction.

On page 15, there is a description of the duties of the Faculty Budget Committee. As it now appears in the Constitution, the description of the duties of the Faculty Budget Committee represents a substitution for the description written by the Constitution Drafting Committee. Almost all concerned with the matter agree that the present description prescribes action virtually impossible of fulfillment. It is recommended the original description of duties as drafted by the Constitution Committee be reinstated.

Option 1 (Faculty)

5.43 Duties. The committee shall have full and easy access to all information - rationales, data, procedures, formats, deadlines, etc. - which is relevant to all phases of the budgetary process. It shall make available such budgetary information to the faculty throughout the year. Prior to the presentation of the annual budget to the Board of Regents, the Committee shall report to the faculty on the university budget, budget priorities, and the procedures by which they are developed, so that the faculty can best discharge its advisory functions. It shall make itself available for consultation with the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Academic Master Plan Committee, the office of University Relations and Development, and college budget committees, and all other agencies or groups concerned with budgetary planning. The Committee may send a representative to all Board of Regents meetings.

Option 2 (Original Draft, Endorsed by the President)

5.43 Duties. The committee shall obtain and disseminate such information concerning the university budget, budget priorities, and the procedures by which they are developed as can best enable the faculty to discharge its decision-making and advisory functions.
On page 16, an alternative is suggested to Section 7 under ARTICLE VI: BILL OF FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. The meaning of this section could be clarified by adopting language from the Procedure for Imposing Discipline, Short of Dismissal, on a Faculty Member, and it would still seem to fulfill much of the intent of Section 7. That is to say, it would use language approved by the faculty to establish the basis of a disciplinary penalty.

**Option 1 (Faculty)**

7. Except for special Regents regulations or particular mandates of the Board of Regents, no disciplinary penalty of any sort shall be imposed on any faculty member except for just cause and upon recommendation of his peers and after academic due process. Except for special Regents regulations or particular Regents mandates, only such grounds as have been approved by the faculty or by the University Faculty Senate shall be considered valid.

**Option 2 (President)**

7. No disciplinary penalty of any sort shall be imposed on any faculty member except for just cause and after academic due process. The grounds for such action will be those approved by the faculty in the Preamble to Procedure for Imposing Discipline upon a Faculty Member. These are: violation of a provision of the Regents' Rules of Conduct, violation of the Statement on Professional Ethics and Responsibility, or violation of established regulations of the university.

The last recommended change is in Section 8 of Article VI, on page 16. To this section it is recommended the following words be added: ..., as described in the Faculty Statement on Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility.

**Option 1 (Faculty)**

8. Except for explicit actions directed to individual faculty members by the Board of Regents, no faculty member shall be judged by administration, students, or peers for the purpose of determining rank, salary, assignment, or other professional perquisites, except on his professional performance.

**Option 2 (President)**

8. Except for explicit actions directed to individual faculty members by the Board of Regents, no faculty member shall be judged by administration, students, or peers for the purpose of determining rank, salary, assignment, or other professional perquisites, except on his professional performance, as described in the Faculty Statement on Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility.

With these changes, the Faculty Constitution is recommended for your approval.
The following proposed Faculty Constitution was presented to the board:

Preamble

Article I: Definition of the Faculty

Section 1. The University Faculty
- 1.1 The Instructional Faculty
- 1.2 The Noninstructional Faculty
- 1.3 Jurisdiction of the Instructional Faculty: Limitation on Voting

Section 2. The Word "Faculty" in this Constitution

Section 3. Social Privileges of a Faculty Member

Section 4. Official Roster of the Faculty
- 4.1 Preparation
- 4.2 Distribution
- 4.3 New and Redefined Positions
- 4.4 Challenges of the Roster
- 4.5 Appeal and Final Disposition of Challenge

Article II: Officers and Duties

Section 1. Chairman of the Faculty
- 1.1 Election
- 1.2 Term
- 1.3 Duties
- 1.31 through 1.35

- 1.4 Absence or Incapacity of the Chairman of the Faculty

Section 2. Vice-Chairman of the Faculty

Section 3. Secretary of the Faculty
- 3.1 Term
- 3.2 Duties
- 3.21 through 3.26

Article III: Meetings

Section 1. Required Meeting

Section 2. Regular Meetings

Section 3. Special Meetings: By Petition

Section 4. Special Meetings: Called by Senate

Section 5. Special Meetings: Requested by the President or Vice-President and Provost

Section 6. Notice of Meetings

Section 7. Regular Meetings: Reserved Times

Section 8. Meetings: Times and Places

Section 9. Parliamentary Guide
- 9.1 Appointment of Parliamentarian
- 9.2 New Business and Deferred Final Action
- 9.3 New Business: Exception for Immediate Action
- 9.4 Specially Privileged Motion to Adjourn
- 9.5 Quorum: Regular Meetings
- 9.6 Quorum: Special Meetings

Section 10. Meetings Open to Public
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Article VI: Bill of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Section 1. through Section 12.

Article VII: Joint Decision and Action

Section 1. General Principles
1.1 Governance
1.2 Appropriate Participation
1.3 Limitations on Participation
1.4 Faculty Consultation with Other Components

Section 2. Joint Governance Agencies
2.1 Joint Agencies: Powers and Restrictions
2.2 Joint Agencies: Students
2.3 Joint Agencies: Accountability and Appeal

Article VIII: Ratification, Amendment, and Review

Section 1. Ratification
Section 2. Amendment of the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty
Section 3. Amendment of this Constitution
Section 4. Approval of the Board of Regents
Section 5. Interpretation and Construction
Section 6. Constitutional Review
   6.1 Interpretation and Contest
   6.2 Violation
Section 7. Appeal and Final Disposition
Section 8. Review of Faculty Decision in Jurisdictional Disputes
Article IV: Jurisdiction and Powers

Section 1. General Principles
Section 2. Powers of the Board of Regents
Section 3. The University Faculty: Jurisdiction and Powers
  3.1 through 3.4 (including 3.31 through 3.35)
Section 4. The Instructional Faculty: Jurisdiction and Powers
  4.1 through 4.7 (including 4.61 through 4.65)
Section 5. Prerogative of the President of the University

Article V: Delegation of Powers

Section 1. The Delegation Principle
Section 2. Delegation of Powers to Faculties of Undergraduate Colleges
Section 3. Delegation of Powers to the Faculty of the Graduate College
Section 4. Delegation of Powers to the University Faculty Senate
  4.1 Senate Membership
  4.2 Terms
  4.3 Prolonged Absence or Incapacity of a Senator
  4.4 Representation of the Instructional Faculty: Limitation on Voting
  4.5 Senate Organization
  4.6 Information and Communication
  4.7 Senate Focus on the University as a Whole
  4.8 Faculty Review of Senate Action
  4.9 Accountability of Faculty Committees to the Senate
  4.10 Delegation of Senate Authority to Faculty Committees
  4.11 Senate Consultation with Administrative Officers
  4.12 Relation of Senate Meetings to Faculty Meetings
Section 5. Standing Committees of the Faculty and the University Faculty Senate
  5.1 The Committee on Committees
    5.11 Membership
    5.12 Terms of Office
    5.13 Duties
  5.2 The University Committee on Curricula
    5.21 Membership
    5.22 Terms of Office
    5.23 Members Ex Officio
    5.24 Jurisdiction and Report
  5.3 The Faculty Welfare Committee
    5.31 Membership
    5.32 Terms of Office
    5.33 Members Ex Officio
    5.34 Duties
    5.35 Grievance Committee Function
    5.36 Information
  5.4 The Faculty Budget Committee
    5.41 Membership
    5.42 Terms of Office
    5.43 Duties
    5.44 Report
    5.45 Information
Section 6. Other Standing Committees
Section 7. Cooperative Action with Other Agencies
PREAMBLE

The University of Northern Iowa is a complex organization composed of interrelated components.

The university was established by the people of the State of Iowa to serve the educational needs of its citizens and it is largely sustained by them. The people's delegates, the General Assembly and the Governor, define the scope of the university's operation and fix the level of its support. The Board of Regents, acting in turn as their delegates, establishes basic policies and sets overall goals.

Within itself, the university is likewise divided into distinct parts, to each of which is delegated a particular function in achieving the primary ends of the university, which are: The discovery and the dissemination of knowledge through teaching, research, and service.

The university's students are its very reason for being. Forwarding their progress toward the attainment of critical intelligence, moral sensitivity, and aesthetic awareness must be at the center of the university's many and varied activities. The faculty's work is to guide the students toward their educational goals through teaching and research. The nonacademic staff provides the services and the material conditions which make that work possible. The administrative offices oversee the whole operation and also conduct the university's relations with the Board of Regents, the General Assembly, the Governor, and the people of Iowa.

The faculty of the University of Northern Iowa believes that the institution best fulfills its purposes when its several components--students, faculty, staff, and administration--act in harmony and cooperation to achieve the common goals of the educational community in which they live.

The faculty further believes that this cooperative endeavor is most likely to succeed when each component understands its proper powers and distinctive functions and at the same time views these powers and functions as shared and interdependent.

With these principles in mind, the faculty of the University of Northern Iowa seeking to define itself more accurately, to outline its rights, responsibilities, and powers more precisely, to describe its functions more exactly, and to set forth more clearly its relations to the other components of the university, hereby establishes and ordains this CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I: DEFINITION OF THE FACULTY

1. The University Faculty. The university faculty shall consist of two groups: the instructional faculty and the noninstructional faculty.

   1.1 The Instructional Faculty. The instructional faculty shall consist of all those who are appointed to one of the four academic ranks--instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor--
and who, in addition, are currently teaching at least one academic
course, or who have equivalent instructional responsibilities,
including teaching and/or supervising instructional under the auspices of
the Department of Teaching.

1.2 The Noninstructional Faculty. The noninstructional faculty shall con­
sist of all those who are appointed to one of the four academic ranks
but who are not teaching at least one academic course as defined in
1.1, above, and, in addition, all those not otherwise included in the
University faculty who hold administrative appointments--excepting
associates of and assistants to administrative officers--that touch
directly on instruction or research or whose duties involve
responsibility for the direction or coordination of programs of
instruction or research or closely related areas. The noninstructional
faculty shall also include the professional library staff and the
emeritus faculty while on active duty, and, in addition, all those
persons whose original appointments both carry faculty status and
predate the adoption of this constitution.

