

The State Board of Regents met at the Iowa School for the Deaf, Council Bluffs, Iowa, on October 19 - 20, 1972. Those present were:

	<u>October 19</u>	<u>October 20</u>
Members of the State Board of Regents:		
Mr. Redeker, President	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mr. Bailey	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mr. Baldrige	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mrs. Collison	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mr. McCartney	Arr. 11:45 a.m.	All Sessions
Mr. Perrin	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mrs. Petersen	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mr. Shaw	All Sessions	Excused
Mr. Wallace	Arr. 1:30 p.m.	All Sessions
Office of State Board of Regents:		
Executive Secretary Richey	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mr. Coffman	All Sessions	All Sessions
Mr. McMurray	All Sessions	All Sessions
Sharon Sass, Secretary	All Sessions	All Sessions
University of Iowa:		
President Boyd	Excused	Excused
Vice Provost Hardin	All Sessions	Exc. 3:00 p.m.
Director Hawkins	All Sessions	Exc. 3:00 p.m.
Provost Heffner	All Sessions	Exc. 3:00 p.m.
Vice President Jolliffe	All Sessions	Exc. 3:00 p.m.
Director Strayer	All Sessions	Exc. 3:00 p.m.
Iowa State University:		
President Parks	All Sessions	Exc. 3:40 p.m.
Vice President Christensen	All Sessions	Exc. 1:00 p.m.
Vice President Hamilton	All Sessions	Exc. 3:40 p.m.
Vice President Moore	All Sessions	Exc. 3:40 p.m.
University of Northern Iowa:		
President Kamerick	All Sessions	Exc. 3:30 p.m.
Business Manager Jennings	All Sessions	Exc. 3:30 p.m.
Provost Martin	All Sessions	Exc. 3:30 p.m.
Director Kelly	All Sessions	Exc. 3:30 p.m.
Iowa School for the Deaf:		
Superintendent Giangreco	All Sessions	All Sessions
Business Manager Geasland	All Sessions	All Sessions
Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School:		
Superintendent Woodcock	All Sessions	Exc. 3:10 p.m.
Business Manager Berry	Excused	Excused

GENERAL

President Redeker called the meeting of the State Board of Regents to order at 9:20 a.m., Thursday, October 19, 1972. The following business pertaining to General or Miscellaneous items was transacted on Thursday, October 19, 1972.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES. The minutes of the September 14-15, 1972, meeting of the Board of Regents were approved, as corrected.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL COORDINATION. The Committee had no report at this time.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON AREA SCHOOLS. At the July meeting, members of the Board of Regents indicated their desire for additional information concerning the Area Community Colleges and Vocational Schools. They were interested, particularly, in those seven institutions that had been examined in 1971 by teams composed of staff members from the State Department of Public Instruction and the three universities under the Board of Regents. Mr. Daryl Pendergraft, Chairman of the Regents' Committee on Educational Relations wrote the report which is on file at the Board Office.

Several Board Members stated that there was a need for standardization among the Area School Campuses concerning accreditation. A Board Member pointed out that the Office of Planning and Programming is funding a study in this area of licensing and standardization.

A Board Member asked if there was difficulty in transferring credits from Area Schools who have achieved accreditation to one of the Regents universities. President Kamerick predicted dramatic changes in this direction. The credits will be transferred, but the question of whether they will fit into the institution's program for a specific area of study is not certain.

Mr. Christensen stated that members of the Regents institutions do go to Area

Schools and advise students. A Board Member stated that these staff members from the Regents institutions are doing an excellent job in counseling and advising these area school students.

A Board Member stated that the Boards' responsibility should be to see that Area Schools have quality programs. These programs should not be uniform with the institutions' programs, because all Area School students will not transfer to the Regents universities.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved that the Board request the Educational Relations Committee to prepare this report for the Board on a biennial basis. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

REPORT ON MEETING OF ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS, OCTOBER 12-13, 1972.

Mrs. Collison and Mr. Bailey reported on this meeting. Mrs. Collison reported that there was much more participation at this meeting. She reported discussion dealing with the emotional level of students as a matter of university responsibility similar to academic education. The students that were present at the meeting were free to join in discussions. Complete copies of the speeches made at the meeting are sent to all Board members.

Mr. Bailey outlined several speeches that were made at the meeting. Some points that he brought to the Board's attention were: Trustees should be more concerned with academic procedures; duplication between high school and the first year of college should be avoided; faculty workload studies must be done; diversity of courses should be a goal of each university, and the area in which it is the strongest should be emphasized; reform within has to come to the universities in a managerial way.

Mr. Heffner reported that the Carnegie Commission met two weeks ago on the University of Iowa campus in closed sessions. Mr. Heffner and Mr. Christensen

were asked to speak before the Commission on Governance in Iowa and the Regents' duties and duties of the Committees. The Commission seemed to be very pleased with the way the Iowa Board of Regents was handling its problems.

INSTITUTIONAL ROADS PROGRAM FOR 1973-77. The Board was requested to approve the 1973 Program and the four projects totaling \$449,487 of which \$342,241 is budgeted for construction purposes, and to approve the Five-Year Program 1973-1977 based on funds available of \$2,445,800 of which \$1,873,686 is budgeted for construction.

The Board Office reported that significant changes have taken place in the Institutional Roads Program presented herein. Briefly stated, these changes are:

- 1) The 1972 Legislature increased the annual allocation for institutional roads to \$1,400,000 annually - an increase of \$400,000 from past levels. This increased amount becomes effective January 1, 1973 and each January 1 thereafter.
- 2) In past years, division of the funds has been \$800,000 for construction; \$200,000 for maintenance, design and engineering. The \$800,000 has then been distributed to user agencies as follows:

Conservation Commission	45.6%	\$364,960
Board of Regents	35.2%	281,520
Social Services	15.4%	124,120
National Guard	3.8%	30,400
	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>\$800,000</u>

The \$200,000 for maintenance has remained in a lump sum with total Highway Commission control over its usage and expenditures.

- 3) Beginning in July, we initiated first, interagency discussion and second, Highway Commission staff discussions on allocation of the fund. Differing approaches by agencies relative to maintenance, design and engineering led us to the conclusion that user agencies should budget the entire fund (for both construction and maintenance) and split up the annual allocation into agency shares. We determined, initially, to use the same formula as had been used for construction. This decision will be reviewed annually by the user agencies especially as it relates to the need by each agency.

- 4) Annual average shares of the fund as agreed to by the agencies are as follows:

Conservation Commission	45.6%	\$ 638,400
Board of Regents	35.2%	491,400
Social Services	15.4%	217,000
National Guard	3.8%	53,200
Total Annual Allocation	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>\$1,400,000</u>

5) Major internal changes in programming for Board of Regents institutions are:

- a- Annual construction levels are almost \$100,000 per year higher than under previous programs.
- b- At the November meeting, new maintenance agreements for each of the universities will be docketed. Formerly, we have been operating under agreements whereby a set \$400/\$500 per mile was reimbursed for maintenance. New agreements will provide for monthly billings reimbursing all maintenance costs on such roads. This means that some \$40,000 annually can be shifted from state operating expenditures to this fund.
- c- In past years, we never have had adequate control or knowledge of design costs on these roads since such costs were not isolated and set out separately within the \$200,000 available for such purposes. We also have entered into design agreements for advantages of control purposes, etc., but have never been reimbursed for such work. In the future, design costs will be isolated and applied against the Regents' total share. Arrangements are proceeding whereby reimbursement for design will be provided.

The programs as drawn represent a significant step toward meeting the institutional road needs. The programs come to you with the unanimous approval of the Roads Committee.

Following Board approval, the program, based on funds available, will be submitted to the Highway Commission for its formal approval and implementation.

A complete copy of the Five-Year Institutional Roads Program to be submitted is on file at the Board Office.

MOTION:

Mrs. Collison moved the Board approve the 1973 Program and the four projects totaling \$449,487 of which \$342,241 is budgeted for construction purposes, and approve the Five-Year Program 1973-1977 based on funds available of \$2,445,800 of which \$1,873,686 is budgeted for construction. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

ENROLLMENT. A report regarding enrollment and the Regents' Universities was presented to the Board.

The basic head count figures for fall 1972 compared with 1971 are:

	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	
University of Iowa	20,387	20,052	-335
Iowa State University	19,274	19,207	- 67
University of Northern Iowa	<u>9,605</u>	<u>8,845</u>	<u>-760</u>
	49,266	48,104	-1,162

Indications are that the condition is not at all peculiar to the state universities. A preliminary review of enrollments at private colleges and universities

in Iowa shows an apparent decline in enrollment of nearly 4%. This compares with the enrollment drop at state universities of 2.4%. A recent report of enrollment in state colleges in Nebraska (exclusive of the University of Nebraska) showed a 14% decrease.

Area schools are expecting a slight overall increase in enrollment. The Department of Public Instruction expects the number of students enrolled in career programs to grow while the number enrolled in college parallel to decrease. This is a continuation of a pattern set in recent years.

The fall enrollment figures at Iowa's state universities are somewhat lower than expected. Enrollments are some 1,400 below estimates made last year

The implications of the enrollment deceleration vary among institutions. While overall enrollment is down, enrollment is up in some particular areas such as health sciences. In general, the picture is consistent with trends reported to the Board over the last few years. Individual institutions will analyze the enrollment statistics in more detail in coming weeks. However, until that time some general observation may be made from the information in hand.

University of Iowa

Enrollment increased in dentistry, medicine, pharmacy, nursing and law. This reflects expanding programs in health sciences with increased emphasis upon enlarging the number of graduates in several health fields in the future. The percentage of women has increased from 34% to 39.3% in the past decade. Although there were slight increases at the freshman and senior levels, they were more than offset by sizeable decreases in the numbers of sophomores (the largest loss) and juniors. There was also a slight drop in graduate enrollment. A major decrease occurred in teacher education programs.

Iowa State University

Enrollment increased in home economics, sciences and humanities, and veterinary medicine. There were major decreases in enrollment in engineering and education. The number of women increased in both the undergraduate and graduate levels, while the number of men decreased by nearly equal numbers. As at other universities under the Board of Regents, the percentage of non-resident students remained virtually unchanged -- 21.1 at ISU, 26% at SUI and 2.33% at UNI.

University of Northern Iowa

The enrollment decrease at UNI was obviously the most dramatic of the three institutions and accounted for 65% of the total decrease from last year. University administration still is assessing the impact of the situation and may wish to comment further at the Board meeting. The percentage of students in teaching programs is down 22%. However, note should be taken of the 59.6% drop in teaching programs at the freshman level. This corresponds to trends reported earlier by UNI.

A report will be submitted to the Board later reflecting the enrollment experience of private colleges and universities and area schools as compared with that of the state universities. Further analysis of enrollment impact may be available at that time.

It was noted that UNI had sent an erroneous report to the Board that the number of full-time equivalent students had not declined. They are revising their figures, and a correct copy will be sent to the Regents and the Board Office at a later date.

Mr. Heffner noted that a major decrease in reported enrollments in teacher education programs is accounted for in large measure by a change in the time in the student's program in which he is admitted to teacher education.

President Kamerick stated that UNI experienced a considerable drop in enrollment in teacher education programs. Elementary education programs are down in enrollment, while business and other classes are experiencing a larger enrollment. He stated that the reduction in the need for teachers is one very large reason for this decline.

Mr. Richey noted that the institutions are revising their fall enrollments figures and will make appropriate changes in a later report on the budget request for 1973-75.

A Board Member stated that the decline that has occurred in the last 10-12 years in non-residents at the Universities is independent of the increase in tuition.

Another Regent pointed out that as long as Iowa tuition stays within reason and within the margin of other surrounding states, not much change will occur in the number of non-residents coming to the universities.

It was noted that the professional schools do not have as many non-residents as other schools within the universities. The reason for this is that because enrollment in these professional schools is tightly controlled. The figure for non-resident enrollment in professional schools this year is the lowest in many years.

Dr. Hardin pointed out that the Medical School has recently had a larger percentage of non-residents in the junior and senior years than in the entering class. However,

the freshman class of this year is so large, that when they reach the junior status there will not be many vacancies available.

TUITION COMPARISONS. A report was submitted to the Board concerning Tuition Comparisons of the Regents' Universities and other surrounding states' institutions of higher learning.

Resident tuition at Iowa state universities in recent years was at or near the top among Midwestern universities and ranked high across the nation. Non-resident tuition ranked somewhat lower but still was comparatively high. Recently compiled tuition figures indicate that Iowa's position in both categories is beginning to drop as other states adopt tuition increases. Iowa universities which ranked at or within the top three of comparable institutions in the 11-state Midwest area for resident tuition purposes a year ago now rank around the middle. Non-resident tuition also appears to be dropping below the mid-point. In some cases the universities compared with UNI are not the ones normally so compared. The UNI Midwest standing can be seen in the enrollment report.

Iowa tuitions have not changed since the major increase in 1969. The 1971 Legislature wrote a provision into the current appropriation act which had the effect of freezing basic resident tuition at current rates for the biennium. The budget askings for 1973-74 and 1974-75 are based upon current tuition rates. Student opinion runs against a tuition increase and the university presidents have voiced their opposition to an increase at this time. Tuition is a very important source of revenue since it accounts for over one quarter of the general education funds for operation of the university proper.

A report to the Board last year stated:

"While Iowa resident tuitions at state universities do not rank quite as high nationally as in 1969, there are still only five states in the nation with higher statewide resident tuitions this year (1971)."

This year there are more states than that just in the Midwest--in fact there are seven Midwest states with higher resident tuition than Iowa. Across the nation there are 16 states now with higher resident tuitions--California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia. Among individual institutions, however, the Iowa universities still rank among the top 20% nationally in resident tuition comparison.

Among Midwest states Iowa universities now rank below the mid-point in comparison with non-resident tuition. And, according to figures used here, UNI's non-resident tuition ranks at the bottom. Nationally, Iowa's non-resident tuition is above average.

The following figures based upon information compiled by surveys of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and the

American Association of State Colleges and Universities indicate the ranking of resident and non-resident tuition in the 11-state area:

<u>Resident Tuition</u>		<u>Non-Resident Tuition</u>	
1. Ohio State	\$750	1. U. of Michigan	\$2,260
2. Purdue	700	2. U. of Wisconsin	1,906
3. U. of Michigan	696	3. Ohio State	1,800
4. U. of Illinois	686	4. U. of Illinois	1,676
5. Michigan State	675	5. Purdue	1,600
6. U. of Indiana	650	6. U. of Minnesota	1,547
7. U. of Minnesota	641	7. U. of Missouri	1,540
8. U. of Iowa	620	8. Michigan State	1,530
9. <u>Iowa State, UNI</u>	600	9. U. of Indiana	1,490
10. U. of Wisconsin	558	10. U. of Nebraska	1,260
11. U. of Missouri	540	11. <u>U. of Iowa</u>	1,250
12. U. of Nebraska	534	12. <u>Iowa State</u>	1,230
13. U. of South Dakota	500	13. North Dakota U.	1,184
14. South Dakota St.	495	14. North Dakota St.	1,164
15. U. of Kansas	486	15. U. of Kansas	1,076
16. Kansas State	476	16. U. of South Dakota	1,076
17. North Dakota U.	456	17. South Dakota St.	1,071
18. North Dakota St.	435	18. Kansas State	1,066
		19. <u>UNI</u>	1,000

Resident tuitions have been raised this year at 10 of the Midwest institutions listed and 11 have increased non-resident tuition. Resident tuition increases ranged as high as 8% at the University of Missouri and non-resident increases went as high as 18.8% at the University of Illinois. Highest rates for both residents and non-residents tend to be in the East and Mid-Atlantic states with the lower rates concentrated in the West and Southeast.