1.3 Jurisdiction of the Instructional Faculty: Limitation on Voting.
Privilege of motion, second, and debate shall be afforded during
faculty meetings to all members of the faculty; however, when the
matter to be voted upon falls distinctively within the jurisdiction
of the instructional faculty as hereafter defined (see Article IV,
section 4), voting shall be limited to members of the instructional
faculty. The chairman of the faculty shall normally rule whether the
issue to be voted upon falls distinctively within the jurisdiction of
the instructional faculty, but his ruling shall be subject to challenge
and vote by the members of the university faculty present.

2. The Word "Faculty" in this Constitution. When the word "faculty" is used in this
constitution without a modifying adjective preceding it, reference to the
university faculty shall be assumed.

3. Social Privileges of a Faculty Member. Associates of and assistants to
administrative officers are accorded the social privileges of a university
faculty member but do not have the right to vote in faculty meetings or in
faculty elections.

4. Official Roster of the Faculty. Within the first ten instructional days of the
fall semester, the chairman of the faculty shall arrange for the availability of
an official roster of the faculty. The chairman of the faculty shall have the
authority to decide boundary cases of faculty status according to the spirit of
the foregoing sections, subject to challenge and review as provided below. The
fall roster shall include a listing of those persons who are qualified for member­
ship in the instructional faculty, those qualified for membership in the nonin­
structional faculty, and, finally, those qualified for exercise of the social
privileges of a faculty member. The spring roster shall consist of a list of
additions to the fall roster. Qualification for faculty status for the entire
academic year shall be established by a person's assignment during either the
fall or the spring semester of that year. Faculty status established during an
academic year shall be construed to apply also to the following summer session,
unless the person does not continue his appointment with the university.
4.1 Preparation. The chairman of the faculty shall request the cooperation of the Office of Academic Affairs and the Data Processing Center in handling the routines of processing and distributing each semester's official roster.

4.2 Distribution. A sufficient number of copies of the roster for the fall and spring shall be prepared to supply each of the following committees, persons, and offices: the Committee on Committees; the chairman of the faculty; the vice-chairman of the faculty; the secretary of the faculty; the Office of Academic Affairs; all college offices; all departmental offices. Each college office and each departmental office shall, for a period of one week after the roster's issuance, prominently display the roster in a place readily accessible to the faculty. In addition, a copy of the current semester's roster shall be made available to any faculty number upon written request to the secretary of the faculty.

4.3 New and Redefined Positions. As positions are added or redefined, the chairman of the faculty, with the consent of the University Faculty Senate, shall determine whether the new or redefined position is one which shall be included under the definition of the instructional faculty or of the noninstructional faculty or whether the position shall carry the social privileges of a faculty member or whether it shall fall under none of these definitions.

4.4 Challenges of the Roster. Challenges of the accuracy or the propriety of the listings in any semester's roster shall be directed to the University Faculty Senate before the end of the first half-semester for adjudication by majority vote.

4.5 Appeal and Final Disposition of Challenges. The Senate's decision (see section 4.4, above) may be appealed to a majority vote of the university faculty whose decision shall be final.

ARTICLE II: OFFICERS AND DUTIES

1. Chairman of the Faculty. The university faculty shall elect its chairman by majority vote.

   1.1 Election. The Committee on Committees shall make at least two nominations; other names may be added to the ballot by petition of at least thirty faculty members delivered to the secretary of the faculty.

   1.2 Term. The chairman shall serve a term of one year, beginning in September; a person may serve no more than two consecutive terms.

   1.3 Duties. The official duties of the chairman of the faculty shall include:
1.31 Presiding at meetings of the university faculty.

1.32 Calling meetings of the faculty (see Article IV).

1.33 Preparing, in cooperation with the vice-chairman of the faculty and subject to the approval of the faculty, the agenda of faculty meetings.

1.34 Acting as spokesman for the established policies and positions of the faculty to officers of administration, to the press, to student leadership representatives, and, consistent with Board policies and regulations, to the Board of Regents.

1.35 Communicating in writing with the faculty, or with its delegate, the University Faculty Senate, or with officers of administration on matters of faculty welfare, educational policy, general institutional concern.

1.351 The aforementioned correspondence shall, when judged appropriate by the chairman, be distributed in copy form to the entire university faculty; filed copies of all the official correspondence of the chairman shall be available for examination by any member of the faculty.

1.4 Absence or Incapacity of the Chairman of the Faculty. When, in the judgment of a majority of the University Faculty Senate, an absence of the chairman of the faculty is prolonged to the point that the Senate judges the effectiveness of the office to be seriously jeopardized, the Senate shall declare the office vacated and shall nominate and then elect a faculty member to fulfill the remainder of the term.

2. Vice-Chairman of the Faculty. The chairman of the University Faculty Senate shall be the vice-chairman of the university faculty. The vice-chairman shall act as chairman in the temporary absence of the elected chairman; he shall serve as a consultant on faculty agenda, and in other ways as requested by the chairman.

3. Secretary of the Faculty. The chairman of the faculty shall appoint the secretary of the faculty.

3.1 Term. The secretary of the faculty shall serve during the term of the chairman.

3.2 Duties. The official duties of the secretary of the faculty shall include:

3.21 Taking, duplicating and promptly distributing the official minutes of the faculty.
3.22 Assisting the chairman of the faculty in the preparation and distribution and possible revision of each semester's roster.

3.23 Maintaining a file of the official correspondence of the chairman of the faculty.

3.24 Keeping the minutes and other official documents of the faculty in a safe and accessible place.

3.25 Maintaining liaison, where and when necessary, with the secretary of the University Faculty Senate.

3.26 Preparing and distributing timely notice of regular and special meetings of the faculty.

ARTICLE III: MEETINGS

1. Required Meeting. There shall be at least one regular meeting of the faculty each semester.

2. Regular Meetings. Regular meetings of the faculty shall be called by the chairman of the faculty; the chairman may also call special meetings of the faculty.

3. Special Meetings: By Petition. In addition, a special meeting of the faculty shall be called by the secretary of the faculty on receipt of a petition signed by thirty members of the faculty.

4. Special Meetings: Called by Senate. And, in addition, the University Faculty Senate may, by majority vote, call a special meeting of the faculty. In this case, the secretary of the University Faculty Senate shall prepare a descriptive listing of the items to be discussed at the aforementioned meeting and shall promptly inform the chairman of the faculty and the secretary of the faculty.

5. Special Meetings: Requested by the President or Vice-President and Provost. The chairman of the faculty shall, at the request of the President of the university or of the Vice-President and Provost, call a special meeting of the faculty.

6. Notice of Meetings. The secretary of the faculty shall prepare and distribute to the entire faculty and to recognized student government leaders, at least one week in advance whenever possible and practicable, a descriptive listing of the item(s) to be discussed at regular or special faculty meetings.

7. Regular Meetings: Reserved Times. A period of time sufficient to provide for a meeting of not less than fifty minutes in length shall be set aside once each month of the academic year for the scheduling of regular faculty meetings. No collegiate-grade classes and no other professional meetings or class exercises, insofar as possible and practicable, shall be scheduled for this period.
8. **Meetings: Times and Places.** Determination of the time and the place of faculty meetings shall normally be the responsibility of the chairman of the faculty, except in the case of meetings called by majority vote of the Senate or by petition. In the latter two cases, responsibility for determining the time and place of the meeting falls to the secretary of the faculty. In either case, the faculty officer shall request the cooperation of the university administration in reserving appropriate times and places for meetings.

9. **Parliamentary Guide.** Except as provided by this constitution, or by the standing rules or by-laws of the faculty, Robert's Rules of Order (latest revision) shall be the parliamentary guide for the conduct of business in regular and special meetings of the university faculty.

9.1 **Appointment of Parliamentarian.** The chairman of the faculty shall appoint a faculty member to serve as parliamentarian during the chairman's term of office; the appointee shall perform such duties as the chairman may stipulate.

9.2 **New Business and Deferred Final Action.** The chairman of the faculty shall, as time and the agenda may permit, recognize members of the faculty who desire to present new and undocketed business at a regular or special faculty meeting. However, final action and vote on new and undocketed business shall automatically be postponed until the next regular or special faculty meeting when such business will be the first order of business at the commencement of the aforementioned meeting.

9.3 **New Business: Exception for Immediate Action.** By a two-thirds vote of those faculty members present, the provisions of section 9.2 (above) may, for the instant meeting only, be overridden and immediate action on new and undocketed business concluded.

9.4 **Specially Privileged Motion to Adjourn.** After the expiration of fifty minutes from the commencement of a regular or special faculty meeting, a member of the faculty may interrupt debate to move to adjourn and the chairman shall immediately put this motion to a vote of the faculty then present; the motion shall be undebatabile; if the motion is adopted, the meeting shall be adjourned forthwith and the business under consideration just previous to the motion to adjourn shall be the first order of business at the commencement of the next regular or special meeting of the faculty.

Option 1 (Faculty)

9.5 **Quorum: Regular Meeting.** A quorum for a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty for which notice has been sent at least one week in advance shall consist of those faculty members present.

9.6 **Quorum: Special Meetings.** A quorum for a special meeting of the faculty shall consist of 25% of the membership of the university faculty as listed in the then current faculty roster.
Option 2 (President)

9.5 Quorum. A quorum for any meeting of the faculty shall consist of twenty-five percent of the membership of the university faculty as listed in the then current faculty roster.

9.6 (Deleted.)

10. Meetings Open to Public. Regular and special meetings of the faculty shall be open to the public, except when the faculty votes to sit in executive session.

ARTICLE IV: JURISDICTION AND POWERS

1. General Principles. The faculty has the right to be adequately informed about and to participate jointly with the related components of the university in the determination of policy touching all the phases of the university's operations. The general principle here operative is that, in curriculum and educational policy, where the faculty's authority is greatest, it functions as the regular decision-making agency of the university, subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and the veto-power of the President of the university. In personnel decisions that can modify the faculty's professional identity, professional quality, and working environment, it functions through consultation and review. The faculty's more general concern with the total program of the university is expressed in the form of recommendations and advice to the related components of the university. Sections 2 through 5, following, specifically define and limit the application of these principles.