There has been a great deal of activity in tuition setting this year illustrated by the fact that 68% of the institutions reported here raised either resident or non-resident tuition and in most cases raised both.

The gist of the situation is that Iowa, although still somewhat high by comparison in resident tuition, is now dropping on the comparison scale as other universities adopt higher tuition rates.

A question was raised by Mr. Bailey as to whether the inclusion of tuition income at current rates in the 1973-75 budget askings makes a commitment to the public concerning tuition. Mr. Perrin stated that the money is budgeted for this and if the money is not received, then the universities will have to get the money some other way. He believed a commitment was being made by the Regents on tuition and any possible increase. Mr. Redeker noted that facts may come to the Board and the Board should have some freedom to review its policy. Possibly tuition should be based on the student's ability to pay, he stated.

The Regents should feel that they can change their views. If there is logic

in a change of tuition rate, the Board should make that decision and not wait for the Governor or the Legislators to tell the Board to do so. The initiative should come from the Board.

Mr. Richey asked the Board for clarification of its present views, since its policy in the 1973-75 budget is not to raise tuition.

Some Board Members felt that perhaps the ability to pay should be incorporated into the budget.

Mrs. Petersen stated that increases in tuition should be in small amounts on a regular basis, rather than a large amount all of a sudden.

Mr. Redeker pointed out that he did not feel that the Board should be committed to the budget for all times. There should be a redistribution of how tuition is charged and the flexibility to change.

Mrs. Petersen noted that tuition increase might be fine for two of the institutions, but not right for the other institution. It was pointed out, in response, that tuition does not have to be the same at all three universities.

A Board Member stated that perhaps some mention should be made in the budget book to the fact that the Board is going to review its tuition policy during the biennium, and possibly make some change.

Mr. Richey reiterated the need for clarification of the Board's position on tuition rates since a clear policy was needed in the event the subject arose during the legislative session. He stated that it was his understanding based on the discussion today that the Board would continue to oppose any increase in tuition, but that the Board does reserve the right to change its policies as unforeseen circumstances arise. He noted that the Board was aware in June and July what trends in tuition rates were in other areas of the country when it adopted its policy of maintaining present tuition rates. The Board was reminded

that tuitions for part-time students were higher relatively than for students that were full-time and that an adjustment in part-time student rates could result in a reduction in tuition income of \$500,000 annually. Therefore, even if tuition rates were adjusted upward for full-time students, it might not necessarily increase total student fees and tuition income to the universities. The Board indicated that the statement of Mr. Richey represented the correct position of the Board concerning tuition rates.

Mr. Richey asked if the Board would be opposed to an increase in tuition if the proposal is made during executive or legislative consideration of the Regents' budget request.

It was again mentioned that some statement should be made that the Board reviews tuition fee allocations and the Board may want to revise its policies.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The 1973 Legislative session which convenes in January will deal with many items involving the Board of Regents and the institutions under the Board. Prior to each legislative session, the Board has discussed, in detail, potential legislation, and in some cases, has taken a position upon some issues. Several important issues present themselves for consideration in addition to the budget requests which have been discussed separately. These matters were discussed at this meeting.

#24. Immunity From Suit. Mr. David Vernon of the University of Iowa Law Faculty gave an oral presentation. He stated that it was unfair for employees of institutions governed by the Board to have contracts they cannot enforce in court and that the absence of a right of access to court caused some uneasiness among employees. He cited the cases of Megee and Ford as raising the sovereign immunity problem. He felt that the Board should waive sovereign immunity and permit the court to decide the cases on their merits. He suggested that the Attorney General should be asked for an opinion concerning the ability of the Board, on its own motion, to waive sovereign immunity in cases involving employment contracts at institutions governed by the Board.

Mr. Bergsten, SUI Law Professor, stated that many of the employees felt that they had not real recourse when issues concerning employment contracts are presented and argued. One should be able to go to court if a disagreement arises.

A Board Member pointed out that the problem went beyond employment contracts and was present in contracts for goods and services entered into with Board institutions.

Professor Vernon stated that in his opinion sovereign immunity should be waived in all contracts with the institutions. He said that the University of Iowa is in the process of establishing internal procedures to handle most of the cases that will arise and that, if sovereign immunity is waived, it is likely that only serious cases will end up in court. Mr. Bergsten concurred, saying that if internal procedures were available, the court probably will require that they be utilized before any court proceedings. Thus, he felt that there would not be a flood of cases to the courts.

Mr. Vernon said that if the Board requested an opinion from the Attorney General, the Board should follow the Attorney General's advice. If the Attorney General says that the Board does not have the power to waive the defense of sovereign immunity, the Board would then have to decide if legislation is needed.

Mr. Perrin suggested that the Board hear both sides on this subject. Mr. Vernon replied that while there may be good reasons to retain sovereign immunity, he could not think of one, except, perhaps, a financial reason.

It was noted that one problem with waiting for an Attorney General's opinion is that the opinion might come too late for anything to be done before the coming legislative session was over.

MOTION:

Mrs. Petersen moved the Board ask for an Attorney General's Opinion concerning the matter of Immunity from suit. This motion died for lack of second.

Mr. Vernon and Mr. Richey will contact the Attorney General and discuss the matter with him. They will report this meeting to the Board. Also, they will draft a paper on the pro's and con's of this matter.

REVIEW OF DRAFT OF BUDGET DOCUMENT FOR 1973-75 REQUESTS. The first draft of the budget requests document for 1973-75 was sent to Board members for review about two weeks ago. Corrections and suggestions were received by the Board Office. Other minor editorial or typographical errors were found. The appropriate corrections will be made by the Board Office unless a suggestion requires a major rewriting of one of the institutional sections.

It was discovered, by the Board Office, that any mention of the Quad Cities Graduate Study Center had been omitted. A section was written and presented to the Board. Also noted was the revised page for the Regents' Office, specifically the paragraph describing the duties of the Board.

Mr. Richey noted that Congress had passed a major social security bill, waiting to be acted upon by the President. This could cause quite a significant change in the budget askings for the Regents Universities, if signed by the President.

Mr. Richey noted that the tuition section of the budget book will be rewritten and up-dated. He stated that there will be new enrollment estimates in December, and that the Board may want to contact the Governor and Legislature regarding this at that time.

It was pointed out that in the Quad Cities section, first paragraph, that "...of the costs..." should be spelled out to make it clearer.

Several editorial suggestions were made for sections of the document. The Quad Cities section is to be updated.

Mr. Richey asked that any additional corrections be phoned into the Board Office by no later than Tuesday noon, October 24.

REVIEW OF CAPITAL REQUEST OF UNI FOR 1973-75 BUDGET. The Board was requested to approve the detailed capital asking of the University of Northern Iowa which

sets forth plans to construct three new facilities.

July Board meeting, the Board approved a capital asking for UNI of \$5,100,000 for new construction. It was reported that the University was reviewing its space needs as they relate to the configuration of buildings and the specific needs of departments. The purpose was to ascertain whether one or two multi-purpose buildings or several special purpose buildings were required in terms of institutional needs and in terms of getting the most efficient use of building funds. Further, a determination had not been made relative to the replacement of space lost by the Gilchrist Hall fire. Consequently, the Board deferred action on authorizing specific new buildings for 1973-75 until the University presented its report for review.

The University, with the assistance of the firm of Thorson-Brom-Brosnar-Snyder, undertook an extensive review of its space needs. Involved were meetings with deans, department heads and faculty members of departments who potentially would be involved in the new space. Questions of sites for new facilities, building configurations, and departmental needs were considered. Considerations were given to the total number of new buildings to be constructed in 1973-75 with the range being one to five new buildings.

The Director of Planning will be present at the Board meeting to answer any questions relative to the review process.

The total request is \$6,313,900, funded as follows (previously approved by Board):

Academic Revenue Bonds	\$5,100,000
Direct Capital Appropriation	250,000
Fire Loss Request	963,900
	<u>\$6,313,900</u>

Projects include --

- a) Three facilities to house:
 - Industrial Arts and Technology
 - Arts
 - Speech and Speech Pathology

The speech facility would be partially funded from fire loss funds.

- b) Utility connections to new buildings. Special costs are associated with some of this construction which involves the extension of utilities to the South Campus. These costs cannot be directly tied to an individual facility until such time as exact siting is determined.
- c) General utilities. Utility needs may be ascertained once the University receives the utilities study. This study is expected to be completed by January 1.

A portion of the general utilities askings might be utilized instead for lease payments. This will require a change in the capital appropriation bill language. The University should have the flexibility to pay for such leases as Baker Hall, Uni-Cue, Erickson Garage, from either capital or operating funds. The asking for capital in this biennium would not, however, be altered. The institution would have to re-study capital priorities in this area if such expenditures are to be shifted from operating funds.

Involvement of these buildings relative to use of new construction techniques still needs resolution. A progress report developed by the Committee on Construction Techniques with recommendations will come to the Board in January. This report will consider involvement of all new facilities in the 1973-75 askings. No major programming on these new facilities will be initiated until the report is presented to the Board.

A Board Member stated that new facilities must be built with a high degree of flexibility.

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the Board approve detailed capital askings in the amount of \$6,313,900.00 of the University of Northern Iowa. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

BOARD OF REGENTS UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL NEEDS AND TEN-YEAR BUILDING PROGRAM,

1973-1983. The action requested of the Board was:

- a. Approve capital needs of Board of Regents Universities totaling \$172,583,366.00
- b. Approve a Ten-Year Capital Program of \$126,344,630.00 for submission to the 1973 Legislative Session for the period 1973-83.
- c. Direct the Facilities Committee to continue its efforts toward development of a space projection model with said model to be fully operational prior to consideration of capital askings to the 1975 Legislative Session.

A complete copy of the University Capital Needs and Ten-Year Building Program, 1973-83 is on file at the Board Office.

The Board Office presented the following information to the Board:

Background on Ten-Year Capital Program

The Academic Revenue Bond Act states: "The board shall prepare and submit to the general assembly for approval or rejection a proposed ten-year building program for each institution Such program shall be submitted no later than seven days after the convening of each regular annual session of the general assembly."

Programs submitted to date and Legislative actions have been as follows:

<u>Legislative Session</u>	<u>Program Submitted</u>	<u>Legislative Action</u>
1969	\$274,376,000	\$93,236,000
1970	\$220,676,000	No Action
1971	\$218,535,000	\$95,000,000
1972	\$222,538,000	No Action
1973 Proposed	\$126,344,630	?

University Capital Needs and Ten-Year Capital Program 1973-83

The Ten-Year Capital Program was presented in a completely revised form.

Some of the primary considerations were:

- 1) Period covered is the five biennia 1973-83. Breakdowns are:
 - a. 1973-75 Capital Askings as previously approved by the Board.
 - b. 1975-77 projection of askings totaling \$31,023,310. Project narratives will be presented at the November meeting and incorporated into the program submitted.
 - c. 1977-83 period will be shown as lump sum needs without specification of particular projects.
 - d. The sum of a), b) and c) make up the Ten-Year Program the Legislature will be requested to approve.
- 2) Capital needs that would be unmet in 1973-83 are shown and added to those proposed for the ten-year period to demonstrate Total Capital Needs. Dependent on changes in conditions -- state revenue picture, institutional enrollments, program changes -- these unmet needs could be included into future Ten-Year Programs in whole or in part.
- 3) The program is expressed basically in terms of 1973 dollars.
- 4) Only state funding from direct appropriations or academic revenue bonds is programmed to finance the \$126,344,630 over the ten years.
- 5) The program consists of four primary factors:
 - a. New space needs as determined by the use of the space projection model.
 - b. Remodeling needs utilizing '73-'75 askings as the base and thereafter projected on a modified life-of-building approach.
 - c. Utility needs as submitted by the universities are identified either as specific projects or listed as recurring unidentified requirements.
 - d. Special needs. These are needs not met by approach utilized in above factors and which represent in each instance specific decisions to be determined by the Board prior to requesting state capital funds for these projects. In most instances, the request for state funds to meet these needs represents only one of several alternatives for funding.

An Explanation & Comments on FactorsFactor I - New Space Needs

Since 1970, the Facilities Committee has been working on a method for projecting space needs. Factor I displays that method -- a Facilities Projection Model. Material presented to the Board included:

- Report from the Committee
- Comments by SUI and UNI
- A series of appendices which set forth some of the decisions reached in drawing up this product. They include -
 - Bases for establishing space factors;
 - Space Model Inputs (standards and factors, methods of count used);
 - Research Space Standards (varies considerably by institution depending on the program in the Model);
 - Library Space Standards (reached with Library Deans for first runs);

Institutional executives raised several questions on results on this first run. All institutions accept the results as they apply to the 10-year Program to be submitted to the 1973 session. The Facilities Committee plans to continue to analyze all aspects of the model. The results of this first effort are probably conservative. Certain changes in space included or excluded from institutional inventories could dramatically alter needs. An example is a possible decision to include University Hospital needs, which are outside this projection, or to transfer existing academic space to elements of the university not included in the present model. The latter decision could, for example, increase the SUI need for new academic space in later years by over \$8 million. The treatment of Baker Hall at UNI is another example.

Despite the valid questions raised and possible changes later, the model represents major progress toward:

- Determining the real space needs of the institutions.
- Developing a base for decisions on meeting real space needs equitably on an interinstitutional basis.

While problems still need solution, these problems are not insoluble in the view of Committee members. They can be ironed out in time for decision-making on 1975-77 askings. The vehicle and means for determining new space needs will then be definite, precise and equitable. The members of the Facilities Committee are

to be commended for their efforts in bringing forth this vehicle.

Factor II - Remodeling Needs

The Board will recall consideration of the so-called "life of building" approach when considering the RR&A portion of '73-'75 askings. The method used to determine remodeling needs is the product of the following factors:

Number of restorations per life of facility	1 or 2
Life	100 yrs.
Current initial cost	\$45 per sq. ft.
Fraction of initial cost to restore all but basic structure	2/3
Portion of expenditures financed from RR&A funds (other sources of funds such as capital for major remodeling and renovations are assumed to allow at least one additional renewal)	1/2
Gross square feet of building space (excluding auxiliary enterprises)	Sq. ft. of space for each institution

While this approach was not used for the RR&A operating budget this year, the approach has validity for projection of capital remodeling needs.