2. Powers of the Board of Regents. It is recognized that nothing in this article, or in this constitution, can take precedence over the laws of Iowa or the statutory powers of the Board of Regents to set policies and to promulgate rules and regulations governing the institutions, including the University of Northern Iowa, that are under its control.

3. The University Faculty: Jurisdiction and Powers. Subject to the limits provided in section 2, above, and section 5, below, the university faculty shall function as the regular decision-making agency of the university for the matters set forth in 3.1 and 3.2, below, and it shall advise in the form of consultation and review as provided in 3.3 through 3.35, below. Moreover, the university faculty may adopt recommendations and resolutions on any matter touching the general welfare of the university and may address such recommendations and resolutions to any appropriate person, group, or agency.

3.1 The general professional standards, working conditions, and welfare of the faculty.

3.2 The role of the university faculty in the governance of the university and the forms and persons by means of which that role is discharged. Where, as commonly will be the case, any definition or modification of the jurisdiction and powers of one component of the university faculty necessarily affects the jurisdiction and powers of another component
of the university (for example, the officers of administration, the student government, or the instructional faculty), the other component shall have concurrent jurisdiction.

3.3 Consultation during the nomination of, and review during the evaluation of, academic administrators, as, for example, academic deans, the assistant academic vice-president, and the (academic) vice-president and provost. Faculty consultation and review shall be subject to uniform procedure(s) which have the approval of the University Faculty Senate and the President and which in each case shall also be subject to Board of Regents policy and regulations as well as to the presidential prerogative hereafter defined (see section 5).

3.31 Consultation: Nomination. Consultation in the case of nomination shall be construed to mean that nominations for the appointment of academic administrators shall be recommended by the President to the Board of Regents only after participation by an appropriate faculty representative agency, following a uniform procedure(s) which has the approval of the University Faculty Senate and/or an appropriate collegiate faculty governance agency and the President, in the search for, screening, and evaluation of candidates, which procedure shall be in general conformity to the following sections: 3.32, 3.33, 3.34, and 3.35.

3.32 Consultation: Evaluation. Consultation, in the case of evaluation, shall be construed to mean that any formal review of the performance of an academic administrator shall include participation by the appropriate faculty following a uniform procedure(s) which has the approval of the University Faculty Senate and/or an appropriate collegiate faculty governance agency and the President.

3.33 Review: Nomination. Review, in the case of nomination, shall be construed to mean that the elected faculty search committee shall forward to the President (or to the Vice-President and Provost, as appropriate) at least three names acceptable to it, which names shall be reported to the faculty represented at a time judged jointly to be appropriate by the President or Vice-President and Provost and the search committee. After receiving the search committee's recommendations, the President (or Vice-President and Provost) may choose to nominate a person not recommended by the search committee. In the latter case, the search committee shall be provided with a formal opportunity to discuss the matter with the President (or the Vice-President and Provost). After this discussion the President (or the Vice-President and Provost) may exercise his prerogative to recommend the person considered in the aforementioned discussion for consideration by the Board of Regents.
3.34 **Review: Evaluation.** Review, in the case of evaluation, shall be construed to mean that while satisfactory performance may normally be assumed, there shall be available, in addition to any other periodic formal review of an academic administrator's performance, a special procedure for faculty review to be initiated by faculty petition and to be enacted only on condition that the President or the Vice-President and Provost approves the request. If the President or the Vice-President and Provost receives such a petition, he may authorize the following procedure: Each member of the appropriate faculty shall be provided with the opportunity to express his judgment on a standard scale and, if he chooses, by signed letter. The responses, other than the contents of individual letters, shall be reported to that faculty by the President or the Vice-President and Provost. The results of this review shall have the status of a recommendation from that faculty to the President or the Vice-President and Provost.

3.35 "**Appropriate Faculty.**" The phrase "appropriate faculty" in sections 3.31 through 3.34, above, shall be construed to mean, in the case of academic deans, the faculty of the college; in the case of the academic vice-president or his deputies, the faculty of the university shall be signified.

3.4 Such other matters as may be, from time to time, submitted to the university faculty for decision by the Vice-President and Provost of the university.

4. **The Instructional Faculty: Jurisdiction and Powers.** Subject to the limits provided in section 2, above, and section 5, below, the instructional faculty shall function as the regular decision-making agency of the university for the matters set forth in 4.1 through 4.5, below, and it shall advise in the form of consultation and review concerning the matters set forth in 4.6 through 4.65, below. Moreover, the instructional faculty may adopt recommendations and resolutions on any matter touching the general welfare of the university and may address such recommendations and resolutions to any appropriate person, group, or agency.

4.1 Curricular decisions which, in the judgment of the dean or the faculty of any college, or of the Vice-President and Provost, or of the University Committee on Curricula, do not lie wholly within the jurisdiction of one college.

4.2 Standards for granting of academic degrees and of academic credit.

4.3 Educational policies not confined to one college.

4.4 Those matters concerning professional standards, working conditions and faculty welfare which pertain distinctively to the members of the instructional faculty itself.
4.5 The role of the instructional faculty, insofar as it is distinct from the role of the full university faculty in the governance of the university and the forms and persons in and by which that role is discharged. Where, as commonly will be the case, any definition or modification of the jurisdiction and powers of the instructional faculty necessarily affects the jurisdiction and powers of another component of the university (for example, the officers of administration, the student government, or the noninstructional faculty), the other component shall have concurrent jurisdiction.

4.6 Consultation during the nomination of, and review during the evaluation of, instructional administrators, as, for example, heads of instructional departments, departmental administrative assistants, and instructional directors; faculty consultation and review in each case shall be subject to uniform procedures which have the approval of the University Faculty Senate and the Vice-President and Provost and which in each case shall also be subject to Board of Regents policy and regulations and the presidential prerogative hereafter defined (see section 5).

4.61 Consultation: Nomination. Consultation, in the case of nomination, shall be construed to mean that nomination for the appointment of instructional administrators shall be recommended by the appropriate dean to the President (or Vice-President and Provost) only after participation by an appropriate faculty representative agency, following a uniform procedure which has the approval of the University Faculty Senate and the Vice-President and Provost, in the search for, screening, and evaluation of candidates, which procedure shall be in general conformity to the following sections: 4.62, 4.63, 4.64, and 4.65.

4.62 Consultation: Evaluation. Consultation, in the case of evaluation, shall be construed to mean that any formal review of the performance of an instructional administrator shall include participation by the appropriate faculty, following a uniform procedure which has the approval of the University Faculty Senate and the Vice-President and Provost.

4.63 Review: Nomination. Review, in the case of nomination, shall be construed to mean that the elected departmental search committee shall send forward to the appropriate dean not more than three at least three names acceptable to it, which names shall be reported to the department represented at a time judged to be appropriate jointly by the dean and the search committee. After receiving the search committee's recommendations, the dean may choose to nominate a person recommended by the search committee or he may choose to nominate a person not recommended by the search committee. In the latter case, the search committee shall be provided with a formal opportunity to discuss the disagreement with the dean. In the event agreement cannot be reached, the chairman of the search committee shall request the opportunity to present the disagreement to the President of the
university (or to the Vice-President and Provost) and the President (or the Vice-President and Provost) shall decide the name of the nominee to be forwarded to the Board of Regents.

4.64 **Review: Evaluation.** Review, in the case of evaluation, shall be construed to mean that, while satisfactory performance may normally be assumed, there shall be available, in addition to any other periodic formal review of an instructional administrator's performance, a special procedure for faculty review to be initiated by faculty petition and to be enacted only on condition that the appropriate dean approves the request. If the dean receives such a request, he may authorize the following procedure: Each member of the appropriate faculty shall be provided with the opportunity to express his judgment on a standard scale, and, if he chooses, by signed letter. The responses, other than the contents of individual letters, shall be reported to that faculty by the dean. The results of this review shall have the status of a recommendation from that faculty to the dean.

4.65 **"Appropriate Faculty."** The phrase "appropriate faculty" in 4.61 through 4.64, above, shall be construed to mean the instructional faculty of the department or other unit administered by the instructional administrator being appointed or reviewed.

4.7 **Such other matters as may be submitted to it for decision by the university faculty, the President, or the Vice-President and Provost of the university.**

5. **Prerogative of the President of the University.** When the university faculty or the instructional faculty have agreed upon a decision, the chairman of the Faculty shall transmit to the President of the university the exact decision agreed upon by either of the faculty bodies. The President of the university may accept the decision and so indicate by appropriate local publication and administrative implementation and by timely transmission, if required, to the Board of Regents. Or the President may veto the decision and return the matter to the appropriate faculty body together with such proposals for amendment as he may wish to suggest. In the extraordinary event that the faculty body reaffirms the decision and the President continues to find it unsatisfactory, the President agrees to present the disagreement to the Board of Regents for resolution with the assurance that the chairman of the Faculty shall have every opportunity to present the majority faculty point of view.

5.1 **Plebiscite or Poll.** If a comprehensive assessment of faculty opinion is deemed necessary or desirable, the President may conduct, or cause to be conducted, a plebiscite of the faculty to ascertain majority conviction.
ARTICLE V: DELEGATION OF POWERS

1. The Delegation Principle. The university faculty and the instructional faculty shall have power to delegate their functions to elected representatives from their membership, and to establish standing or ad hoc committees as they see fit.

2. Delegation of Powers to Faculties of Undergraduate Colleges. The functions of the university faculty and of the instructional faculty are hereby delegated, for all matters lying essentially within the jurisdiction of a single college, to the appropriate faculty of that college. Decisions of a college faculty or of its elected agencies are reviewable by the university faculty or its agencies only upon a finding by a college faculty, or by a college dean or the Vice-President and Provost or by the University Faculty Senate, that the responsibilities of another college or general university responsibilities are substantially involved.