The method used to determine remodeling needs is outlined below:

1. A remodeling base was constructed for each institution. This base considers all facilities on the campus for which the state has more or less exclusive responsibility to maintain and to which the remodeling dollar yield of \$30 per gross square foot is applicable. For example, the base doesn't include General Hospital at SUI but does include other budget functions such as Psychiatric Hospital, Oakdale. The base doesn't include farm buildings, sheds, garages, etc. A comparable base has been established for each institution. The base does not include space under construction and includes only items covered on the 1971 inventory. The ages of present buildings are shown. The remodeling base does not include space scheduled to be razed in the next 10 years.
2. The base is multiplied by \$30 per square foot to arrive at total dollar need for one renovation.
3. For purposes of the Ten-Year Plan, one restoration is assumed from capital funds in 100 years. Thus, the total dollar yield is divided by 100 to arrive at annual dollar remodeling need.
4. Annual dollar need is then multiplied by the eight years for 1975-83. Added to that yield is 1973-75 remodeling askings to arrive at the programmed 10 years.
5. Identification of specific projects to be remodeled within dollar yield will be set forth one biennium ahead of 1973-75.

The conservatism of this approach is recognized as it relates to a single renovation from Capital. RR&A funds have not been sufficient to permit a second renovation. Shown as unprogrammed, therefore, but as a need is a second remodeling in 100 years. Part of this remodeling could come from RR&A funds, or transfer of responsibilities could occur by not asking for RR&A and increasing capital askings to meet this need fully.

The important points are:

- a. The model was not designed to consider remodeling needs.
- b. Remodeling needs of the institutions are sizable and some method had to be developed to project this need.
- c. This method is fairly easily understood and yields dollar amounts to meet a sizable portion of requirements.
- d. The relationship that exists between work done by RR&A funds and capital funds should be clarified. The Committee will continue to address itself to this problem. Until a solution is reached, it does not seem to be appropriate to transfer all remodeling needs into Capital.

Factor III - Utility Needs

This subject requires a major study on an interinstitutional basis. Decisions have been reached by the Board in the past on an individual institutional basis without adequate tools to determine interinstitutional priorities. Further, institutions put off and backlogged major utility projects in a quest to meet more urgent new space needs during the expanding '60's. It is proposed that a major utilities study be conducted with completion by February 1974, which will consider all utility needs of the institutions - how to meet those demands - effects and alternatives on operating and capital budgets.

For the current 10-year plan, utility needs consist of -

1. Specific projects identified by the institutions as requirements which should be met.
2. A set amount each biennium for each institution to meet recurring or unidentifiable general utility projects.

The significance of this factor in the future is illustrated by the almost \$30 million programmed for this purpose with another \$5 million deferred beyond the 1973-83 program. The effect on operating budgets of utility decisions reached over the past several years makes this an equally cogent need for solution as that of modeling on new space needs.

Factor IV - Special Needs

Special Needs are present on each campus. In terms of specific projects, these include:

Psychopathic Hospital Addition
State Bacteriological Lab
Recreation and Intramural Building - ISU
Farm Land Purchase - ISU
Baker Hall Purchase and Remodeling - UNI

Alternatives to requesting state funds for each of the above are fairly obvious. In the Baker Hall matter, further detailed discussion should take place between the Board and UNI at a fairly early date.

The basic approach used for 1973-83 required the institutions to identify and list those projects, for purposes of planning, which are seen as needs to be met within the next ten years. None of these needs is programmed in the 1973-75 askings. The 1975-77 projection generally, at this point, would meet only the recurring portions of special needs -- for both Advance Planning funds and Campus Development funds.

Overall Summary

The \$126,344,630 1973-83 program is, without question, the most realistic capital program presented to the Board in years. While the Legislature has been reluctant in the past to approve a 10-year program in excess of \$100 million, inflation since 1969, alone, parallels pretty closely the \$95 million approval level and the \$126 million program.

The program has been accepted by the universities as a fair statement of their needs although expression of those needs within the dollars set forth has to be viewed as conservative for reasons set forth earlier.

Please note that the relative priority of each of the four factors presented are not established. This can be done only on an individual project basis.

Present for discussion were John Pace, Iowa State University, Richard Gibson, University of Iowa, and Leland Thomson, University of Northern Iowa.

Mr. Caldwell and Mr. McMurray of the Board Office first explained various aspects of the program to the Regents. Mr. Caldwell gave a detailed explanation on standards and determinations in the space projection model. Mr. McMurray explained the factors making up the program.

A question arose concerning library standards. Institutional officials responded by saying that all the institutions need more library space. However, standards for determining library needs have to be reviewed, and revised to reflect more realism. Board members commended the Facilities Committee by stating

this type of projection is the best method yet devised and it promises to be better with planned requirements.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board approve the capital needs of the universities totaling \$172,583,366.00; approve a ten-year program of \$126,344,630.00 for submission to the 1973 Legislative session for the period 1973-83; direct the Facilities Committee to continue its efforts toward development of a space projection model with said model to be fully operational prior to consideration of capital askings to the 1975 Legislative Session; direct the Committee to present specific proposals for an interinstitutional study on utility needs to the Board; direct the institutions to continue to bring specific proposals for razing facilities to the Board on an individual project basis. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

EXECUTIVE SESSION. President Redeker announced that there were three personnel items to be discussed in Executive Session. In roll call vote on whether the Board should resolve itself into Executive Session, the vote was as follows:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison, McCartney, Perrin, Petersen, Shaw, Wallace, 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 5:00 p.m., and arose therefrom at 5:45 p.m.

President Redeker called the meeting of the Board of Regents to order at 9:15 a.m., Friday, October 20, 1972. The following business pertaining to General or Miscellaneous was transacted on Friday, October 20, 1972.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. (continued)

#19. Amendment to Academic Revenue Bond Act Regarding 10-year Building Program.

The Academic Revenue Bond Act, Chapter 262A, passed in 1969, requires the Board

to submit a 10-year capital program to the Legislature each year. It was suggested that in view of the possible savings in money and effort that the non-appropriation year report be eliminated. In the off-year the two houses have merely noted in their journals that the report has been received.

It was the consensus of the Board to make this a part of its legislative askings as a non-controversial economy bill.

MOTION:

Mrs. Petersen moved the Board approve the amendment to Academic Revenue Bond Act regarding a biennial, rather than annual requirement for reporting the 10-year building program as part of the Board's legislative program askings. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

#4. Governance and Planning. As a result of the Higher Education Act of 1972 there appears a strong possibility that many states, including Iowa, will have to consider some changes in the manner in which planning for higher education is conducted. The federal act makes federal funds for state planning and vocational school improvement contingent upon establishment of a commission, which is broadly and equitably representative of all facets of post-high school education and the public. Federal officials have made it clear they mean to include proprietary schools as well as public, private and vocational institutions in the representation. Since no present agency meets this mandate, an existing agency will need to be expanded to meet the requirements or a new agency created. The provisions in the law are conditional rather than mandatory. However, it would appear the state would want to qualify for the funds. Neither the appropriations nor the guidelines were completed at the time of the meeting. The Board was requested to express some preference on this matter.

Some Board members felt that this subject was premature and that no action should be taken at this time.

Mr. Richey stated that it was quite probable that action would need to be taken on this at the next legislative session.

Mr. McCartney and other Board Members felt that the only position the Board could take at this time was to be adequately represented on any Board created.

It was the consensus of the Board that this be re-docketed for the November meeting.

#9. Appropriation for Gilchrist Hall Fire Loss. Gilchrist Hall at UNI was destroyed by fire this year. An appropriation of \$963,900 would be needed to replace the space lost. The Executive Council has provided funds for razing the building and replacement of some equipment and supplies.

Mr. Richey pointed out that a special bill is required. The Board has already approved a capital program for UNI based on this money. This would represent formal approval.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board seek a special appropriations of \$963,900 to replace space lost by Gilchrist Hall Fire. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

#21. Request for Space Lost by Fire at Ankeny Research Farm. It was suggested that the Board consider requesting a bill to appropriate \$7,575 for this loss due to the fire which destroyed an insulated storage building at this facility.

Mr. Perrin stated that if the state is our insurer, claims should be filed with the Executive Council in the same manner as with an insurance company, with such claims being paid by the State. He went on to say that we have come to the place, if the state is not acting as an insurer, it seems some state agencies should have insurance. Concern was expressed over the role played by the Budget and Financial Control Committee in deciding to submit such minor claims to the Legislature.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board include a request for space lost by fire at Ankeny Research Farm of \$7,575 with the Gilchrist fire loss appropriation. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

#1. Proposed Transfer of Mental Health Authority. A legislative study committee appears ready to propose transfer of the Iowa Mental Authority from under the Board of Regents to the Department of Social Services. The director of the division of mental health in the Department of Social Services would automatically become the director of the Mental Health Authority. In 1965 the Iowa Mental Health Authority was designated by law to be the agency to handle federal mental health funds. The Iowa Mental Health Authority is staffed and managed by the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Iowa and is headquartered in the Psychopathic Hospital. Local Community Health Centers have announced opposition to the proposed transfer and have asked to retain their present close relationship with the University of Iowa and the Psychopathic Hospital. Questions have been raised about whether the proposed transfer would be damaging to educational and research programs and whether any control over the Psychopathic Hospital, however slight, would shift to the Department of Social Services.

Mrs. Collison is the Board representative to the Iowa Mental Health Authority. She stated that if this transfer would take place, an area of trust would be lost, the move would not make it any more efficient, and it would only create more bureaucracy.

Dr. Hardin stated that a bill is being written concerning this subject that would transfer these programs to the institutions. He felt that it would be premature at this time to take any action. He added that the University has a role to play in the Mental Health Authority, and that this role should be defined.

It was the consensus of the Board that any action taken at this time on this matter would be premature.

Dr. Hardin was requested to prepare a statement setting forth the role of the University in Mental Health under any arrangement.

APPEAL BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY. The following request from Local 870, dated September 12, 1972, and signed by four union officers, was presented to the Board under the provisions of Section 2.07 of the Regents Procedural Guide. The Board was petitioned to review the function of the Merit Coordinator relative to his refusal to arrange for an impartial Regents Merit System Appeals Board as provided in the merit rules; that the Board consider the facts of the grievance; and that the Board order a remedy that will assure the employees of the Board of Regents redress of wrongs whether or not covered by a specific section of the Board of Regents Merit System rules.

The signed grievance, related correspondence and employer replies made at various steps of the appeals procedure were forwarded to the Merit Coordinator, under cover of a letter requesting a hearing before the Appeals Board. This letter, dated June 28, 1972, and signed by Mildred W. Stoakes, was attached together with the grievance and replies from ISU Administration. (Eleven pages of employee signatures on the grievance are not enclosed.) The grievance reads as follows:

We grieve that we were not consulted on increases in the cost of Hospital and Health Insurance with Bankers Life Company. We ask that the increase in the cost of the insurance be borne by the employer.

In his reply, Mr. Volm cites Regent Merit Rules (10.3, Step 5, paragraph 3) which require that a grievance specify the institutional or merit rule which was allegedly violated. He notes that the employees' grievance does not contain such a specification, concludes that the grievance is therefore not valid, and refuses to arrange for the requested hearing.

The aggrieved employees state that they were not consulted regarding health insurance increases and ask that the University assume the cost of the increase.

In reply, University Administration notes an open meeting held specifically to discuss the increases, and the fact that the budget as approved by the Regents specifies the amount of employer contributions toward insurance costs, and the University has no additional funds available.

While it maintained that the grievance was not proper, the University proceeded to meet with the grievants in an effort to explain and resolve the problem.

It was noted that the Merit Coordinator's contention that the grievance is not valid because it does not, as required, specify a rule which was allegedly violated. Merit rules also specifically exclude general wage levels from consideration under the grievance procedure.

The University notes that its contributions to insurance costs are fixed in its salary budget as approved by the Regents. It seems logical, therefore, to interpret employer contributions toward fringe benefit costs as part of general wage levels. For these reasons it was recommended in this case that the Board uphold the decision to deny a hearing before an impartial Appeals Board.

Discussion initially centered on the role of the University. Mr. Moore explained the University position.

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the Board affirm the position of the University in this matter. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The petition raised questions pertaining to the role of the Merit System Coordinator. The question asked was if the Merit Coordinator has authority to refuse to arrange for a hearing as required in the rules.

There are a number of requirements in the Rules concerning appeals (See Section 10.3, Regents Merit Rules). It is interpreted that any one requirement is valid and controlling only if the other preceding requirements are satisfied.

For example, in their letter of September 12, to the Board, local union officers state that, "Your attention is called to this grievance which has been presented to the University at all levels required by the...grievance procedure". This indicates that the union recognizes the necessity to satisfy at least some of the requirements in the rules before proceeding to the Appeal Board. It is reasonable to expect that all requirements be met.

Therefore, it was suggested by the Executive Secretary that the Merit Coordinator has authority, subject to review by the Executive Secretary and the Regents, to refuse to arrange for a hearing as required in the rules, if he finds that prior requirements of the rules have not been satisfied. To find otherwise could result in third party involvement in any or all insitutional functions.

If the Merit System Coordinator holds that a matter is not grievable, the employee has certain other recourse:

At present employees may petition for a hearing before the Board under Sections 2.07 or 4.15 of the Regents Procedural Guide. This is in addition to the appeal procedure provided in the Merit Rules, and presumably prior to appeal in the courts. (The right to court review of a final administrative act of any public official or body is generally subject to prior exhaustion of established review procedures.) The University of Iowa has been asked to do a study to clarify and coordinate the various Regents appeals procedures. Until its completion a question will remain regarding employee recourse in cases where the Board upholds a decision to deny a hearing before the Regents Merit Appeals Board. The Board could consider the cases as falling under the general hearing policies of Section 2.07 or as an appeal of an "adjudicatory order" under Section 4.15, Sub-section A of the Procedural Guide.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board affirm the right of the Merit System Coordinator to rule whether a case is grievable under the Merit System, and that the Merit Coordinator has the right to refuse to convene an appeals board. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

After the Merit Coordinator has decided a matter not to be grievable, the employee should be able to come to the Board for further review under section 2.07 or 4.15 of the Procedural Guide or resort to the Courts.

MOTION:

Mr. McCartney moved the Board retain jurisdiction to review decisions of the Merit Coordinator as to whether a matter is grievable upon appeal by an employee. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE. The Board had been requested by the Legislative Higher Education Study Committee that it name five members to an advisory board to aid the Committees' consultants. The first meeting of that group was held on Tuesday, October 17.

Mr. Richey reported that the consultants requested the Regents to prepare a statement of its aims and objectives, (role and scope).

The overall statement should include a statement from each individual institution on role and scope. The plan would be to present the statement to the Board for action early in the November meeting. The Board would then review and approve and then forward this statement to the committee and consultants during that meeting.

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the Board approve the naming of Presidents Boyd, Parks, Kamerick; Stanley Redeker and R. Wayne Richey to represent the Board on the advisory board. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

REPORT ON MEETING WITH BUDGET AND FINANCIAL CONTROL COMMITTEE AT IOWA STATE

UNIVERSITY. It was reported by President Parks that the meeting went very well. The morning was spent, at their request, on 1973 askings; the afternoon on a tour of facilities and programs. It was noted that most of the members were present.