3. Delegation of Powers to the Faculty of the Graduate College. The functions of the university faculty and of the instructional faculty with respect to the graduate programs of the university are hereby delegated to the faculty of the Graduate College, and to such representative agencies as it may establish from its membership and empower to act on its behalf.

4. Delegation of Powers to the University Faculty Senate. The principal representative agency of the university faculty shall be the University Faculty Senate, which shall have the power to act for the faculty on all matters within its jurisdiction with these two exceptions: (a) The Senate shall not have power to amend this constitution; (b) The Senate shall not have power—except in emergencies—to set aside a decision of the full faculty taken during the current academic year. Exercise of the aforementioned emergency powers shall require a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

4.1 Senate Membership. The University Faculty Senate shall be composed of eighteen members: Three members of the instructional faculty of each undergraduate college shall be elected by the full faculty of that college; three members shall be elected by and from the university faculty-at-large; and three members shall be elected by and from the noninstructional faculty. The Chairman of the Faculty shall be an ex officio member of the University Faculty Senate, with full rights of debate and motion.

4.2 Terms. Terms shall normally be three years, with terms of one-third of each group defined in 4.1 above, to expire each year. A member shall serve no more than two consecutive full terms.

4.3 Prolonged Absence or Incapacity of a Senator. In case the absence or the incapacity of a senator should extend through as much as a complete semester, or if, in the Senate's judgment, it is probable that the absence will so extend, the Senate shall declare that senatorial office vacated and shall then proceed to request of the appropriate university faculty or college faculty agency either that a special election be held to fill the unexpired portion of the term or that the person receiving the next highest vote total in the election that installed the aforementioned senator be declared the incumbent in the
senatorial office for the unexpired portion of the term. The provisions of this section shall not be construed to abridge the right of a senator to designate an alternate from his elective constituency to serve in his place and to exercise the functions of his office for reasonable periods of time.

4.4 Representation of the Instructional Faculty: Limitation on Voting. When the Senate exercises representatively the distinctive functions of the instructional faculty, privileges of motion, second and discussion shall be granted to all members of the Senate, but votes shall be cast only by those senators who are current members of the instructional faculty.

4.5 Senate Organization. The Senate shall elect a chairman and a vice-chairman from among its members; it shall establish such additional offices and committees from among its members or the faculty-at-large as it sees fit; and it shall adopt appropriate by-laws, rules, and procedures for the conduct of its business consistent with the requirements and the spirit of this constitution.

4.6 Information and Communication. The time, place, and agenda of meetings of the Senate shall be regularly communicated in timely form to the faculty; faculty members and recognized student government leaders shall have the right to attend and be heard at meetings of the Senate; minutes of Senate meetings shall be promptly distributed to the entire faculty and to recognized student government leaders; and Senate documents shall be available for inspection by faculty members and by student government leaders upon request.

4.7 Senate Focus on the University as a Whole. It shall be the duty of the Senate to consider all matters that come before it from the point of view of the welfare of the entire university and the State it serves; although elected from various faculty constituencies, Senators shall consider themselves the representatives of the best in their profession rather than the representatives of fractions of their larger constituency.

4.8 Faculty Review of Senate Action. Actions of the Senate shall be reviewed by the faculty upon petition of thirty members of the faculty, delivered to the secretary of the faculty, within fifteen days from the publication of the minutes of the Senate meeting at which the action was taken.

4.9 Accountability of Faculty Committees to the Senate. Except when otherwise directed, all standing committees of the faculty and all ad hoc faculty committees shall report to and be accountable to the University Faculty Senate, and their work subject to instruction or amendment by the Senate.

4.10 Delegation of Senate Authority to Faculty Committees. The Senate may delegate to any faculty committee the authority to make disposition of any matter, subject to subsequent Senate review.
4.11 Senate Consultation with Administrative Officers. The Senate shall establish procedures for regular communication and consultation with the officers of administration, but particularly with the President and the Vice-President and Provost of the university.

4.12 Relation of Senate Meetings to Faculty Meetings. Except when specifically authorized by majority vote of the University Faculty, the University Faculty Senate shall not meet while the Faculty is in session.

5. Standing Committees of the Faculty and the University Faculty Senate. The faculty and its delegate, the University Faculty Senate, shall establish the following standing committees:

5.1 The Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees shall be a standing committee of the university faculty and of the instructional faculty.

5.11 Membership. The Committee shall be composed of seven members, one member elected by and from the faculty of each undergraduate college and three members elected by and from the university faculty-at-large from nominations by the University Senate or by petition of thirty members of the faculty.

5.12 Term of Office. The Committee shall normally be composed of members serving staggered terms of three years duration, but the terms of not less than two members shall expire each year. The Committee on Committees shall have the power to determine and set the precise terms of the rotation of members.

5.13 Duties. For every elective office of the university faculty or instructional faculty except as otherwise provided in this constitution, the committee shall nominate from the university faculty or the instructional faculty twice as many candidates as there are vacancies. In making nominations, it shall not nominate persons currently serving and continuing in an elective office of the university faculty or instructional faculty other than the one for which nomination is being made, or the same person for more than one elective office. And, in addition, the committee shall supervise faculty elections and shall annually make such recommendations concerning the committee structure of the university as it may see fit or as may be required of it by the Senate.

5.2 The University Committee on Curricula. The University Committee on Curricula shall be a standing committee of the instructional faculty.

5.21 Membership. Faculty membership shall consist of seven members, one to be elected by and from the instructional
5.22 Terms of Office. The Committee shall normally be composed of members serving staggered terms of three years duration, but the terms of not less than two members shall expire each year. The Committee on Committees shall have the power to determine and set the precise terms of the rotation of members.

5.23 Members Ex Officio. In addition to the seven regular members, the Registrar, or his representative, shall serve as ex officio secretary, without vote. The Vice-President and Provost, or his representative, and the Director of Teacher Education shall serve as members ex officio, both without vote.

5.24 Jurisdiction and Report. Except as the instructional faculty or the Senate may otherwise provide, the Committee on Curricula shall make recommendations to the University Faculty Senate concerning all curricular changes for which the Senate has responsibility; the committee reports to the University Faculty Senate, but it shall also transmit its reports to the Student Senate for advice.

5.3 The Faculty Welfare Committee. The Faculty Welfare Committee shall be a standing committee of the university faculty.

5.31 Membership. The Committee shall be composed of seven members, one member elected by and from the faculty of each undergraduate college; one member elected by and from the noninstructional faculty; and two members elected from the university faculty-at-large.

5.32 Term of Office. The Committee shall normally be composed of members serving staggered terms of three years duration, but the terms of not less than two members shall expire each year. The Committee on Committees shall have the power to determine and set the precise terms of the rotation of members.

5.33 Members Ex Officio. The Vice-President and Provost shall designate one department head and one college dean, from different colleges, to serve ex officio, both without vote.

5.34 Duties. Except as the university faculty or Senate may otherwise provide, the Faculty Welfare Committee shall make recommendations to the Senate on all matters of faculty salary and fringe benefit policies, working conditions, employment status, and grievance and dismissal procedures.
which either the Senate or the committee, on its own initiative, wishes to consider.

5.35 **Grievance Committee Function.** The Committee shall, in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the Senate, serve as a faculty grievance committee.

5.36 **Information.** Except when the Faculty Welfare Committee serves as a grievance committee, the meetings, minutes, correspondence and documents of the committee shall be made readily accessible upon request to all members of the university faculty.

5.4 **The Faculty Budget Committee.** The Faculty Budget Committee shall be a standing committee of the university faculty.

5.41 **Membership.** It shall consist of seven members, one member elected by and from the faculty of each college, including the Graduate College; and one member elected by and from the university faculty-at-large; and one member elected by and from the Faculty Welfare Committee.

5.42 **Term of Office.** The Committee shall normally be composed of members serving staggered terms of three years duration, but the terms of not less than two members shall expire each year. The Committee on Committees shall have the power to determine and set the precise terms of the rotation of members.

Option 1 (Faculty)

5.43 **Duties.** The Committee shall have full and easy access to all information - rationales, data, procedures, formats, deadlines, etc. - which is relevant to all phases of the budgetary process. It shall make available such budgetary information to the faculty throughout the year. Prior to the presentation of the annual budget to the Board of Regents, the Committee shall report to the faculty on the university budget, budget priorities, and the procedures by which they are developed, so that the faculty can best discharge its advisory functions. It shall make itself available for consultation with the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Academic Master Plan Committee, the office of University Relations and Development, and college budget committees, and all other agencies or groups concerned with budgetary planning. The Committee may send a representative to all Board of Regents meetings.

Option 2 (Original Draft, Endorsed by the President)
5.43 **Duties.** The committee shall obtain and disseminate such information concerning the university budget, budget priorities, and the procedures by which they are developed as can best enable the faculty to discharge its decision-making and advisory functions.

5.44 **Report.** The Committee shall make recommendations to the Senate, the faculty, and to the President of the University, with report to the Senate and the faculty and subject to their review, such budgetary needs, priorities, and allocations as will in its judgment best implement the educational decisions and policies of the faculty.

5.45 **Information.** The meetings, minutes, correspondence, and documents of the committee shall be made readily accessible to all members of the university faculty.

6. **Other Standing Committees.** The faculty and the Senate may establish such further committees, standing or ad hoc, as they see fit, and delegate to them, subject to review by the university faculty, any of their functions and responsibilities. Except as explicitly provided otherwise, all such committees report to and are answerable to the Senate.

7. **Cooperative Action with Other Agencies.** Nothing in this article precludes service of members of the faculty on committees or other appropriate professional groups established by the university administration or other appropriate agencies, except that no internal agency of university governance not answerable to the university faculty may exercise any of its functions.

**ARTICLE VI: BILL OF FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

1. **Every faculty member has the professional responsibility to obey valid regulations of the university and the Board of Regents.**

2. After an initial probationary period, not to exceed six years, during which time he may be visited and observed in his classroom by his peers and by the appropriate academic and instructional administrators, the faculty member shall either be formally recognized as occupying some academic rank with tenure status or he shall be released from the university, after appropriate notice.