PROGRESS REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF REGENTS MERIT SYSTEM.

The schedule previously reported to the Board called for submitting the classification plan for institutional and Board review in October, followed by the allocation of individual positions into classes; notifying employees of such allocations in January; and resolving classification appeals between then and July 1, 1973, when the new classification plan would first be effectively related to a pay plan. It was anticipated that the process of allocating positions would reveal the need

for some revisions and additions and that these could be made prior to notifying employees of classification allocations.

At a recent meeting of the Interinstitutional Personnel Committee it was proposed that a tentative allocation of positions and follow-up revisions be accomplished before submitting the plan for approval. The revised schedule now calls for submitting the classification plan for Board approval at its meeting in January.

No action was requested at this time.

BOARD OFFICE PERSONNEL REGISTER. The Board Office Personnel Register had no items this month.

NEXT MEETINGS. There was some discussion as to when the Board should meet in Des Moines. The Board Members felt that it was very important to legislators that a Board meeting be held in Des Moines sometime during the session. It was the consensus that the meeting would not be in January.

In further discussion, the Board determined to meet in November beginning Wednesday afternoon, November 8, at 1:00 p.m.

December 14-15	Iowa State University	Ames
January 11-12	University of Iowa	Iowa City
February 8-9	University of Northern Iowa	Cedar Falls
March 8-9	Board Office	Des Moines
April 12-13	Iowa State University	Ames
May 10-11	University of Northern Iowa	Cedar Falls
June 14-15	University of Iowa	Iowa City
August 9-10	Iowa State University	Ames

EXECUTIVE SESSION. The Board determined that matters relating to the Dellevar Case should be discussed initially in Executive Session. On roll call vote whether the Board should resolve itself into Executive Session, the vote was as follows:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison, McCartney, Perrin, Petersen, Wallace, Redeker

NAY: None

ABSENT: Shaw

The Board having voted in the affirmative by at least a 2/3 majority, resolved itself into Executive Session at 1:00 p.m., and arose therefrom at 1:40 p.m.

DELLEVAR CASE. Upon arising from Executive Session on this matter, the Board took the following action in public session:

MOTION:

Mr. McCartney moved the Board award Mrs. Dellevar the unpaid balance of the contract for the 1970-71 school year, minus any other income from other sources during the contract period, and the usual deductions for taxes and social security; payment to be subject to waiver by Mrs. Dellevar of any further liability by the school in this matter, and her agreement to accept payment as full and final settlement. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion. Voting as follows:

AYE: Bailey, Collison, McCartney,
Peterson, Wallace
NAY: Perrin, Redeker
PASSED: Baldrige
ABSENT: Shaw

The motion carried.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

The following business pertaining to the University of Iowa was transacted on Thursday, October 19, 1972.

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL - NORTH TOWER PROJECT. The Board was requested to:

- a. Approve the project, schematic plans and budget.
- b. Authorize to negotiate a contract with Hansen, Lind, Meyer, Iowa City, Iowa, for architectural services.
- c. Select the University Architect's office as inspection supervisor.
- d. Authorize the University of Iowa to seek in early 1973 a revised General Assembly resolution authorizing the North Tower Project and hospital revenue bonding authority not to exceed \$10 million.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Construction	\$11,194,000
Site Work	100,000
Off-Site Work	75,000
Moveable Equipment	1,150,000
Architectural Fees, Supervision and Surveys	850,000
Contingency	559,750
Total	<u>\$13,928,750</u>

Source of Funds:

University Hospital Building Usage Fund	\$ 4,228,750
University Hospital Revenue Bonds	9,700,000
	<u>\$13,928,750</u>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The North Tower Project consists of a seven-story addition to the General Hospital which will add approximately 168,000 gross square feet of space by connecting the present east and west wings with the existing tower section on the north perimeter of the hospital. The addition will provide 68,000 square feet of clinic expansion, 12,000 square feet of additional operating room facilities, 12,000 square feet of Radiology Department expansion, 80 inpatient replacement beds, and 41,000 square feet of space for supporting functions. The new space created will allow eventual reallocations of existing space to bring about multiple improvements of the hospital's most deficient patient and teaching areas.

The basement will house Supply Processing and Dispatch, a Physical Therapy department, mechanical equipment, and a student nurse locker room facility. These space allocations when interrelated with other functions in the existing basement will provide given supporting services for the entire hospital; in particular, Supply Processing and Dispatch which will have direct vertical materiel distribution elevator

access to all floors and specifically to the Surgery Operating Suite on sixth floor and the Head Specialty Operating Rooms on the second floor.

The first floor will house the Internal Medicine Clinic, a Blood Donor Center, a Multiphasic Screening Clinic, and a lobby and a waiting area for clinic patients. The lobby area will provide waiting space and control for all clinics located in the North Tower Addition and existing adjacent areas.

There will be easy vertical access to the second floor housing the Dermatology and Thoracic and Cardiovascular Clinics in new construction and the General Dentistry, Oral Surgery, and Orthodontic, and Otolaryngology and Ophthalmology Clinics in existing adjacent areas. In this manner, both through vertical or horizontal access, outpatients will find immediate access to clinical facilities from a single control and lobby area.

The third floor will house 20 semi-private two-bed rooms for use by Internal Medicine together with a nurses' office, a nursing station, a nurses' locker room, medication room and utility room.

On the fourth floor, the Obstetrics and Gynecology Clinic will be provided necessary space to consolidate their existing segregated private and nonprivate clinics. In addition, the Neurosurgery Clinic will be assigned 4,000 square feet of space on this floor.

The fifth floor will house 20 two-bed rooms for our surgical service together with a nurses' office and control room and necessary supporting facilities.

The sixth floor will provide space for eight additional operating rooms, four scrub rooms, a large conference-teaching room, a storage area, holding area, work area, and patient control area.

The seventh floor will provide for expansion of diagnostic radiology in the form of five new diagnostic rooms, six offices, a conference-teaching area, control, dressing and work space.

The Architects Selection Committee has recommended the firm of Hansen Lind Meyer, Iowa City, Iowa, for this project. The architect for the much more extensive southern expansion was the joint venture of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill and Hansen Lind Meyer. The judgment to recommend Hansen Lind Meyer was based on 1) the constricted size of the project in comparison to the originally planned addition, 2) the firm's intimate knowledge of the needs of the Hospital developed during the past five years, 3) the firm's very substantial experience in building hospitals, 4) their location in Iowa City, 5) their demonstrated compatibility with the campus consultant, Hodne/Stageberg, 6) the saving which will occur by use of a firm fully oriented to the project and able to move immediately into completion of drawings.

The Board was given a detailed presentation of the schematic plans for the University Hospital North Tower Addition by Hodne/Stageberg Partners, Planning Consultants for this project.

Others present for discussion were Drs. Hardin, Eckstein, Clifton and Mr. Colloton.

Mr. Hodne, in response to questions, stated that one problem, concerning the outside appearance of the hospital building, was the Tower. He stated that the Tower could be dismantled and kept as an artifact in the Mall, or the addition could be built around the Tower so it could be seen from all floors. Decision had not been made as yet.

Extensive discussion followed relative to need and how this need could be met.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board approve the project, schematic plans and budget; authority to negotiate a contract with Hansen, Lind, Meyer, Iowa City, Iowa, for architectural services; selection of the University Architect's office as inspection supervisor; and authority to seek in early 1973 a revised General Assembly resolution authorizing the North Tower Project and not to exceed \$10 million in hospital revenue bonding authority. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL - PEDIATRIC CARDIOVASCULAR CLINIC. The Board was requested to:

- a. Approve the project, schematic plans and budget.
- b. Approve the selection of University Architect's Office as architect and inspection supervisor.

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Construction	\$ 237,000
Site Work	8,500
Off-Site Work	10,000
Moveable Equipment	310,000
Planning, Supervision and Surveys	22,750
Contingency	31,150
Total	<u>\$ 619,400</u>

Source of Funds:

Hospital and Medical Facilities Construction Program Grant	\$ 557,460
University Hospital Building Usage Fund	61,940
	<u>\$ 619,400</u>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project consists of a single story and basement addition to the Pediatric Clinic on the west side of University General Hospital in a current court yard area. The clinic will provide four exam office units, a heart catheterization diagnostic unit, an exercise laboratory, a chemistry laboratory, a graphic unit encompassing the capability for vectocardiography, phonocardiography, and ultrasound procedures. Architecture of style similar to that of the General Hospital will be incorporated into the design including the scale of windows and building materials. The exterior of the facility will be brick masonry which will match the masonry on the existing facility.

A detailed presentation of the schematic plans was presented to the Board by Hodne/Stageberg Partners, Planning Consultants for this project.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board approve the project, schematic plans and budget; approve the selection of University Architect's office as architect and inspection supervisor. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

MUSEUM OF ART ADDITION AND ALUMNI CENTER. The Board was requested to:

- a. Approve the general project concepts.
- b. Approve the site selection for Alumni Center.
- c. Approve authority to negotiate contract with Harrison and Abramovitz, New York, New York for architectural services.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project would provide for the construction of two additions to the north of the Museum of Art. Although the additions would be planned and constructed as one project, each is intended for a separate purpose. Both projects would be funded by the University of Iowa Foundation from funds now in hand or pledged. This will include a grant from the University of Iowa Alumni Association, for the Alumni Center. The buildings would become the property of the University of Iowa upon completion.

MUSEUM OF ART ADDITION

This project would add a structure of approximately 14,000 gross square feet to the existing Museum of Art. It will house a group of galleries to be known as the Carver Galleries in recognition of the donor of the funds to be used to finance the project. The project will also include some remodeling within the existing building to accommodate the reorganization of galleries and service space. Project cost is estimated to be approximately \$700,000.

ALUMNI CENTER

This addition would house Alumni Records, an official office of the University, the University of Iowa Foundation, and the University of Iowa Alumni Association. The addition, programmed to be approximately 10,000 gross square feet in area, will include administrative and clerical offices, records storage and a combination conference room-lounge to be used jointly with the Museum of Art. Project cost is estimated to be approximately \$400,000.

Following completion by the project architects and the University, the Regents will be requested to approve preliminary plans and budgets for these projects.

Darrell Wyrick of the Foundation, Joseph Meyer of the Alumni Association and James Berney, President of the Alumni Association were present for the discussion.

A presentation of the schematic plans was made to the Board by Hodne/Stageberg, Planning Consultants.

In discussion, the Alumni Association and Foundation stated their preference was that the site adjacent to the Museum of Art be selected for the new Alumni Center. The recommendations to this proposal relate to timing of the project, cost, parking, sharing of facilities, and other considerations.

Hodne/Stageberg Partners investigated 13 possible locations on campus for the site selection of the Alumni Center. Of those 13 sites, four sites were studied in more depth. It was their conclusion that the site north of and attached to the Museum is the most advantageous site of the sites studied for location of an Alumni Center. The principal reasons for recommendation of this site were:

- Strong functional relationship with the Museum which is regarded as mutually valuable by the Museum and the Alumni Center administrations.

- Strong identity of the Alumni Center with the community-oriented cultural activities of the University.
- Minimum competition for use of the land by others both now and in the future.
- No significant added cost to use of this site over alternative sites.
- Satisfactory central orientation to the overall campus.

These questions were raised and discussed:

- Adaptability of structure to Museum use.
- Operating costs for alumni center.
- Elimination of site north of Union.
- Selection of architects.

Mr. Heffner stated that some other architects, possibly from Iowa, could be selected, but it was felt that Harrison & Abramovitz would treat this project with the same tone and style as the original Museum project done by them.

MOTION:

Mrs. Petersen moved the Board approve the general project concepts as shown above; approve the site selection for the Alumni Center; grant authority to negotiate contract with Harrison & Abramovitz, New York, N.Y., for architectural services. Mr. Shaw seconded the motion. The following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Collison, McCartney,
Petersen, Shaw, Redeker

NAY: Baldrige, Perrin, Wallace

The motion carried, 6-3.

The following business pertaining to the University of Iowa was transacted on Friday, October 20, 1972.

ANNUAL REPORTS OF LEAVES OF ABSENCE AND RESIGNATIONS. In accordance with the Procedural Guide of the State Board of Regents, a summary report including resignations and leaves of absence for personnel covered under Sections 4.04 and 4.05 was presented to the Board. A complete copy of this report is on file at the Board Office.

STUDENT FEE PROPOSAL. The Board was requested to approve regulations implementing the concept of positive opting-in for non-mandatory student fee collections by the State University of Iowa.

A report by SUI stated:

At the Board of Regents March 9-10, 1972, meeting, it was moved by Mrs. Petersen, seconded by Mr. Perrin, and unanimously passed that: "The Board approve the concept of positive opting-in to such a student organization, provided satisfactory arrangements can be made, subject to Board approval at a later date."

The action requested constitutes the "satisfactory arrangements" requested by the Board as a proviso before it would take final action on the matter of optional student fees.

A letter dated September 20, 1972, to President Willard Boyd from the University of Iowa Student Association Senate, states the substance of the action requested here. It is highly appropriate that the student body have a large voice in developing a proposal for the orderly collecting and disbursing of optional student fees. Accordingly, the action requested herein closely follows the substance of the University of Iowa Student Association Senate proposal, with improvements in language, clarifications, and technical changes where deemed appropriate by the University.

Also appended hereto (labeled "Exhibit B") is a statement dissenting from portions of the proposed regulations, on behalf of The University of Iowa affiliate of Iowa Students Public Interest Research Group.

Regulations for approval, collection and disbursement of optional student fees:

Sec. 1. For purposes of these regulations, a "mandatory student fee" is an obligation imposed upon a student of the University by Regent and University action, an "optional student fee" is an obligation imposed upon a student of the University at his or her own voluntary request as defined herein.

Sec. 2. The two kinds of fees defined in section 1 shall be independent of each other in every way, the collection and disbursement of one kind shall not necessarily imply the collection and disbursement of the other kind, and, where they are both collected and disbursed, they shall not be commingled.

Sec. 3. An organization, in order to be eligible to invoke the optional student fee collection and disbursement process by the University as defined herein, must:

- (a) be a student organization formally recognized as such by the University, and
- (b) be educational in nature or have an educational purpose, and
- (c) be politically non-partisan, non-profit, and controlled by the student membership or student representatives thereof through a set of known and fair internal governance procedures, and
- (d) if it is an affiliate or sub-unit of some other organization not a recognized student organization formally recognized as such by the University, be fairly represented in the policy-making organ of that other organization of which it is an affiliate or sub-unit, and, provided that said other organization must itself be in conformance with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

Sec. 4. An organization in conformity with section 3 shall, subject to the requirements of subsections 6(a) and 6(b), be certified as authorized to solicit individual obligations by members of the student body for an optional student fee, and the University of Iowa Student Association Senate (hereinafter, the UISA Senate) shall certify that fact to the University, for each such organization meeting either of the two following criteria:

- (a) a two-thirds affirmative vote (of those Senators present and voting) has been achieved on the issue of authorization for that organization at a duly convened meeting of the University of Iowa Student Association Senate, or
- (b) petitions are received by the UISA Senate, conferring authorization upon the named organization, provided the petitions bear valid signatures of students in twice the number as voted in the most recent all-University election, or thirty-five percent of the student body, whichever is larger, and provided the organization is eligible under section 3.