3. **Every faculty member shall accept, and shall attempt conscientiously to perform, a fair share of the work that is directly related to the instructional program.**

4. **Participation in meetings of the department and the faculties of which he is a member, and service in faculty offices and committees, are a regular part of the professional responsibilities of each faculty member.**

5. **The individual faculty member shall be totally free in thought and expression within the limits of the law of the land.**

6. **The faculty recognizes that its major responsibility is the education of the students of the university, while at the same time accepting collateral responsibilities for the pursuit of research and the provision of service.**
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Option 1 (Faculty)

7. Except for special Regents regulations or particular mandates of the Board of Regents, no disciplinary penalty of any sort shall be imposed on any faculty member except for just cause and upon recommendation of his peers and after academic due process. Except for special Regents regulations or particular Regents mandates, only such grounds as have been approved by the faculty or by the University Faculty Senate shall be considered valid.

Option 2 (President)

7. No disciplinary penalty of any sort shall be imposed on any faculty member except for just cause and after academic due process. The grounds for such action will be those approved by the faculty in the preamble to "Procedure for Imposing Discipline upon a Faculty Member." These are: violation of a provision of the Regents' Rules of Conduct, violation of the Statement on Professional Ethics and Responsibility, or violation of established regulations of the university.

Option 1 (Faculty)

8. Except for explicit actions directed to individual faculty members by the Board of Regents, no faculty member shall be judged by administration, students, or peers for the purpose of determining rank, salary, assignment, or other professional perquisites, except on his professional performance.

Option 2 (President)

8. Except for explicit actions directed to individual faculty members by the Board of Regents, no faculty member shall be judged by administration, students, or peers for the purpose of determining rank, salary, assignment, or other professional perquisites, except on his professional performance, as described in the Faculty Statement on Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility.

9. Every faculty member has a right to know, and to be able to consult in writing whenever practicable and feasible, all the official policies and regulations which govern his behavior within the institution, which define his responsibilities and obligations, which affect his prospects and expectations, or which in any way control and confine his professional interests or relations.

10. Every faculty member has the right to be present at, and to observe, any meeting of any agency of the faculty, except for grievance, dismissal, or disciplinary hearings which may be closed at the request of the person charged and except for departmental or other personnel evaluation meetings which may be closed at the option of the evaluation group.

11. Every faculty member has the right to consult with all persons who exercise institutional authority over him, to know the nature and scope of that authority, and to know the forms and processes by means of which that authority is exercised.
12. Within the limits established by duly approved descriptions of courses and programs, the individual faculty member shall accept full professional responsibility for and exercise complete personal freedom in the following matters: Choice of textbooks and materials; class assignments; academic standards; evaluation of student performance. The faculty member's freedom is further limited by the following considerations: (1) If a formal due process procedure should result in a finding in favor of a student petition for redress of a grievance against a faculty member, the judgment arrived at by this process shall prevail; (2) If a formal due process procedure should result in the disciplining, termination, or dismissal of a faculty member in connection with his abuse of the freedom granted above, the judgment arrived at by this process shall prevail.

ARTICLE VII: JOINT DECISION AND ACTION

1. General Principles. Attainment of the educational goals of the university requires a community of involvement and effort. The learning of the students, the teaching and research of the faculty, the supportive services of the staff, and the enabling and coordinating activities of the administration are merged in the pursuit of common academic goals.

1.1 Governance. University governance is the focusing of decision-making authority upon a need or a problem of the university. Governance either results in the establishment of policy or the promulgation of individual decisions that reflect prior policy or precedent. The aim of governance, in the light of the joint decision and action principle, is the utilization of all the university's components in the attempt to realize the common ends of all.

1.2 Appropriate Participation. It is the view of the faculty of the University of Northern Iowa that the university will be governed best when all of its components share in the initiation, the formulation, and the approval of the basic decisions and the basic policy-making of their enterprise. While it is recognized that the first step in the initiation of policy or decision may come from any component of the university, the faculty here affirms its conviction that, insofar as possible and practicable, the final approval, as well as the forms and the persons that shape it, should involve timely consultation and, on appropriate occasions, review, from all those who will be significantly affected by the results of the decision or policy.

1.3 Limitations on Participation. The faculty recognizes that routine, day-to-day decisions, as contrasted to basic policy decisions and key personnel judgments, cannot be encumbered by a lengthy process of internal consultation. Most such decisions, it is admitted, will and should be made without prior consultation and against a background of already accepted institutional policy. The faculty is cognizant of the fact that emergency situations and extra-institutional requirements may, on occasion, impose limits on the full processes of consultation that are ideally the best method of implementing cooperative decision-making. Moreover, the faculty is keenly aware that the necessity of
expedition in decision-making will at times be in conflict with the tedious routines of committee deliberation and the primary demands of scholarship and pedagogy. Nonetheless, in spite of these reservations, the faculty here commits itself to, and commends to its colleagues, the principle of joint decision and action as set forth above and hereafter in this article.

1.4 Faculty Consultation with Other Components. In those areas where the faculty functions as the regular decision-making agency of the university (see Article IV), it hereby resolves to exercise its responsibility in close cooperation with the other, related components of the university, particularly the offices of administration and the students of the university.

2. Joint Governance Agencies. The university faculty and its representative agencies shall have the power to enter into joint agencies of governance with the other, related components (students, administration, staff) of the university.

2.1 Joint Agencies: Powers and Restrictions. Such joint agencies shall have the power to exercise the advisory and the decision-making functions of the faculty in the areas of the faculty's jurisdiction as earlier defined, provided that they maintain the standards of notice, accessibility, reporting, and accountability required of agencies of the faculty by this constitution.

2.2 Joint Agencies: Students. The University Faculty Senate shall have the power to authorize voting student membership in any appropriate representative body of the faculty, including those defined under this constitution.

2.3 Joint Agencies: Accountability and Appeal. Any action of a joint agency of governance, which action involves the decision-making or advisory functions of the faculty, may be appealed to the University Faculty Senate by petition of thirty members of the faculty, delivered to the secretary of the Senate. Only those senators who are members of the faculty may vote on such appeals.

ARTICLE VIII: RATIFICATION, AMENDMENT, AND REVIEW

1. Ratification. This constitution shall become the official Constitution of the university faculty of the University of Northern Iowa effective two weeks from the date of its adoption by majority vote of a regular or special faculty meeting, notice of which shall have been given at least one week in advance to the university faculty.

2. Amendment of the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty. The Faculty Manual, by-laws and other standing rules and resolutions of the faculty already adopted or which may be adopted under this constitution may be amended, revised, or repealed by majority vote at a regular or special meeting of the faculty, notice of which, including a statement of the proposed amendment, revision, or repeal, shall have been given at least one week in advance.
3. Amendment of this Constitution. This constitution may be amended, revised, or repealed by a two-thirds vote at a regular or special meeting of the faculty, notice of which, including a statement of the proposed amendment, revision, or repeal, shall have been given at least one week in advance.

4. Approval of the Board of Regents. After ratification of this constitution by the faculty of the university, it shall be subject to approval by the Board of Regents. Amendments to this constitution, by-laws adopted under it, and amendments to such by-laws shall also be subject to Board approval, when, in the judgment of the President of the university or the Regents, such approval is required or desirable.

5. Interpretation and Construction. In case of any actual or apparent conflicts of construction or interpretation between this constitution and the current Faculty Manual and/or other officially adopted standing rules and resolutions of the university faculty, the contested issues shall be resolved in favor of this constitution. If the adjudication of a contested issue is resolved in such a way as to alter a section of the Faculty Manual or other officially adopted standing rule or regulation of the faculty which has previously received Board approval, then that alteration shall be subject to approval by the Board of Regents.

6. Constitutional Review. Challenges directed to the provisions of this constitution may be made in the following two circumstances: (1) A person may be uncertain or in doubt about the meaning, construction, definition and/or application of some provision(s) of this constitution, and (2) A person may allege that the action, policy, or utterance of some component of the university, or of some person holding membership in some component of the university, has violated some provision(s) of this constitution. Review and decision shall be afforded in each of these two instances as follows:

6.1 Interpretation and Contest. In case of a misunderstanding and/or a contested interpretation of the provisions of this constitution, the interested party may present his case in writing for adjudication and decision by the University Faculty Senate and the Senate shall decide the matter by a majority vote.

6.2 Violation. In case of an alleged violation of one of the provisions of this constitution, the complainant party may present his case in writing, appropriately documented, to the University Faculty Senate for adjudication, and, after due deliberation and/or investigation, the Senate shall decide the matter by majority vote.

7. Appeal and Final Disposition. If the interested or the complainant party referred to, above, in 6.1 and 6.2 respectively, should, after completion of adjudication and decision by the Senate, remain dissatisfied, he may request the chairman of the faculty to enter his contest or complaint, as heretofore separately defined, on the agenda of the next regular or special meeting of the faculty and the chairman shall enter the petition on the agenda. The issue shall then be resolved by majority vote of the faculty; the action of the faculty shall be considered final.

8. Review of Faculty Decision in Jurisdictional Disputes. In case of a contested interpretation or an alleged violation of this constitution, as defined above, that is alleged to involve concurrent jurisdictions claimed by other components of the university, as, for example, the administration, the students, or the staff, the decision of the faculty body may be reviewed by the Administrative Council.
by the UNI Student Association, by the Committee on the Administration of Clerical Personnel, by the Physical Plant Committee, or by more than one of these bodies, as appropriate. The review(s) shall decide the issues by majority vote of each appropriate body or bodies. If the review bodies decide the issues compatibly with the faculty body's determination of the same issues, and if the interested or the complainant party is satisfied, then the issues shall be considered settled. But if the interested or the complainant party is still dissatisfied or if one or more of the review bodies adopt findings incompatible with the faculty body's determination, then the issues may be submitted for adjudication and decision to an ad hoc Judiciary Committee composed of two members elected by and from the University Faculty Senate and two members elected by and from each reviewing body previously engaged in the adjudication of the issues. The ad hoc Judiciary Committee shall elect its own chairman and promptly decide the issues before it by majority vote. Unless the chairman of the ad hoc Judiciary Committee reports a tie-vote and/or unless the interested or the complainant party is still dissatisfied, the issues shall be considered settled. In the two former instances, the record of the deliberations to this point shall be submitted to the President of the university for decision. The President's decision shall normally be final, except that the interested or the complainant party may, subject to Board policies and regulations, appeal the matter to the Board of Regents for final resolution.