Sec. 5. An organization which has been certified as authorized to solicit under section 4 and subsection 6(b) shall retain such authorization until:

- (a) authorization obtained under the provisions of subsection 4(a) is terminated by a two-thirds vote (of those Senators present and voting) at a duly convened meeting of UISA Senate, or

- (b) authorization obtained under the provisions of subsection 4(b) is terminated by the failure of the organization to receive an obligation of optional student fees from thirty-five percent of the student body in any tuition term (semester, trimester, quarter, as the case may be) after the tuition term in which said authorization was achieved.

Sec. 6. An organization authorized to solicit under the provisions of section 4 and not having such authorization terminated under the provisions of section 5, may solicit funds under the following conditions and by the following procedures:

- (a) the total amount of all optional student fees solicited shall not exceed ten dollars per student per tuition term, and no one organization may solicit for more than two of those ten dollars, and
- (b) where more than one organization is authorized to solicit, the organizations shall be judged eligible to participate in the order in which they become currently authorized, until the ten-dollar total limit is reached, and for purposes of deciding precedence the date of the vote shall be controlling for authorizations achieved in accordance with subsection 4(a), and the date of receipt by the UISA Senate of sufficient valid petitions shall be controlling for authorizations achieved in accordance with subsection 4(b) herein, the UISA Senate shall be the judge of disputes as to precedence arising under this provision, and the Senate shall certify to the University which organizations are eligible to participate in what dollar amounts, and,
- (c) the University shall include one or more obligation instruments (for example, in computer card, or equivalent form) indicating thereon the name of any organizations certified to it by the IUSA Senate as eligible for participation in accordance with section 4 and subsection (b) of this section, together with the dollar value of the solicited optional student fee for each such organization, place for the student's authorizing signature, and instructions that if assessment of any optional fee is desired in a subsequent University bill the card should be completed, signed, and returned; the said instrument(s) to be enclosed, in regular materials delivered to all students, such as the registration packet or the first mailed University term bill, in accordance with, for authorizations by petition, the method called for by the petition, and
- (d) Each student who incurs an obligation to pay the optional student fee attached to a particular organization in the instrument and under the procedure of subsection (c) of this section, shall have the amount of that fee billed to his or her account in regular fashion, and
- (e) each student billed under subsection (d) of this section shall be released from his or her obligation within a thirty-day period after his having made it, upon application in writing to the cashier's office, and

- (f) each student billed under subsection (d) of this section, and who pays on the obligation, shall have the payment refunded on the basis of mistaken payment provided he or she applies to the cashier's office for such refund within thirty days following such payment.

Sec. 7. An organization receiving optional student fees under the provisions of section 6, shall be additionally bound:

- (a) to reimburse the University for all administrative costs incurred by the University in the collection and disbursement of the fees, and
- (b) to maintain complete and accurate accounting books and records, which shall be available for public inspection, and
- (c) to use such optional student fees for the benefit of the student community of the University, and
- (d) to receive all such student fees from the appropriate University account by a single disbursement through that account, and
- (e) to meet any other guidelines promulgated by the University or the Board of Regents in regard to this regulation.

The following statement of dissent was submitted:

Statement Dissenting from Proposed Regulations on Behalf of the Iowa Student Public Interest Research Group (ISPIRG)

The University of Iowa affiliate of the Iowa Student Public Interest Research Group presents this dissenting statement on the grounds that the action requested does not constitute the "satisfactory arrangements" requested by the Board.

The University of Iowa affiliate of the Iowa Student Public Interest Research Group therefore proposes the following amendments:

Section 5(b). strike "thirty-five percent of the student body" and insert "the number as voted in the most recent all-University election or fifteen percent of the student body, whichever is larger."

The amount here indicated is sufficient to elect student government, and should therefore be a realistic and fair measure of student support for any other group.

Section 6(c). strike "place for the student's authorizing signature . . . should be completed, signed, and returned" and insert "place for the student's signature, and instructions that the card should be completed, signed, and returned indicating authorization or non-authorization of assessment of any optional fee in a subsequent University bill."

Also insert at the end of subsection (c) "at the option of each certified organization, educational information may be stated on said instrument or included with said instrument."

This system will allow more positive and responsible opting-in than the alternate proposal.

Sections 6(e) and 6(f) strike "thirty days" in both subsections (e) and (f) and insert "fifteen days following the final day for payment allowed without penalty."

Any organization would have to hold off any activity for a month, when "fifteen days following the final day for payment without penalty" should be sufficient time to provide for any requested refunds.

Present for discussion were: John Wellman, legal consultant from the ISPIRG Office in Des Moines, and students Robin Mashbein, Gary Sea, Alan Stowell. Also present was Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Spady, Special Assistant to President, SUI.

In introducing discussion, Ms. Mashbein stated that representation at meetings of student organizations on campus to discuss student fee proposals was not representational of all groups. She stated that the procedures that were followed were fair, but that some student groups were denied a chance to input into the changes -- therefore, the above changes are suggested to the Board.

MOTION:

Mr. McCartney moved the Board adopt the regulations and amend same by accepting all amendments shown above made by ISPIRG except for Section 6 (c), 1st paragraph. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion.

AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved to amend the above motion by striking all language of 6 (e) as originally introduced. This motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Hubbard stated the original "35% of the student body" was viewed by Senate as realistic since ISPIRG had received 40% plus support originally. Mr. Hubbard also stated that the apparent reason for omission of the clause dealing with the inclusion of educational information was because of postage and mailing problems involved. Finally, he mentioned that members of the UISA Senate were supposed

to be present for the discussion. In their absence, he had attempted to present their viewpoints fairly without appearing to be biased towards those viewpoints.

Ms. Mashbein stated that the student associations could not reach a 35% participation rate. The 15% figure was chosen because of studies done throughout the country, and because it was very realistic of support generation being based on student government support.

AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved to amend the original motion and return Section 5B language to original language. This motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Perrin stated his disappointment in ISPIRG at ISU. He added that students were supposed to be given the chance to opt-out and apparently had difficulties in doing so. Further, he questioned opt-out methods scheduled for the next quarter. He stated that he hoped these differences would be noted and taken care of properly, and if not, he questioned whether ISPIRG could remain. He went on to say that the proposal now before the Board takes determinations on such student fees completely out of the hands of the Regents, and that the Board and administration should have much more to say about this policy. It needs much revision further stating that he preferred a petition method with very specific controls on amounts involved. In response as regards Iowa State, President Parks stated that the chance to opt-out was given. He added that this matter would be looked at very carefully.

Extensive discussion evolved around the question of auditing, problems involved therein and whether such audits would be done by the University.

AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION:

Mr. Baldrige moved to amend the original motion to provide for a regular auditing and that such audits be filed by all organizations with the University. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison,
Perrin, Petersen, Wallace,
Redeker

NAY: McCartney

ABSENT: Shaw

In explaining his "Nay" vote, Regent McCartney stated that under opt-in, dissatisfaction with the processes is totally a students' problem and no one else's.

Discussion then turned to technical means of solicitation (Section 6c).

AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION:

Mrs. Collison moved to amend original motion to add Section 6 (c), 1st paragraph, as shown on the ISPIRG proposal. This motion died for lack of a second.

Board Members responded that decisions on technical details were beyond scope of this discussion.

After extensive discussion, Mr. Wallace stated that a stronger role for students in the collection of fees is needed, and added that the entire discussion should be on the campus with the students making their own decisions concerning this matter.

Mr. Heffner reminded the Board that these are the recommendations of university administration and the Board should proceed to take action on this matter.

AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved to amend the original motion by striking the language in Section 4 (a) which reads "a two-thirds affirmative vote of those Senators present and voting" and inserting new language to read "a two-thirds affirmative vote of the UISA Senate." Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

VOTE ON ORIGINAL MOTION AS AMENDED:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison,
McCartney, Perrin, Petersen,

NAY: Wallace, Redeker

ABSENT: Shaw

The motion carried, 6-2.

Regulations for approval, collection and disbursement of optional student fees:

- Sec. 1. For purposes of these regulations, a "mandatory student fee" is an obligation imposed upon a student of the University by Regent and University action, an "optional student fee" is an obligation imposed upon a student of the University at his or her own voluntary request as defined herein.
- Sec. 2. The two kinds of fees defined in section 1 shall be independent of each other in every way, the collection and disbursement of one kind shall not necessarily imply the collection and disbursement of the other kind, and, where they are both collected and disbursed, they shall not be commingled.
- Sec. 3. An organization, in order to be eligible to invoke the optional student fee collection and disbursement process by the University as defined herein, must:
- (a) be a student organization formally recognized as such by the University, and
 - (b) be educational in nature or have an educational purpose, and
 - (c) be politically non-partisan, non-profit, and controlled by the student membership or student representatives thereof through a set of known and fair internal governance procedures, and
 - (d) if it is an affiliate or sub-unit of some other organization not a recognized student organization formally recognized as such by the University, be fairly represented in the policy-making organ of that other organization of which it is an affiliate or sub-unit, and, provided that said other organization must itself be in conformance with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) of this section.
- Sec. 4. An organization in conformity with section 3 shall, subject to the requirements of subsections 6(a) and 6(b), be certified as authorized to solicit individual obligations by members of the student body for an optional student fee, and the University of Iowa Student Association Senate (hereinafter, the UISA Senate) shall certify that fact to the University, for each such organization meeting either of the two following criteria:
- (a) a two-thirds affirmative vote of the UISA Senate has been achieved on the issue of authorization for that organization at a duly convened meeting of the University of Iowa Student Association Senate, or
 - (b) petitions are received by the UISA Senate, conferring authorization upon the named organization, provided the petitions bear valid signatures of students in twice the number as voted in the most recent all-University election, or thirty-five percent of the student body, whichever is larger, and provided the organization is eligible under section 3.

- Sec. 5.** An organization which has been certified as authorized to solicit under section 4 and subsection 6(b) shall retain such authorization until:
- (a) authorization obtained under the provisions of subsection 4(a) is terminated by a two-thirds vote (of those Senators present and voting) at a duly convened meeting of UISA Senate, or
 - (b) authorization obtained under the provisions of subsection 4 (b) is terminated by the failure of the organization to receive an obligation of optional student fees from *the number as voted in the most recent all-university election or fifteen percent of the student body, whichever is larger.*
- Sec. 6.** An organization authorized to solicit under the provisions of section 4 and not having such authorization terminated under the provisions of section 5, may solicit funds under the following conditions and by the following procedures:
- (a) the total amount of all optional student fees solicited shall not exceed ten dollars per student per tuition term, and no one organization may solicit for more than two of those ten dollars, and
 - (b) where more than one organization is authorized to solicit, the organizations shall be judged eligible to participate in the order in which they become currently authorized, until the ten-dollar total limit is reached, and for purposes of deciding precedence the date of the vote shall be controlling for authorizations achieved in accordance with subsection 4(a), and the date of receipt by the UISA Senate of sufficient valid petitions shall be controlling for authorizations achieved in accordance with subsection 4(b) herein, the UISA Senate shall be the judge of disputes as to precedence arising under this provision, and the Senate shall certify to the University which organizations are eligible to participate in what dollar amounts, and,
 - (c) the University shall include one or more obligation instruments (for example, in computer card, or equivalent form) indicating thereon the name of any organizations certified to it by the UISA Senate as eligible for participation in accordance with section 4 and subsection (b) of this section, together with the dollar value of the solicited optional student fee for each such organization, place for the student's authorizing signature, and instructions that if assessment of any optional fee is desired in a subsequent University bill the card should be completed, signed, and returned; the said instrument(s) to be enclosed, in regular materials delivered to all students, such as the registration packet or the first

mailed University term bill, in accordance with, for authorizations by petition, the method called for by the petition; *at the option of each certified organization educational information may be stated on said instrument or included with said instrument, and*

- (d) Each student who incurs an obligation to pay the optional student fee attached to a particular organization in the instrument and under the procedure of subsection (c) of this section, shall have the amount of that fee billed to his or her account in regular fashion, and
- (e) each student billed under subsection (d) of this section shall be released from his or her obligation within a fifteen-day period *following the final day for payment without penalty, upon application in writing to the cashier's office, and*
- (f) each student billed under subsection (d) of this section, and who pays on the obligation, shall have the payment refunded on the basis of mistaken payment provided he or she applies to the cashier's office for such refund within fifteen days following *the final day for payment without penalty.*

Sec. 7. An organization receiving optional student fees under the provisions of section 6, shall be additionally bound:

- (a) to reimburse the University for all administrative costs incurred by the University in the collection and disbursement of the fees, and
- (b) to maintain complete and accurate accounting books and records, which shall be available for public inspection, and
- (c) to use such optional student fees for the benefit of the student community of the University, and
- (d) to receive all such student fees from the appropriate University account by a single disbursement through that account, and
- (e) *to provide for regular, annual auditing and to file such audits with the University.*
- (f) to meet any other guidelines promulgated by the University or the Board of Regents in regard to this regulation.

(Changes made by the Board are shown in italics)

Mr. Moore explained how Iowa State University proposed solution to problems with ISPIRG fee collection at Iowa State University.

He said that detailed instructions will be included and it will be made very convenient for the students to opt-out if they want.

COLLEGE OF NURSING ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS. The Board was requested to approve a revised statement of admissions requirements for the College of Nursing which will rescind and replace existing College of Nursing requirements in Iowa Departmental Rules after filing with the Rules Review Committee.

Applications for admission to the College of Nursing should be submitted to the Director of Admissions, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. Applicants for admission to the undergraduate program in nursing must present a minimum of thirty semester hours completed in an accredited college.

For admission to the College of Nursing an applicant must have:

- a. Completed specific coursework as prescribed by the faculty of the College. The director of admissions will provide a list of the coursework required.
- b. Completed the American College Test.
- c. Performed satisfactorily on all courses undertaken.

Applications from students who have minor deficiencies in meeting grade-point requirements specified above will be reviewed by the admissions committee of the College, and, upon favorable recommendation of the committee, such students may be granted conditional or probationary admissions.

Fulfillment of the minimal requirements listed above, however, does not assure admission to the College of Nursing. From those applicants who meet the minimum requirements, the admissions committee will select the applicants who, in their judgment, appear to be best qualified.