The following written statements represented the reactions of the Administrative Council of the University of Northern Iowa to the proposed constitution:

**General Objectives of the Constitution**

The purpose of the Constitution is to define the roles and responsibilities of the faculty in achieving the educational objectives of the University, and further, to specify the mechanisms by which effective faculty participation will be achieved. These are proper objectives.

**Structure of the Constitution**

The Constitution has evolved as a single document which speaks not only to broad principles, but to circumscribed procedural matters as well. A division of the present content into a Constitution and a set of Bylaws would have provided a needed workable differentiation between principle and procedure and between relatively enduring structures and more labile mechanisms.

The Constitution does not effect an economy of words.
The "Spirit" of the Constitution

The tenor of the Constitution is one which emphasizes a bifurcation between faculty and administration. We find that: (1) The Constitution makes provision for faculty participation in the selection of administrators, but not for participation in the selection of other faculty. (2) No administrators sit as ex officio non-voting members of the Senate. (3) Administrators who hold academic rank are accorded full faculty privilege only in terms when they teach.

Specific Points of Concern

Instructional and Non-Instructional Faculty (pp. 3-6, 13-19)

A distinction is drawn between Instructional Faculty and Non-instructional Faculty. This differentiation has engendered critical comment on several bases. It excludes from total privilege faculty members on full-time research appointments, deans of colleges not currently teaching, and other non-teaching faculty and administrators even though they may have academic rank and/or hold original appointments granting the entitlements of full faculty status. For contrast rather than criticism, it may be noted that full privilege is accorded a part-time temporary, visiting instructor hired for a single semester. The distinction between Instructional and Non-instructional Faculty is also questioned on the bases of its divisive consequences, its utility, and the labored structure it produces in the Constitution.

The Faculty Budget Committee (p. 27, Article V, Section 5.43)

The provinces and responsibilities proposed for the Faculty Budget Committee constitute, in their totality, a mandate which is neither workable nor in the best interests of the University.

Definition of a Quorum (p. 12, Article III, Sec. 9.5)

Definition of quorum as the faculty members present at a regular meeting announced a week in advance is objectionable.

Jurisdiction and Powers (pp. 13-19, Article IV)

The general principles, as set forth and elaborated, are insufficient for a clear distinction between personnel policies on the one hand, and decisions regarding individual faculty members, on the other.

Specification of the faculty as the "regular decision-making agency of the university" for matters related to the "professional standards,
working conditions, and welfare of the faculty" does not acknowledge
an important concurrent administrative responsibility, especially
in the areas of decisions on tenure, salary, and promotion.

The need for and wisdom of requiring extensive faculty participation
in the nomination and review of persons in "assistant" positions is
questionable, especially when the positions carry staff as opposed
to line responsibilities.

A provision which, pro forma, obliges the President to carry to the
Board of Regents any faculty action twice disapproved does not
provide sufficient discretion with respect to matters appropriate
for consideration by the Regents.

Matters of Ambiguity and Language

Constitutional language of necessity lacks precision. There are,
nonetheless, sections and provisions of the Constitution which must
be noted for ambiguity or a less than ideal cast of language.

Article I, Sect. 1.2, p. 3. The definition of "The noninstructional
Faculty" will be difficult to interpret and apply.

Article IV, Sect. 3.2, p. 14. The statement on concurrent jurisdiction
is ambiguous.

Article VI, Sect. 7, p. 29. There is need for a better definition
and modification of the phrase "... no disciplinary penalty of
any sort ... ."

Article VI, Sect. 12, p. 30. While the intent of vesting primary
responsibility in the faculty member for the items enumerated in
this section is appropriate, the phrase "complete personal freedom"
carries the sense that a faculty member may completely disregard
collective wisdom.

Tenure Period (Article VI, Sect. 2, p. 29)

It seems more appropriate that specification of a probationary period,
and related considerations on tenure, should be developed outside
the constitutional framework.
The following excerpts represent opinions of University of Northern Iowa University Faculty:

"The purpose of this survey was to provide the Chairman of the Faculty and the President of the University of Northern Iowa with information regarding the 'general attitude of most faculty' toward a newly-adopted Constitution of the Faculty.

"In order to accomplish the above objective, a single page, five item questionnaire was constructed. The questionnaire was mailed to 584 members of the faculty on February 8, 1973.

"Approximately seventy-six percent of the faculty responded to the survey. Specifically, 391 (67.0%) who returned their questionnaires and fifty (8.6%) who returned name cards or follow-up letters indicating that they did not wish to participate in the study.

"The majority (66.5%) of those faculty participating in the survey indicated that they favored or strongly favored the newly-adopted Constitution."

Limitations of the Study

"As the reader will note (see Questionnaire, Appendix I), the research instrument asked 'Which of the following statements best reflects your overall opinion of the newly-adopted Constitution of the Faculty?' This question assumes that the survey population had (1) read the Constitution, and (2) formulated an opinion toward the Constitution. Both assumptions were considered and discussed by the staff of the Social Research Center prior to the execution of the study. It was the opinion of the Center that the survey population would (1) have read the Constitution before completing and returning the questionnaire, or (2) have indicated that they neither favored nor disfavored the Constitution because they had not studied the document, or (3) not returned the questionnaire because of (a) lack of knowledge about the Constitution, or (b) lack of interest. It is the opinion of the Center that most of the respondents who participated in this survey were generally knowledgeable of the Constitution of the Faculty at the time they participated in the study, yet the reader is cautioned that the findings here presented may, to a certain degree, reflect an 'uneducated opinion' by some respondents toward the Constitution of the Faculty."
The following written review of the constitution was presented by the University of Northern Iowa Student Association:

The purpose of a university is to provide educational opportunity for students. Students are in effect consumers of a product. All matters influencing that product have an effect upon students. While a student's academic life, that is the period of time that he attends an educational institution is relatively short, this product continues to influence him the rest of his life. Therefore, any matter affecting the education of students will have an effect upon his life. It is because the constitution of the faculty does have an effect upon the product of education that students have the legitimate right as consumers to review and comment upon this constitution.

The university is a very complex structure and it is composed of many distinct groups. All of these groups should work in harmony to achieve the end result, the education of students. The constitution of the faculty of U.N.I, while it might have legitimately intended to merely unify and define its own group has failed at this attempt, perhaps through no initial intention, but this constitution does not provide for harmonious working relations between the different components of the university. In its attempt to establish a uniform body with its own governance, the faculty has over-extended itself.

The attempt and reason behind the constitution is admirable and correct, but the end result was not a product that set forth consistent basic principles in regard to the faculty. The result is a lengthy, wordy, ambiguous, contradictory document. It apparently began as an attempt at defining principles not only of the faculty but of the university as a whole. The constitution has a tendency to be vague and undefined in many of its statements. The faculty in its attempt to set up its own constitution has in effect ended up drafting a university constitution.

The Student Association definitely agrees with the constitution in its preamble that, "a university's students are its very reason for being and that the different components should work harmoniously." The Student Association does object however to the faculty's attempt to define its relations to the other components of the university. There is an understanding by the Student Association of the need for some definition of the relations of the components of the university, but it does object to one of those components defining those relations. This cannot be objectively done by one of the components. There is a need for this definition.

The constitution in many parts contains material that is primarily of inter-faculty concern, however, these articles do often point out the inadequacy of the constitution. Many of the articles such as Article I in its definition of faculty is exceeding what a constitution should do. Many of these articles and a great deal of the sections contain material that should be contained not in the constitution but in by-laws.
Article III on meetings contains some questionable material. In section 1 the constitution refers to the required meetings of the faculty and then in section 7 it speaks of the regular meetings of the faculty. Section 1 gives the impression that the faculty does rely upon its Faculty Senate for governance, but section 7 is the one which points up one of the main problems of the faculty. This is the fact that it is the general faculty which is the true governing body. The Faculty Senate's action exists only as long as the general faculty allow. General faculty meetings are not the place for the legislation of policy since many disinterested faculty members permit a small group to act out its own self interest. The responsibility for its governance should reside in its senate. The fact that it is the general faculty which has the authority is compounded by the fact that the constitution provides for such an easy method for matters to be brought before the general faculty meetings. This also is compounded by the fact that there is no quorum required. This section, 9.5, goes beyond being objectionable, it is ridiculous. All of these statements contained in the constitution point out the inconsistencies within this constitution.

It is felt that Article IV on the Jurisdiction and Powers is the article that most affects the students. The article begins by stating in section 1 that the faculty as one of the components within the university has the right to participate in the determination of policy? Does each component have equal weight in this determination, or is it the case where on paper all the components are equal, but in actuality some are a little bit more equal than others?

The faculty by declaring itself as the greatest authority in curriculum and educational policy and the regular decision making agency over those matters tends to ignore the students role. This is also contradictory to section 1 of Article IV which said that the components had a right to participate jointly in the determination of policy. Students as consumers and the ones who will be affected the most by such action are ignored. Perhaps this could be cleared up by a clearer definition of regular.

The first phrase in section 3.2 Article IV is not even a sentence. This is of course being picky, but it does illustrate many faults of the constitution.

The is also a need for a more distinct definition of what is meant by concurrent jurisdiction in 3.2. Does this mean that a common interest? Does it mean for example that in order for policy to take effect where it concerns more than one component that the policy must be approved by each component that is affected? Theoretically students would have the greatest jurisdiction because they are affected by the most policies at the university. Article VII, section 1.2 speaks of the appropriate participation, and does not speak of concurrent powers but of only consultation.

These are the main points which the Student Association questions within the faculty constitution. The faculty should not be entirely accused of going beyond their jurisdiction within this constitution. This constitution is just more evidence of the need for a clearer definition of the components and their relations from the university as a whole not from just the faculty's viewpoint.