A Board Member stated that this was a move in the right direction in the admissions to the College of Nursing and encouraged other departments and Colleges to examine their admissions requirements.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved to approve the above revised statement of admissions requirements for the College of Nursing, and to file said requirements with the Departmental Rules Review Committee. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. Executive Secretary Richey reported the Register of Capital Improvement Business Transactions for the period September 1 through October 6, 1972, had been filed with him, was in order and was recommended for approval. The following construction contracts were recommended for approval:

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>AWARDEE</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTRACT ITEM</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
University Hospital Renovation for Medical Intensive Care Unit 3rd Floor West	Burger Construction Co., Iowa City, Iowa	General	\$ 39,140.00
" "	AAA Mechanical Contrac- tors, Inc., Iowa City, Ia.	Mechanical	42,713.00
" "	Meisner Electric Co., Newton, Iowa	Electrical	11,972.00

APPROVAL OF PURCHASE ORDERS FOR EQUIPMENT:

Dental Sciences Building Equipment (35 orders to five different vendors)	\$ 13,196.96
---	--------------

The following Revised Budgets were recommended for approval:

DENTISTRY BUILDING - SITE DEVELOPMENT BUDGET INCREASE

The Dentistry Building budget includes an item of \$145,000 for site development and parking area. Of this amount, \$95,000 was approved for use in funding of the parking area for that portion to be used for faculty and staff parking. This left a balance of \$50,000 in this budget item for site development in the remaining areas. As detailed site development plans progressed, it has become apparent that this amount would provide only minimal site development, limited primarily to replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter on Newton Road, grading and topsoil, sodding and seeding, drainage improvements and partial lighting.

In order to complete the site development in a reasonably satisfactory manner to include adequate lighting, plantings, mulching, bicycle racks, additional planning and supervision and miscellaneous costs, it is proposed to increase this budget item to \$98,800, the increase of \$48,800 to be funded from Income from Treasurer's Temporary Investments.

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL REPAIRS, REPLACEMENTS AND ALTERATIONS RENOVATION FOR MEDICAL
 INTENSIVE CARE UNIT - 3rd FLOOR WEST

REVISED BUDGET

	<u>(10-72) Preliminary</u>	<u>(10-72) Revised</u>
Planning & supervision	\$(4,000) ⁽²⁾	\$(4,000) ⁽²⁾
Construction	55,000	93,825
Equipment	(27,000) ⁽¹⁾	(27,000) ⁽²⁾
Contingency	9,000	3,115
	<u>\$64,000</u>	<u>\$96,940</u>
 Source of funds:		
Univ. Hosp. RR & A - Acct. D050-0886	\$46,100	\$46,100
Univ. Hosp. Bldg. Usage Acct Y985-0877	17,900	50,840
	<u>\$64,000</u>	<u>\$96,940</u>

(1) To be purchased from University Hospital Equipment fund, therefore not included in total.

(2) Charged to D480, therefore not included in total.

The following New Projects were recommended for approval:

VOLUNTEER SERVICE LOUNGE PROJECT

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

General Construction.....	\$ 5,100
Electrical Construction.....	1,550
Floor Covering and Acoustical Ceiling	2,140
Piping Construction.....	550
Painting	300
Ventilating and Air Conditioning	1,000
Planning and Supervision	(1,000) ⁽¹⁾
Contingency.....	1,500
Owner Furnished Equipment	<u>(4,000)⁽²⁾</u>
 Total	 <u>\$12,140</u>

Source of Funds: Building Usage Account Y985-1095.

(1) Charged to Account D480, therefore not included in total.

(2) To be purchased from University Hospital 1972-73 Equipment Fund, therefore not included in total.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project consists of the development of approximately 1,045 square feet of space in the basement of the General Hospital. The work to be accomplished consists of installation of interior partitions, doors, floor tile, acoustical ceiling, light fixtures, painting and associated electrical and mechanical work. Completion of the project will provide the necessary space to support the new volunteer service for the hospitals and clinics.

Inasmuch as no single portion of the cost will exceed \$10,000, work will be accomplished by the Physical Plant Department or by competitive quotation and purchase order, or by a combination of these. Materials will be procured from Physical Plant Stores or by the quotation and purchase order procedure.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AIR CONDITIONING

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Equipment	\$ 4,000
Electrical	5,600
Plumbing	5,700
Sheet Metal Construction	9,400
Controls	3,600
Contingency	3,000
Engineering	<u>2,000</u>
Total	<u>\$33,300</u>

Source of Funds: University Hospital Building Usage
Fund Y985-1092

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project consists of providing air conditioning with fresh air makeup capability for the Environmental Services and Pharmacy Store offices located on the first floor and basement respectively at the southeast corner of the General Hospital. The work to be accomplished consists of installing an air-handling unit, air-cooled refrigerant condenser, controls, plumbing, air duct distribution, and associated electrical work. The accomplishment of this project will also eliminate a current five-ton well-water-cooling requirement.

Inasmuch as no single portion of the cost will exceed \$10,000, work will be accomplished by Physical Plant department or by competitive quotation and purchase order, or by a combination of these. Materials will be procured from Physical Plant Stores or by the quotation and purchase order procedure.

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

WARDS C21, C31, C41 AND C51 AIR-CONDITIONING AND HEATING PROJECT

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Planning and Supervision	(1,000) ⁽¹⁾
Engineering	4,800
General Construction	6,500
Ventilation and Air-Conditioning Installation	38,000
Piping Installation	13,000
Electrical Construction	6,400
Contingency	<u>2,500</u>
Total	<u>\$71,200</u>

Source of Funds: University Hospital RR & A

(1) Charged to Account D480, therefore not included in total.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Southeast Building Addition has a west interface with the east side of the one-series wards. The construction effort has now progressed to the point where the easterly windows must be permanently closed. The blocking of the windows precludes the use of window air conditioners and windows as a source of cooling and fresh air for the affected patient areas and faculty offices.

To satisfy the cooling and fresh-air requirements, it is proposed to install a system which will provide air conditioning for C31, fresh tempered air for C21 through C51 and exhausting for the four floors. The new system will create a cleaner and healthier environment for the patients and clinical staff.

The work to be accomplished consists of installing an air-handling unit and penthouse on the roof of C51, installation of air ducts and reheat coils, installation of piping to support the system and to supply chilled water from the 200-ton chiller unit located in the Southeast Addition basement, and associated electrical work.

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

REMODEL HOSPITAL SCHOOL DENTAL CLINIC

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Planning & Supervision	\$ 1,200
General Construction	9,000
Mechanical Construction	5,000
Electrical Construction	3,000
Equipment	30,300
Contingencies	<u>1,500</u>
Total	<u>\$50,000</u>

Source of funds: Kresge Foundation Grant

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The present Dental Clinic is poorly arranged and equipped to carry out its function of providing dental care for retarded and handicapped children. The project contemplates the construction and equipment of a modern facility in the space presently allocated. It will provide three operatories and companion consoles, a work room for tray preparation and sterilization, a reception counter and waiting area. New walls, wall coverings, lighting, acoustical ceilings, carpeting and x-ray protection are included in the budget.

Inasmuch as no part of the work exceeds \$10,000, it is proposed that work be accomplished by quotations and purchase orders or by the Physical Plant work force, or by a combination of these.

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

REPLACE EASTLAWN STEAM TUNNEL

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Engineering and supervision	\$ 1,650
General construction	7,500
Mechanical construction	4,850
Contingencies	<u>1,000</u>
Total	<u>\$15,000</u>

Source of funds: University RR & A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project consists of replacing approximately 100 feet of deteriorated steam tunnel under Iowa Avenue with insulated concrete duct bank.

It is proposed that, since no part of the work is over \$10,000, the project be awarded in two parts to outside contractors through the process of quotations and purchase orders.

The Physical Plant department is designated as the architect and inspection supervisor.

EAST CAMPUS SUBSTATION

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Engineering and supervision	\$ 6,000
Purchase of materials	45,500
Excavation and backfill	7,000
General construction	2,400
Duct Bank installation	6,600
Electrical construction	2,500
Contingencies	<u>6,000</u>
Total	<u>\$76,000</u>

Source of funds:	64th G. A. Academic Revenue Bonds - General Utilities	\$37,000
	Income from Treasurer's Temporary Investments	39,000
		<u>\$76,000</u>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The construction of this project is proposed to reinforce the capability of the University's 4160V distribution system to deliver the continually increasing demand for electrical power from connected buildings. This project will correct a phase difference presently requiring a network of 4160V distribution lines on the East Campus to be positively isolated from the principal distribution lines from the Power Plant and will also provide an additional source of power to the main Center Campus feeder. A further advantage accrues in increased versatility in switching loads from one feeder to another, without a phase difference, to alleviate overloaded 4160V circuits as variations of load demand occur from day to day or season to season.

The project consists of two parts:

- (1) Replacing one transformer and associated accessories in a three bank transformer substation on the east side of the City Water Plant north of Bloomington Street and,
- (2) Installation of a 4160V feeder to a manhole located at the intersection of Bloomington and Capitol Streets to provide a switching connection to the 4160V Center Campus Feeder and the East Campus Feeder from the Power Plant.

The new transformer will increase the feeding capacity from 2000 KVA to 3000 KVA and will correct the phase difference on this portion of the campus distribution system. The updated transformer renovation will draw power from an underground 13,200V distribution line from the Burlington Street Substation, a line having ample capacity. This 13,200V power is presently supplied by the Iowa-Illinois Gas and Electric Co., but within two years will be derived from the 15,000KW turbine generator now being installed at the University Power Plant.

The maximum capability of supplying 4160V power from the feeders emanating from the Power Plant is not great enough to meet growing demands. It is necessary, therefore, to provide additional sources such as this transformer reduction from 13,200V lines.

Inasmuch as no portion of the work exceeds \$10,000, it is proposed that work be accomplished by the Physical Plant department.

The Physical Plant department is selected as the engineer and inspection supervisor.

ART CAMPUS SUBSTATION

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Engineering and supervision	\$ 3,500
Purchase of materials	25,000
General construction	3,000
Electrical construction	8,500
Contingencies	4,000
Total	<u>\$44,000</u>

Source of funds: 64th G. A. Academic Revenue Bonds
General Utilities

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The University is obtaining 4160V power for its Center Feeder from a transformer tie with an overhead line from the Iowa-Illinois Gas and Electric Company. The company has requested the University to discontinue this connection because of increasing demands on the line from other customers. This tie was originally made with the understanding it would be temporary.

Aside from the temporary nature of the tie and the shortage of power therefrom, a more pressing reason exists for its removal. The type of transformer installed on the site delivers 4160V power 30° out of phase with the rest of the University's system, including the power obtained at the Burlington Street and Melrose Avenue substations. This power is fed into the 4160V Center Feeder to supply power to various buildings. This feeder is required to be isolated from the rest of the feeder system at the present time because of the phase difference.

The proposed substation will derive power from an existing underground 13,200V feeder. It will supply 4160V power through a transformer to the Center Feeder which will be in phase with the whole system. This will allow versatile switching of loads from one feeder to another and balancing of feeder loads as required.

Increased electrical reliability for a large number of buildings will result and the useful life of the 4160V feeder system will be extended by avoiding overload conditions.

Project consists of: Purchase and installation of high voltage cable and switch gear; installation of transformer; duct bank construction; necessary electrical connections and construction of an enclosure screen around substation.

Inasmuch as no part of the work exceeds \$10,000, it is proposed that work be accomplished by the Physical Plant department.

The Physical Plant department is selected as the engineer and inspection supervisor.

RENOVATION FOR MEDICAL INTENSIVE CARE UNIT - 3rd FLOOR WEST

PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Planning and Supervision	(4,000)(2)
Construction	55,000
Equipment	(27,000)(1)
Contingency	<u>9,000</u>
Total	<u>\$64,000</u>

(1) To be purchased from University Hospital Equipment Fund, therefore not included in total.

(2) Charged to D480, therefore not included in total.

Source of Funds: University Hospital RR & A Account D050-0886	\$46,100
University Hospital Building Usage Acct Y985-0877	<u>17,900</u>
(Revision of this budget listed earlier)	<u>\$64,000</u>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As a continuing step in the redevelopment of our clinical facilities, we wish now to renovate the former third floor west private maternity suite into a Medical Intensive Care Unit. Completion of this project, which will include seven beds, a blood gas laboratory, and other supporting facilities, will permit separation of medical and surgical ICU functions and thereby substantially enhance our total institutional care of critically ill patients.

This project consists of the redevelopment of 2,500 square feet of space on the third floor west of the General Hospital.

Work to be accomplished consists of relocating doorways, installation of plumbing, vacuum and oxygen outlets, upgrading of electrical services to accommodate monitoring units and other general refurbishing.

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

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board approve the Register of Capital Improvement Business Transactions for the period September 1 - October 6, 1972; the contracts shown above be awarded; the purchase orders for equipment be awarded; the revised project budgets shown above be approved and new projects shown above be approved; the Executive Secretary be authorized to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wallace, and was passed unanimously.

JOHN F. MURRAY ENDOWMENT FUND. The Board was requested to accept the following report and ratify the changes.

Stock Split
\$ 42,250.00

1000 shares of S.S. Kresge Co. common stock Par Value \$1000.00
(\$1 per share) 3 for 1 split Certificate #DXX 46658 Received 7/28/72

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the Board accept the report for the quarter ending 9/30/72; the change as shown above. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY BY THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS - 302 MELROSE AVENUE.

The Board was requested to approve the purchase of property at 302 Melrose Avenue.

Present Owner

Alfred N. and Sue M. Scales

Legal Description

The South 294 feet of the following described premises: Beginning at a point 1767.3 feet East of the Southwest corner of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Sec. 9, Twp. 79 North, Range 6 West of the 5th P.M., thence East 95 feet; thence North 467.6 feet; thence West 95 feet; thence South 467.6 feet to the place of beginning; EXCEPTING THEREFROM the following tract: Beginning at a point 40 feet westerly of the Southeast corner of the above described premises, thence to a point 150 feet North and 50 feet West of said SE corner, thence to a point 75 feet westerly of the NE corner of the North line thereof.

General Description

The land area is 15,750 square feet, zoned R3A (multi-family dwellings). On the land is located a 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ story, wood frame single-family dwelling and a 2-car detached garage. The house consists of a kitchen, living room, parlor, dining room, pantry, 2 bedrooms, den and bathroom on the first floor and a floor attic on the second floor. The house is clean and excellently maintained.

Purchase Price (Appraisals \$40,000 and \$42,000)

The purchase price is \$41,000, payable \$10,000 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 and 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 general campus boundaries and specifically within an area which the university owns all but four of the eleven properties. The property is now being offered for sale by its elderly owners and should be purchased while available at a reasonable price. (\$1,000 below the high appraisal). It is expected that the property will be used for tenant rental until needed for other university purposes.

A trend has developed in Iowa City whereby small parcels of land located near the campus have been purchased for construction of small apartment complexes (6 to 18 units). The location of this property is extremely desirable to potential buyers for apartment construction. If the University fails to buy the property now, it will no doubt be developed into apartments. Future acquisition costs will then be prohibitive.