The students today are adults and as such do have an interest in what is going to affect their lives. Any educational policies at an institution will definitely affect a students academic life, but it will also have a great influence upon his life once he is out of college. Therefore, there must be guaranteed student input of equal magnitude to other input in the determination of educational policies. It is because the faculty constitution does not allow this equal input and to protect the rights of students that many statements within this constitution are not only questionable in their meaning, but are objectionable to our interpretation.
Additional written material from other individuals was also considered by the board.

Mr. Poage stated he did not believe the faculty was opposed to president's options. Mr. Stewart, UNI Student Association, stated he felt the faculty is stepping beyond its jurisdiction in the proposed document in defining faculty relationship to other constituents such as the Board of Regents. He stated the Board of Regents only has the initial acceptance of this and the students and the administrators have only the opportunity to comment. He stated in many instances action taken by the Faculty Senate is then brought up before the general faculty meetings and felt this was poor government.

He stated the UNI Student Association believes what is needed is more of a university constitution which tries to define specifically the relationship of the different components of the university. He stated that in areas of concurrent jurisdiction, where matters concern students, such jurisdiction must be accepted by both students and faculty before it goes into effect. He requested the board to return the document to campus for further consideration.

Mr. Poage, UNI, stated that the constitution states the faculty as being the regular decision making body and does not refer to it as the only decision making body. He stated that in the history of UNI they have had a long tradition of inviting students to all committee meetings but faculty is not invited to sit in on student committee meetings. He stated "it should go both ways".

Mr. Jones, UNI, responded to Mr. Stewart that the Faculty Senate, even
though it is elected by the faculty, is not always representative of the faculty opinion and therefore occasionally items are brought before the general faculty. Mr. Jones said the faculty, in writing this constitution, were just trying to codify existing practices.

Mr. Hansmeier stated the university faculty should have a voice in university affairs as well as the students. He added administrators "need a little authority" if they are to fulfill their responsibilities. He also stated, "I submitted a minority report because primarily students are getting short-changed in this constitution. This doesn't mean that the students have been short-changed at UNI. We have got good faculty leadership and the students have had a good chance to participate but that right is not provided for in this constitution. If the faculty leaders were to change in a different direction I think this constitution could result in a substantial erosion of student participation." He also added he thought this is a faculty power statement, which is fine, but commented the students also need to be defined.

Mr. Maas concurred with Mr. Hansmeier and stated that faculty members are permitted to student meetings but do not show enough interest to attend the student meetings, in response to a statement made earlier by Mr. Poage.

Mr. Maas also stated that if this was just a faculty constitution the students would not be concerned; but, this appears to be more of a university constitution governing more than just the faculty. Mr. Poage commented that it might have been better to call the constitution a procedural guide.
Mr. Thompson stated that most of the faculty powers listed in the constitution specifically including those with respect to curriculum are already found in the faculty manual. He added that this document does not attempt to gain new powers for the faculty or infringe on already institutional decisions. He explained it simply codifies existing practices.

Mr. Hansmeier stated he has as much respect for tradition as anybody but said he didn't think we should "quickly rush to put all of our traditions into concrete".

Regent Perrin stated he felt the board should receive this constitution with commendation to the faculty for their work in setting forth an outline of faculty role but was not in favor of making the constitution the rules and regulations of the university. He added the only reason for board action is to give it force of board authority and that action would step on someone.

Regent Bailey commented he felt the students should be commended for their interest. He stated that if this document were adopted by the board, it would have considerable effect on the other two universities. He commented that it would place the faculty of the University of Northern Iowa in the dominant decision-making position with reference to matters that very possibly would affect the curriculums of the other two universities. Regent Bailey also stated he felt the faculty of the University of Northern Iowa has the right to have this as their statement of position, statement of goals, etc., but for us to approve and adopt this would be completely another matter. He stated it would in effect put us in a position of having the faculty of the University of Northern Iowa provide the governance of the
university. He stated he felt the faculty might adopt the proposed constitution but it is certainly not something the board should also adopt as its guidelines and rules of action.

President Boyd expressed his disagreement with Regent Bailey by saying he didn't feel the constitution would have any implications for the University of Iowa. He stated the matter of governance is vested in the board by clear statutory language.

President Kamerick stated there are a number of different types of committees at the University of Northern Iowa and representation of the various components is established through committee work. Mixed committees would not fall under the jurisdiction of this faculty constitution. In that sense an area of governance is left out of consideration here although there are some possible limitations on the action of those committees. Most of those committees report either directly to the president or to some other administrator. He also added the faculty has been operating under this constitution since October 1972. That is an internal arrangement. President Kamerick stated he insisted this constitution come before the Regents because it touches the Regents' power and touches the power of the administration. Many of the changes that have been made in the constitution were made because "I insisted that it be brought to the Regents," he stated. President Kamerick went on to say he strongly urged the board either to vote this constitution up or down and stressed he was very opposed to the Regents simply receiving it. He stated it is very important the board, if it receives, tell him what exactly it is receiving; otherwise, the administration and the students and the faculty are left in an intolerable position.
"We have to know which version is to be accepted because the limitations contained in sections 4, 7 and 8 are limitations that can't be ignored," he added.

Regent Wallace stressed to UNI that they are trying to hold onto tradition but yet pull away from it. He stated that somewhere along the line they have to make the decision of which way they want to turn - either a teacher's college or a viable university.

Regent Baldridge stated he felt the constitution is a great effort on the part of the faculty. He stated that through custom the administration has granted the faculty complete authority over curriculum and any attempt to withdraw power is usually very upsetting. He added that he would have great reservations about accepting this constitution. He said most of these reservations remained unchanged since last fall.

Regent Shaw commented he would like to accept the constitution as previously mentioned with modification. If we were simply to put this on file and send it back it should be sent back at least with the option for the faculty to draw back to things that are clearly faculty matters, he stated. He went on to say we're not asserting any rights or any powers. The document as now written does assert some powers that are not clearly for the time being vested where the document assumes they are vested and to the degree. As that assertion is going to be made we have the question of whether we want to draw all this out. If the faculty doesn't deal with educational matters as a faculty, it permits others to come and do it. He emphasized the faculty should do it.
Regent Collison stated she felt a process needs to be incorporated in this constitution that is more expressive of students.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved the board insert Option 2 in each case and where there are not two options, insert the suggested recommendations by President Kamerick in his letter to the Board of Regents. The motion was seconded by Mr. Baldridge.

President Redeker commented the board seemed to be willing to change the constitution but unwilling to approve it. He stated he would be willing to accept the constitution since we have approved a faculty constitution on another campus at an earlier date.

Regent Zumbach pointed out he is very much in favor of the university concept in governance and stated he will not be able to give approval as proposed. He recommended that this particular constitution be turned down and also recommended the university give thought to the university governance concept.

Regent Petersen stated "we cannot impose a kind of government from the top."

Regent Zumbach added that unless all powers are defined we cannot start allocating specific powers to one particular group of people. He also stated we are not fully aware of what we may be doing to the other constituents on the University of Northern Iowa campus.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the board recognize the submission to the Board of Regents by the faculty of the University of Northern Iowa of the constitution of the faculty as amended by the suggestions of the president and further recognize the same as amended, as the constitution of the faculty, commending them not only
for their extended efforts but also for their continuing interest in the well-being of the university but without adopting the same as the act or will of the board. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion.

Regent Collison stated that she could see the intent of the proposed motion but could not support it for fear that it could be misinterpreted. Discussion followed in which all parties expressed views as to the meaning of the motion and also whether this motion would resolve the matter.

VOTE ON MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE: The motion failed with Collison, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach voting nay.

AMENDMENT TO PETERSEN MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved to add to her motion "and that the constitution be approved". Mrs. Collison seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Regent Perrin stated that this was setting up the faculty as the complete and only person in running the university and disapproved of this.

VOTE ON PETERSEN MOTION AS AMENDED: The motion failed with Petersen voting aye and the remaining eight members voting nay.

Mr. Martin asked the board to consider approval of the constitution on a provisional basis or for a set period of time such as a year and deleting from such action those sections of the constitution which deal with joint governance responsibilities such as language contained in Sections 7 and 8 of Article 8.
MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board approve the constitution for one year with the proposed amendments and presidential changes and deletion of Section 7 and Section 8 of Article 8 and the university be permitted to review this matter and return with recommended revisions. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion.

President Kamerick commented he felt the provisional year would be quite all right but any revisions of the constitution would take into account the interests and needs of the student.

AMENDMENT TO WALLACE MOTION: Mr. Zumbach moved the board direct the university in the deliberations of the faculty in developing the constitution during this coming year that the concerns and interest of the students and administrators be taken into account in development of the said constitution. Mrs. Petersen seconded the amendment and it passed unanimously.

VOTE ON WALLACE MOTION AS AMENDED:

On roll call, the following voted:
AYE: Petersen, Wallace, Redeker.
NAY: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Shaw, Zumbach.
ABSENT: None.
The motion failed.

Mr. Poage advised the board that the faculty could work out this constitution. He expressed his thanks to the board for all the time allowed for the faculty.
The following business pertaining to the Iowa School for the Deaf was transacted on Thursday, June 28, 1973.

AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR GIRLS' DORMITORY ADDITION - PHASE II. The Board was requested to 1) approve the project, project budget, and authorize the issuance of change orders totaling $288,499 to carry out construction of Phase II, Girls' Dormitory Addition and 2) allocate $315,000 of 65th G.A. capital appropriations to ISD for Girls' Dormitory Addition - Phase II.

The board office reported that at the November 1972 board meeting contracts were awarded for construction of Phase I, Girls' Dormitory Addition. This phase provided for construction of a basement floor consisting of twelve 2-student dorm rooms. Also under this phase, construction was initiated on the ground floor. At the same time bids were taken for Phase II. Bidder agreed that in the event he was awarded a contract for Phase I, his bid for Phase II and all alternate proposals would be valid until July 2, 1973, and could not be withdrawn before that date. Purpose for this being that when the 1973 legislature funded Phase II, construction could continue through to total project completion. Phase II, under consideration at this time, consists of construction of a first and second floor with twelve 2-student dorm rooms on each floor. Completion of the ground floor with a recreation room, completion of the lounge in the basement, construction of a connecting lounge to the existing dormitory, carpeting and draperies for the entire addition, doors on the rooms for the entire addition.

The students living at the school have suffered from over-crowding for a number of years. The present girls' dorm is occupied over-capacity by
about 25 students. Rooms designed for two students are occupied by three or four students. In addition, some 40 girls are housed in the Main Building. This arrangement takes space needed to house boys.

If this addition can be completed, the school will gain 36 2-student rooms. Overcrowding for the foreseeable future will be eliminated. The situation for the school will be comfortable but not spacious.

It should be noted that this project was approved as the top priority in the askings for direct appropriations to this session of the legislature. Further, the completion of this project by Phase II is still urgently needed. Failure to complete at this time will 1) leave a very incomplete structure, both physically and aesthetically and 2) cause loss of the option to take advantage of an excellent set of bids and cause substantial increase in eventual completion costs.

Revised Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Construction</td>
<td>$197,216</td>
<td>$222,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Construction</td>
<td>50,569</td>
<td>44,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Construction</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>21,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Soil Borings &amp; Survey</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects Fees (8%)</td>
<td>20,822</td>
<td>23,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>3,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$287,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$315,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64th G.A. Capital*</td>
<td>$277,000</td>
<td>$277,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Sale Fund (ISD)</td>
<td>5,390</td>
<td>5,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Funds (ISD)</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th G.A. Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$287,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$315,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $30,000 reallocated.
The architect for the project and this Office have agreed that Phase II construction can be initiated upon completion of a change order by each of the three contractors. The change order for each contractor would contain the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butler Construction Co., Omaha</td>
<td>Accept Base Bid &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>$222,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept Alternate No. 3-A</td>
<td>+ $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Doors and frames for student rooms on basement floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept Alternate No. 2-B</td>
<td>+ $13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Draperies and carpets for entire building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept Alternate No. 3-B</td>
<td>+ $3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Doors and frames for student rooms on 1st &amp; 2nd Floors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change desk tops in dorm rooms on 1st &amp; 2nd Floors</td>
<td>+ $570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from wood to formica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings through being able to eliminate roof over Phase I</td>
<td>+ $7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend completion date to February 14, 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Plumbing &amp; Heating,</td>
<td>Accept Base Bid &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>$44,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Bluffs - Mechanical</td>
<td>Changes in sanitary sewer &amp; storm sewer</td>
<td>+ $44,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings through being able to eliminate roof over Phase I</td>
<td>+ $1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hack Electric Co., Council</td>
<td>Accept Base Bid &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>$21,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffs - Electrical</td>
<td>Savings through being able to eliminate roof over Phase I</td>
<td>+ $21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regent Baldridge queried ISD personnel whether there would be any problems in constructing Phase II while Phase I was still under construction. He was assured no problems are foreseen; in fact, elimination of need for a temporary roof over Phase I will save $8,600.

MOTION: Mr. Perrin moved the Board 1) approve the project, revised project budget, and authorize issuance of change orders totaling $288,449 to carry out construction of Phase II, Girls' Dormitory Addition, and 2) allocate $315,000 of 65th G.A. capital appropriations to ISD for Girls' Dormitory Addition - Phase II. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.
The following business pertaining to the Iowa School for the Deaf was transacted on Saturday, June 30, 1973.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of May 1973 were ratified.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. There were no items on the May Register.

APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY-TREASURER. The Board was requested to approve the re-election of C. E. Geasland as Secretary and Treasurer of the Iowa School for the Deaf for the year beginning July 1, 1973.

MOTION: Mr. Perrin moved the board approve the re-election of C. E. Geasland as Secretary and Treasurer of the Iowa School for the Deaf for the year beginning July 1, 1973, with the understanding that reports to the board will be made through the superintendent of the Iowa School for the Deaf and that the treasurer's bond in the amount of $50,000.00 will be purchased from the lowest possible bidder. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion, and in absence of objection President Redeker declared the motion approved.

SALE OF LAND. The board was requested to declare a parcel of land consisting of 2.181 acres, plus or minus, at the Iowa School for the Deaf to be of no further educational value to the school and direct that procedures be initiated to sell this parcel. In October 1970 the board declared two parcels of land at ISD to be of no further educational value to the school. Parcel A consisted of 2.15 acres forming the SW quadrangle formed by the intersection
of State Highway 375 and State Highway 92. Parcel B consisted of 10.03 acres forming the NW quadrangle formed by the intersection of State Highway 375 and State Highway 92. Bidding procedures were initiated for the sale of these two parcels. No bids were received. Negotiations for Parcel A were held in abeyance while Parcel B was eventually sold to the Evangel Temple Assembly of God Church for $35,100. Interest has been expressed within the last 30 days by at least two parties for Parcel A. The parcel now has been surveyed, thus the 2.181 acres figure. The action recommended above would lead to a bid date for submission of sealed bids on Wednesday, July 18, at Iowa School for the Deaf.

MOTION: Mr. Wallace moved the board declare the above-mentioned parcel of land consisting of 2.181 acres, plus or minus, at the Iowa School for the Deaf to be of no further educational value to the school and direct that procedures be initiated to sell this parcel. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion. On roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: None.
The motion carried.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET. The material pertaining to the preliminary budget for ISD for 1973-74 is contained in the general section of these minutes.
IOWA BRAILLE AND SIGHT SAVING SCHOOL

The following business pertaining to the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School was transacted on Saturday, June 30, 1973.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of May 1973 were ratified.

APPOINTMENT OF M. D. BERRY AS SECRETARY-TREASURER. The board was requested to approve the appointment of M. D. Berry as Secretary-Treasurer of the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School for 1973-74.

MOTION: Mrs. Petersen moved to approve the appointment of M. D. Berry as Secretary-Treasurer of the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School for 1973-74. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perrin and passed unanimously.

EUDORA F. McGRERO FUND. The board was requested to ask the Attorney General's Office to act as legal counsel in seeking to amend the Eudora F. McGregor Trust Fund. The Board Office noted that the board has been interested for some time in broadening the provisions contained in the McGregor Trust Fund in order that it might be beneficial to more students. Conversations with the Attorney General's Office indicate that that office will furnish counsel for this purpose.

MOTION: Mr. Perrin moved to seek the assistance of the Attorney General's Office as legal counsel in seeking to amend the Eudora F. McGregor Trust Fund. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. The board was requested to ratify the authority granted by the Executive Secretary on June 14, 1973, to employ an architect to draw up bid specifications for the re-roofing of the Children's Cottage.
Mr. Berry, Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School, reported that on June 14, 1973, the Executive Secretary approved employment of the firm of Brown-Healey-Bock to draw up bid specifications so that the reroofing of the Children's Cottage could proceed. Formal bidding appeared to be necessary because the project probably would exceed $5,000.00. Mr. Berry stated that a public hearing was held on this project June 26. Seven sets of specifications were issued and one bid was received which was rejected because a compliance statement on equal opportunity was not filed with the bid and for failure to enclose 5% bid security.

Regent Baldridge questioned the condition of the school's roof for this fall and Mr. Berry stated that it "will do".

**MOTION:** Mr. Wallace moved the board ratify the authority granted by Mr. Richey on June 14, 1973, to employ the firm of Brown-Healey-Bock to draw up specifications for the reroofing of the Children's Cottage. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Mr. Wallace moved the board reject the single bid received for the reroofing of the Children's Cottage for reason of failure to enclose 5% bid security and because a compliance statement on equal opportunity was not filed with the bid. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Regent Shaw stated that consistency of policy on bid specifications and irregularities is most important. Executive Secretary Richey requested that any projects utilizing RR&A funding, even though construction is through use of force labor, be set up as a project requiring Board approval. He specifically mentioned a project on kitchen repairs to the superintendent's
Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School reported:

At one time IBSSS owned Lots four (4) and five (5) Block nine (9), Griffins Addition to the City of Vinton. During the period of 1959-60, The Iowa State Highway Commission constructed what is now Highway No. 218 and acquired the major portion of the above described property by a resolution for transfer of jurisdiction and control which is recorded in the Regents minutes of September 8-9, 1960, pages 92 and 93.

This resolution and transfer was approved by the Executive Council of Iowa on September 19, 1960 as is noted in the Regents minutes of October 13-14, 1960, page 140. Due to this action, it now appears that IBSSS has remaining a strip of land approximately 18 feet by 264 feet.

The 1973 Street Improvement Program for the City of Vinton requires the acquisition of a piece of the remaining property measuring approximately 18 feet by 50 feet. They have acquired all other property necessary for completion of the street. The City Council, through their engineer, John L. Franklin, Howard R. Green Company, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, is now asking to purchase or acquire the IBSSS property.
There would be several methods to determine the value of the land and for what it is worth, Mr. Franklin has revealed that the City Council has waived the paving assessment in exchange for the land adjacent to IBSSS property. By this method the City acquired street right-of-way measuring 50 feet by 264 feet for the total amount of $2,784.00, or approximately $10.55 per frontal foot. On this basis, our property would be valued at $190.00. Mr. Franklin indicated that the City Council would waive the paving assessment in exchange for the IBSSS property.

The Administration at Iowa Braille has determined that the land in question is no longer needed for the improvement or maintenance of the school since it is located one city block from any other land used by the school. We further feel it would be good public relations to meet the request of the City of Vinton. It also appears that this would be the logical time to dispose of the balance of this tract of land so that future problems will be avoided.

Vinton City Attorney Bennet M. Fischer has been contacted and he will provide the legal documents necessary to complete the first transaction recommended above.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board of Regents declare a strip of land 18'x50' of no further educational value and enter into an agreement with the City of Vinton and sell to the city this strip of land, consideration to be waiver by the city of the paving assessment against the state for the land involved and, further, that the board declare the remaining parcel of land, approximately 18'x214', in Lots 4 and 5, Block 9, Griffins Addition, to be of no further educational benefit to the school at this time but that actual offering of the land for sale be held in abeyance until a later date. Mr. Shaw seconded the motion. On roll call, the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldridge, Collison, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, Zumbach, Redeker.

NAY: None.
The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. Saturday, June 30, 1973.

R. Wayne Richey, Executive Secretary