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the Board approve the purchase of property at 302 Melrose Avenue, Iowa City, Iowa at a purchase price of \$41,000, with \$10,000 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 and merchantable title. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion. On roll call, the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison,
McCartney, Perrin, Petersen,
Wallace, Redeker

NAY: None

ABSENT: Shaw

GENERAL HOSPITAL ADDITION. The Board was requested to approve the adoption of a resolution terminating contract for architectural services.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the State Board of Regents and the Architects for the University of Iowa Hospital Project (a joint venture consisting of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill and Architects Hansen Lind Meyer), in consultation with the Architect's Office, The University of Iowa, entered into an agreement dated October 5, 1970, for architect-engineer services in connection with the proposed General Hospital Addition to be located at 605 Newton Road, Iowa City, Iowa; and

WHEREAS, said Hospital Addition was to be partially financed by Federal funds which are now no longer available due to cuts in Federal spending, and it has therefore become necessary to halt planning for said project; and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 1970, the Architects submitted a series of alternate schemes for temporarily closing down the architectural planning, and on December 21, 1970, the Coordinating Committee for Hospital Planning of the University approved Scheme I of said proposals; and

WHEREAS, on December 31, 1970, Dr. Robert C. Hardin, Vice Provost and Dean of Health Affairs, by letter notified the Architects of the adoption of Scheme I; and

WHEREAS, the requirements of Scheme I have now been completed and the Architects have been paid for all services rendered relating to the project close out; and

WHEREAS, Section 9 of said agreement dated October 5, 1970, provides that either party shall have the right at any time to terminate said agreement upon written notice to the other party;

NOW, THEREFORE, Be It and It is Hereby Resolved by the State Board of Regents of the State of Iowa as follows:

1. That the agreement dated October 5, 1970, between the State Board of Regents and the Architects for the University of Iowa Hospital is hereby terminated.
2. That the Executive Secretary of this board is authorized and directed to give written notice of said termination to the Architects for the University of Iowa Hospital pursuant to Section 9 of said agreement.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board approve the above Resolution terminating the contract for architectural services. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

PURCHASE OF JEFFERSON BUILDING - SEVEN FLOORS. The Board was requested to approve the exercise of option to acquire seven floors of the Jefferson Building.

At its meeting August 10-11, 1967 the State Board of Regents approved a lease between the University of Iowa Facilities Corporation and the State Board of Regents of the State of Iowa for the use and benefit of the State University of Iowa for the use of the top seven floors of the Jefferson Building. (43,040 sq. ft.)

The lease was for a term of 5 years at a rate of \$32,000 a year with the provision that at the end of the 5-year term the purchase option would be completed upon payment of \$50,000 plus a sum equal to the amount of interest paid by the Iowa Facilities Corporation to the Iowa City Hotel Company on \$210,000 of the purchase price under its contract. The interest paid by the University of Iowa Facilities Corporation on this amount is computed to be \$44,246.49.

It is requested that the Regents approve exercise of the option to acquire seven floors of the Jefferson Building for a final payment of \$94,246.49 (\$50,000.00 + \$44,246.49) from Treasurer's Temporary Investments, subject to the approval of the Executive Council.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board approve the option to acquire seven floors of the Jefferson Building, subject to approval of the Executive Council. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. On roll call, the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison, McCartney
Perrin, Petersen, Wallace,
Redeker

NAY: None

ABSENT: Shaw

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

The following business pertaining to Iowa State University was transacted on Thursday, October 19, 1972.

APPOINTMENT. The Board was requested to approve the following:

Lee R. Kolmer - Dean, College of Agriculture; Director, Agriculture Experiment Station; and Professor of Economics; effective on or before March 1, 1973. Salary as budgeted, twelve months' basis, plus annuity.

A Board Member expressed that he was very pleased with the above appointment.

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved the Board approve the above appointment. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The following business pertaining to Iowa State University was transacted on Friday, October 20, 1972.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month September 1972, were approved.

1973-75 CATALOG CHANGES. The Board was requested to approve the 1973-75 catalog changes.

MOTION: Mr. Perrin moved the Board refer the 1973-75 catalog changes to the Interinstitutional Educational Coordination Committee for its review, comments, and recommendations. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Several Regents commended ISU on the good job done in reviewing courses and achieving a more concentrated listing of course and credit offerings.

President Parks stated that 320 courses were dropped, while 260 courses were added. It was noted that 123 of the drops came about because of the phase-out

of Technical Institute. Without this consideration, net courses added were 260; dropped were 197 courses. A complete copy of the 1973-75 Catalog Changes is on file at the Board Office.

CONSOLIDATION OF DEPARTMENTS. The Board was requested to approve consolidation of three departments into two in the College of Engineering.

Approval was requested, effective July 1, 1973, for the consolidation of the undergraduate curriculum in Engineering Science, presently administered by the Department of Nuclear Engineering, with the Department of Engineering Mechanics. Upon consolidation the new department will be renamed the Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics. ISU also requested that its graduate program in Nuclear Engineering be associated administratively with the Department of Chemical Engineering and the combined department be renamed the Department of Chemical Engineering and Nuclear Engineering. These administrative changes will eliminate the need for the present Department of Nuclear Engineering, will provide more efficient and flexible programs, and will effect economies within the College.

The net result of the combinations of Engineering Science with Engineering Mechanics and of Nuclear Engineering with Chemical Engineering will be the elimination of one department (Nuclear Engineering), greater emphasis on engineering science as a major engineering discipline at the under graduate level, and more efficient administration of existing programs. No new courses or programs are being introduced and no new staff will be required. Some reduction in staff may occur because of the more efficient administration and through combinations of staff with allied interests and capabilities. Additional salary savings will be made by the elimination of a department head's position. The combination outlined, however, grew out of pedagogical as well as economical considerations.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board approve the above consolidation of departments. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

STUDENT TEACHING AGREEMENTS FOR 1972-73. The Board was requested to approve the following Student Teaching Agreements for the 1972-73 academic year:

Ackley-Geneva
Area VI Community College Administration Center
Clarinda
Estherville
Griswold
Indianola
M-F-L
Mason City
NESCO
Sioux City

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board approve the above student teaching agreements for the 1972-73 academic year. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

LAND TRANSFER FROM HUNZIKER AND FURMAN BUILDERS TO IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY. The Board was requested to grant authority to request the Executive Council of the State of Iowa to accept a gift of land by warranty deed of a plot of ground approximately 9,326 square feet, located as described below, to be the property of the state of Iowa for the use and benefit of Iowa State University.

When Hunziker and Furman Builders purchased Jensen Gardens for land development the east side of their property line was the west side of the Iowa State University golf course. This property line runs generally north and south, but is uneven from the northeast corner to the southeast corner of Jensen Gardens. A portion of this land has no commercial value to Hunziker and Furman Builders, so they are willing to deed it to Iowa State University. This will result in a straight line connecting the northeast and southeast corners of Jensen Gardens.

This land may possibly be used in the future to lengthen a fairway at the golf course. The following is a legal description of this land:

The East 33.0 feet of Lot 5 in the SW 1/4 of Section 33, Township 84 N, Range 24 W of the 5th P.M., Story County, Iowa. More particularly described as commencing at the intersection of the west line of said section 33 and the North Right-of-Way line of the Chicago and Northwestern Railway; thence S 85°05'10"E., along said R.O.W. line a distance of 661.72 feet to the point of beginning; thence N 0°17'10"E, 280.83 feet;

thence S 89°42'50"E., 33.0 feet; thence S 0°17'10"W., 283.51 feet to the North line of said C & NW RR R.O.W.; thence N 85°05'10"W, along said R.O.W. 33.10 feet to the point of beginning.

The Board members expressed thanks to Hunziker and Furman Builders for this gift of land.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board request the Executive Council to accept a gift of land by warranty deed of a plot of ground approximately 9,326 square feet, located as described above. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion. On roll call vote, the following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison,
McCartney, Perrin, Petersen,
Wallace, Redeker

NAY: None

ABSENT: Shaw

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INSTITUTIONAL ROAD. The Board was requested to approve the establishment of the institutional road and the public crossing of the railroad in accordance with Chapter 306.10 and 306.18, Code of Iowa 1971.

It is proposed that a new institutional road be established connecting Elwood Drive to South Riverside Drive and extending to the Chicago and Northwestern Railway right of way. This new institutional road will be known as South 16th Street and will serve as the main access road to the new Veterinary Medicine Facilities which are presently being constructed adjacent to this road.

The sub-base for this road is being constructed by the contractor on the Veterinary Medicine Facilities with fill material which is being removed from the construction site. The contractor is compacting and constructing this road to suitable standards with a rock surface at no cost to the State of Iowa in exchange for allowing the contractor to reduce the haul on the remaining excess earth being removed from the site.

It is anticipated that the City of Ames will improve this new institutional road as they have already sold bonds to construct the bridge across Worle Creek. When the City of Ames surfaces this road, it is anticipated that they would assess the State of Iowa up to the statutory limit of \$20,000.

DESCRIPTION:

70 feet each side of a line described as beginning 325.03 feet North and 33 feet West of the North 1/4 Corner, Section 15, Township 83 West, Range 24 North of the 5th P.M., Story County, Iowa; thence North 84°18'30" West 275.76 feet; thence along a 636.32 foot radius curve concave to the right 567.67 feet; thence North 33°13'00" West 579.87 feet to the South line of Elwood Drive; also 70 feet each side of a line described as beginning 325.03 feet North and 33 feet East of the North 1/4 Corner, Section 15, Township 83 West, Range 24 North of the 5th P.M., Story County, Iowa; thence South 84°18'30" East 261.90 feet; thence along a 636.62 foot radius curve concave to the right 154.60 feet; thence South 57°00'30" East 46.86 feet to the West line of the Chicago and Northwestern right-of-way.

Mr. Moore stated that this project probably would not be completed for two or three more years. The staff of the Highway Commission had been notified and the Executive Council would be informed.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board approve the establishment of the institutional road as set out above. Mr. McCartney seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

ANNEXATION OF PROPERTY BY THE CITY OF AMES. The Board was asked to approve a request to the City of Ames to annex the property surrounding the Ames Laboratory Reactor.

It is proposed that the City of Ames be requested to annex the property which surrounds the Ames Laboratory Reactor in order that existing and future services can be provided in this area by the City. The legal description is as follows:

The Northwest 1/4 Southeast 1/4, the Northeast 1/4 Southeast 1/4, The Southwest 1/4 Northeast 1/4, the Southeast 1/4 Northeast 1/4, all in Section 32, Township 84 North, Range 24 West of the 5th P.M. Story County, Iowa.

Also the South 48.5 rods of the Northeast 1/4 Northeast 1/4 said Section 32.

Also the West 5 acres of the South 1/2 of the Southwest 1/4 Northwest 1/4 and the West 5 acres of the North 1/2 of the Northwest 1/4 Southwest 1/4 in Section 33, Township 84 North, Range 24 West of the 5th P.M., Story County, Iowa.

Presently the City provides electricity and water utilities to the property under contract with the Ames Laboratory and fire protection under contract with the University. With the construction of a sub-development east of this property, it is anticipated that the University will on occasion need to ask the City to send its police and animal control officers to the property. Also the City has agreed to take over the maintenance and snow removal of several institutional roads located on this property under contract with the Iowa Highway Commission, and there is some question as to whether or not the City can legally do this for roads located outside of the City limits.

The property is presently not served by a sanitary sewer. If and when the City decides to extend such a utility to the area, the State of Iowa would be assessed its share of said sewer. It is not anticipated that the sanitary sewer will be extended to this property in the near future.

Except for the possibility of an assessment for a sanitary sewer, there appears to be no other cost to the University or the State of Iowa as a result of this annexation proposal.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board request the City of Ames to annex the property surrounding the Ames Laboratory Reactor. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion. On Roll Call vote, the following voted:
AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison, McCartney, Perrin, Petersen, Wallace, Redeker
NAY: None
ABSENT: Shaw

EASEMENT FOR UNDERGROUND CABLE TO NORTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY. The Board was requested to approve and authorize the securing of approval from the State Executive Council for an underground cable easement to the Northwestern Bell Telephone Company.

The Northwestern Bell Telephone Company is requesting permission to bury its telephone cables from Ames, Iowa, to Kelly, Iowa, on the west side of State Street as shown on the attached map. This will furnish storm-proof service to customers in this vicinity.

The cable will be buried 42 inches deep by a machine similar to a subsoiler which does not disturb the ground or interfere with farming over the cable.

The form of the easement agreement will be that as previously prescribed by the Board of Regents and used by Iowa State University, which includes the description of the easement area, indemnification of the State of Iowa, the State Board of Regents and Iowa State University, and the remainder of the standard provisions. No costs will accrue to the State of Iowa or to Iowa State University as a result of approval of this easement.

Compensation for the easement was verbally set forth by Mr. Moore.

Regent McCartney questioned the agreement because all rights in the future to ever build on this property would be given up by the easement. Another Regent stated that usually the company will move the cable, but at considerable expense.

It was suggested that the easement be re-written to require the company to waive payment if the cable needed to be covered, etc., for an access drive.

MOTION:

Mrs. Petersen moved the Board defer action on this matter and that it be further investigated and any recommendations be brought back to the Board for its approval. Mr. McCartney seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

CENTRAL CONTROL SYSTEMS. The Board was requested to approve a contract for engineering services with Environmental Engineers, Inc., Ames, Iowa.

It is proposed to enter into an engineering services contract with Environmental Engineers, Inc., for a feasibility study of a central control system serving not only the new Veterinary Medicine Facilities, but the entire university campus as previously brought to the attention of the Board, June, 1972.

The Phase I portion of the study would:

1. Provide an estimate of various energy loads and demands on the buildings for both summer and winter.
2. Present an analysis of each building with regard to the types of mechanical systems.
3. Give potential savings and energy in man hours through use of an automated control system.
4. Provide a description of the type of automated control system which could be incorporated into a network.
5. Deal with the adequacy of outdoor security lighting, adequacy of indoor fire and smoke detection, and fire protection facilities such as standard types of sprinklers.
6. Give an estimated cost of the proposed automated system.

The Phase II portion of the study, which would be initiated after approval and acceptance of Phase I, would be an in-depth analysis of each building surveyed. This analysis would include:

1. Up-to-date statements and schematic diagrams of the various systems in the building.
2. Recommendations for minimum upgrading of the systems for better environmental control.
3. Recommendations for each type of equipment regarding such components as bearings, filters, motors, etc., which need to be serviced on a periodic basis.
4. Recommendations regarding the type of fire protection to be added or extended.
5. Recommendations regarding building security.
6. Recommendations regarding the automated control of the equipment, including a programming for preventive maintenance on the various components.
7. A statement of the cost and type of system required for the automatic control system.

The contract for engineering services for the feasibility study will be in the standard form with the following specific provisions:

1. Engineering firm shall be compensated for its design services on this project at a rate not to exceed \$10.00 per hour for time of principals and registered engineers, and direct payroll cost for all other personnel times a multiplier of 2.3. The multiplier applies to direct payroll cost and covers all overhead items such as vacations, holidays, sickness, training, bonuses, social security, workmen's compensation, routine clerical work, typing and administrative costs such as general supervision by the principals.
2. The engineering firm will not charge in excess of the above and in no case will the total charges for the Phase I portion of the study exceed \$5,000 and the Phase II portion of the study exceed \$35,000.
3. The university will reserve the right to cancel the contract at any time with zero termination costs, and in no case will the amount due the engineering firm exceed the above amounts.

The contract will provide that the engineer may not start the Phase II portion of the study until the Phase I portion has been approved and the engineer given a notice to proceed on the Phase II portion in writing by the university. Should the university decide that the Phase I study does not justify proceeding with the Phase II portion of the study, the university may, at its option, notify the engineer that the remainder of the contract is cancelled and that the university will have no obligation beyond the sum agreed to for the Phase I portion of the study.

The funds for this study will be provided from overhead reimbursements for use of facilities.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board approve the contract for engineering services with Environmental Engineers, Inc., Ames, Iowa. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. Executive Secretary Richey reported the Register of Capital Improvement Business Transactions for the period September 15 - October 19, 1972, had been filed with him, was in order and was recommended for approval.

In absence of objection, President Redeker declared the Register of Capital Improvement Business Transactions for the period September 15 - October 19, 1972, approved.

CHANGE ORDER FOR VETERINARY MEDICINE FACILITIES - PHASE I. The Board was requested to approve a change order for Veterinary Medicine Facilities - Phase I.

The soils engineering report for this project prepared by Layne-Western Company, Inc., in July of 1969, indicated the strong possibility that subsurface water could be a problem during the construction of the building foundation system. As an accurate assessment of the extent of the problem could not be made at that time because of the limited information normally obtainable from conventional soil borings, it was inadvisable to include specifications for remedial measures in the bid documents.

Shortly after excavation work began in August of 1972, it became obvious that the subsurface moisture present in at least that part of the site that had been excavated was so great that equipment mobility was seriously impaired, footings and foundations could not be formed, nor could the spongy soil be counted on to provide proper support for the structure at the levels indicated on the structural drawings.

The soil mechanics division of the Layne-Western Company was called in by the university to assess the conditions at the site and to recommend a solution to the problem. A copy of their report of August 25, 1972, is attached.

The remedies recommended in this report have been effected and have proven effective in solving the problem. As the extent to which these measures would have to be carried could not be determined until more of the site had been excavated, it was not possible to accurately determine the cost of this extra work prior to proceeding with it. Unit prices for gravel fill and extra excavation had been agreed upon, however, prior to the onset of the work. These unit prices were reviewed and approved by Layne-Western Company and Iowa State University physical plant department, and work has proceeded on the basis of the following prices:

Approved gravel fill in place and compacted	\$3.75 per ton
Excavation to undercut for fill	\$2.00 per cu. yd.
Extra trench excavation	\$2.00 per cu. yd.

At this time the excavation work is about fifty percent complete and, fortunately, the subsurface conditions have been improving steadily as excavation proceeds from northeast to southwest. Consequently, we are now able to estimate the cost of this extra work to be approximately \$120,000. The exact cost will not be known until all remedial work is completed and an accurate accounting is made of receipted material delivery tickets.

This will be treated as a conventional change order to the construction contract, but will be handled through a purchase order since the architect for the project has provided no services in behalf of the work. Also, because the payments due contractors on this project are tied into a computerized progress schedule, it is extremely difficult and costly to accommodate change orders of undertermined magnitude in the cost assignment section of this system.

At the time that the contracts for Phase II are submitted for approval, the revised project budget will be adjusted to reflect this change order.

In response to questions, Mr. Moore explained that the prices were very reasonable for the conditions involved in the project.

MOTION:

Mr. Baldrige moved the Board approve the change order for Veterinary Medicine Facilities - Phase I as described above. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

The following business pertaining to the University of Northern Iowa was transacted on Friday, October 20, 1972.

GRIEVANCE APPEAL - JAMES J. HIDUKE - REQUEST FOR A HEARING. Those present for discussion were Mr. Hiduke, Mr. David Morgan (representing Mr. Hiduke), Dr. Daniel Cahill, Professor and Head of English Language and Literature Department, Dean Harry Ausprich, College of Humanities and Fine Arts and Professor Joseph Fox.

Mr. Redeker stated that the only question to be decided was whether or not to hear the appeal of Mr. Hiduke and that discussion should be limited to that point. The Board had before it extensive written material relating to this matter.

All parties were given an opportunity to express their views on the question.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved that the Board deny the appeal for a hearing by Mr. James Hiduke. Mrs. Collison seconded the motion. The following voted:

AYE: Bailey, Baldrige, Collison,
McCartney, Perrin, Petersen,
Redeker

NAY: Wallace

ABSENT: Shaw

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of October, 1972, were ratified.

ANNUAL REPORT OF RESIGNATIONS AND LEAVES OF ABSENCE. In accordance with the Procedural Guide of the State Board of Regents, a summary report including resignations and leaves of absence for personnel covered under Sections 4.04 and 4.05 was presented to the Board. Resignations of personnel having temporary or probationary status were not included in this report. A complete copy of this report is on file at the Board Office.

Dr. Martin stated that there was a slight increase in resignations this year over last year. He also stated that there were fewer Post-doctoral Professional Leaves this year than in the past year.

APPOINTMENT. The Board was requested to approve the following appointment:

Dr. Louis Hellwig - as Acting Head of the Department of Psychology
He was appointed Assistant Professor of Psychology at the
University of Northern Iowa in 1965. He is a graduate of New
Mexico State University with B.A. and M.A. degrees in Psychology
and he received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Missouri.
He has published and has presented papers at professional meetings.
He is a member of Pi Gamma Mu Social Science Fraternity.

In absence of any objection, President Redeker declared the above appointment approved.

CONTRACT - THORSON, BROM, BROSHAR, SNYDER, ARCHITECTS OF WATERLOO, IOWA. The Board was requested to ratify Executive Secretary's approval of the following contract for consulting services to assist the University Planning Department to ascertain whether one or two multi-purpose buildings or three special purpose buildings are required in terms of institutional needs and in terms of getting the most efficient use of building funds. The architects are Thorson, Brom, Broshar, Snyder, of Waterloo, Iowa. The contract follows:

Dear Mr. Jennings:

As you know, we have been contacted by Dr. Leland Thomson regarding the possibility of our providing consulting services for your planning work now in progress. We understand that you wish us to develop the required planning tools which you need for your forthcoming Regents meeting on October 19th and 20th. We further understand that your University departments will have their input to us by the 25th of September, making approximately two weeks available for our work. We would be most happy to do this consulting service for you with our fee based upon the actual hours expended, as we have done on other projects in the past. Our charges for this service would be as follows:

	<u>1966 Rate</u>
Partners.....	\$20.00
Associates.....	17.50
Registered Architects.....	15.00
Graduate Architects.....	12.50
Architectural Draftsmen.....	10.00
Secretary.....	6.00
	<u>\$ 17.00</u>
	11.40
	8.90
	6.00
	4.80

You understand, of course, that the University would have the right to request an actual accounting of time and expenses recorded, if they so desire. Also, you realize we will only do work as specifically authorized by the University.

Since we are so familiar with your campus and its program, we feel our time can be used very productively and that a valid information package can be developed for the Regents without wasted effort. Any program of this kind will, of course, rely heavily on the University's input, and we are pleased to know that much thought has already been given to the areas you wish to investigate, and that most of the raw material will be available for use in the very near future.

We would look forward to working with you in this necessary and important programming phase of your capital improvements design.

Sincerely,
THORSON-BROM-BROSHAR-SNYDER, ARCHITECTS

Approved for the Regents

R. Wayne Richey
Executive Secretary

Date 9/27/72

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Board confirm Executive Secretary approval of the above contract with Thorson, Brom, Broshar, Snyder, architects of Waterloo, Iowa, for consulting services. Mr. Perrin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

EDUCATION CENTER, UNIT I -- EQUIPMENT. The Board was requested to ratify actions of the Executive Secretary in approving purchase of \$15,790.75 in equipment for Education Building, funded by Academic Revenue Bonds.

Since the September meeting, two special situations arose relative to purchase of equipment for this building.

List 5 contains purchases totaling \$12,615.55 - all purchases utilizing GSA pricing. UNI was able to effect savings totaling \$1,100 through using the Federal prices. It was understood that use of Federal supply contracts had been cut off by HEW. However, later information indicated that use of such contracts had been continued for the time being. The indefinite nature of this commitment to continue led UNI to ask for approval on these purchases.

In the two instances where other than the low bid is the GSA pricing, backup justification was provided.

List 6 contains purchases totaling \$3,175.20. In this instance, the university determined additional tables and chairs were needed. The Board earlier ratified the actions in approving purchase of certain tables and chairs. The University determined that the vendor on the earlier order would hold open his price and permit purchase of additional tables and chairs at the previous level.

To permit the University to take advantage of this offer, and to gain delivery at an earlier date than possible if approval had to wait until October 19-20, the Executive Secretary approved this extension on the original amount ordered.

With these purchases, some \$200,718.46 of the \$350,000 available is expended.

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the Board ratify actions of the Executive Secretary in approving purchase of \$15,790.75 in equipment for the Education Building funded by Academic Revenue Bonds. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

ARCHITECT CONTRACT -- DURRANT, DEININGER, DOMMER, KRAMER, GORDON, DUBUQUE, IOWA.

The Board was requested to approve an additional \$6,020 fee to the Architects, for the Biological Research and Small Animal Building.

Mr. Jennings, UNI Business Manager, stated that by letter of October 11, 1972, Durrant, Deininger, Dommer, Kramer, Gordon, Architects, had accepted the terms and conditions as set forth in Mr. Jennings letter of October 10, 1972, and accepted \$6,020 as full settlement of the claim for extra services rendered.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board approve an additional \$6,020 fee to the Architects - Durrant, Deininger, Dommer, Kramer, Gordon, Dubuque, Iowa, in final settlement of their claim for extra services rendered on Biological Research and Small Animal Building. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. Executive Secretary Richey reported the Register of Capital Improvement Business Transactions for the period September 13 to October 11, 1972 had been filed with him, was in order and was recommended for approval.

The following Construction Contracts were recommended for approval, subject to the Board waiving certain irregularities in four instances:

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>AWARDEE</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTRACT</u> <u>ITEM</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Library Addition, Unit II	John G. Miller Construc- tion Co., Waterloo, Iowa	General	\$ 1,194,789.00
" " " "	Young Plumbing and Htg. Co., Waterloo, Iowa	Mechanical	358,450.00
" " " "	Paulson Electric Inc., Waterloo, Iowa	Electrical	288,000.00
* " " "	Ed Turnquist Co., Dubuque, Iowa	Carpet	36,795.00

*(The bid bond submitted was slightly different than that specified and previously approved by the Board, but in the opinion of Mr. Leo Baker, the form submitted satisfies the specifications and is in compliance. Therefore, waiver of this irregularity appears to be proper.)

** " " " "	Powers Regulator Co., Des Moines, Iowa	Temperature Control	20,500.00
------------	---	------------------------	-----------

** (Three bids were submitted. The only bid fully responsive to specifications was: Honeywell, Inc., Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (2nd lowest bidder -- \$20,776) The question of response centers around type of bid security submitted. Honeywell submitted a bid bond.

Specifications state: Section 0-page 5 - Conditions of the Contract - "Each bid must be accompanied by cash, certified check of the bidder, or a bid bond prepared on the form attached hereto, duly executed by the bidder as principal and having as surety thereon a surety company approved by the owner, in the amount of 5% of the bid"

Security submitted by the other two bidders was cashier's check -- not specified as permissible. These bids were:

Johnson Service Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa (High bidder)	\$21,776
Powers Regulator Co., Des Moines, Iowa (Low bidder)	\$20,500

Powers Regulator, on the afternoon of October 12, on its own volition submitted a certified check in substitution of its cashier's check. Some question remains as to the validity of the cashier's check as proper bid security. A copy of a brief on the use of cashier's checks as bid security prepared by an attorney for Powers Regulator was attached. The Board was informed that cashier's checks cannot be permitted.

It appeared that the Board could waive the irregularity and accept the Powers bid (different in bids is \$276). Irregularity waived would be the late submission of proper bid security.)

***Baker Hall - Interior Painting	Clutes Painting Co., Waterloo, Iowa	Painting	13,899.00
--------------------------------------	--	----------	-----------

*** (Section 16 of the Instructions to Bidders states: "Work shall start as soon as possible after award of contract and be completed by January 1, 1973."

The low bidder stated his inability to complete prior to February 12, 1973. It was recommended that this irregularity be waived.)

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>AWARDEE</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTRACT ITEM</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
****Reroofing of Regents' Dining Room and Lounge Building - Unit I	Cedar Service Co., Cedar Falls, Iowa	Roofing	\$ 26,667.00

****(Bid security submitted was a bid bond but not in proper Board approved format. The firm was requested to substitute its bid bond for one in compliance with specs. This has been accomplished, waiver was recommended.)

The following New Project was recommended for approval:

COMMONS REMODELING FOR EDUCATIONAL MEDIA CENTER

Project Description

The Educational Media Center, formerly partially housed in Gilchrist Hall, has been moved into areas of the Commons Building. This proposal encompasses use of parts of all four floors of the building and totals approximately 18,000 sq.ft. or fifty-five per cent (55%) of the net assignable space.

The basement locker area (1,650 sq.ft.) is to be a darkroom/processing facility. Removal of existing toilet/shower fixtures is necessary. Two walls, four process sinks, and required lighting will be installed. The west side of the ground floor (3,780 sq.ft.) is to be a graphics production facility and studio. A new wall enclosure, two sinks, and a large amount of surface wiring is required. The first floor work (730 sq.ft.) on the east side of the building involves the Department Head's office. Two walls, new lighting and carpet complete the area. Draperies are also required for the high windows in the south entry porch, now an audio/visual center. The mezzanine area (2,200 sq.ft.) is presently being made secure for a media laboratory. New lighting, several outlets, and one new wall are required.

Approximately 8,360 sq.ft. of space will be included for remodeling and painting as required for full operation beginning the second semester.

Project Budget

Estimated Expenditures:

CONTRACT	\$30,000.00
PHYSICAL PLANT WORK	3,000.00
CONTINGENCIES	4,000.00
	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$37,000.00

Source of Funds: Unallocated Funds - 63rd G.A.

Several Board Members stated that more specific language should be used in these forms, so as to discourage irregularities. The lowest possible bid should be the ultimate goal, and every possible way should be used to attain this goal. Institutions should exercise particular care in setting completion dates; language on non-acceptability of cashier's checks should be written.

MOTION:

Mr. Wallace moved the Register of Capital Improvement Business Transactions for the period September 13 - October 19, 1972, be approved; the contracts as shown above be awarded; the irregularities be waived; the new project be approved; the Executive Secretary be authorized to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perrin, and it passed unanimously.

ARCHITECT CONTRACT - APPROVAL OF EXTRA COMPENSATION TO THORSON, BROM, BROSHAR, SNYDER. The Board was requested to approve extra compensation to Thorson, Brom, Broshar, Snyder Architects for redesign of the plaza area of the Education Center.

It is requested that Education Center Plaza be redesigned to fit the site limitations now existing in that area of the central campus. The present Plaza design will eliminate the only hockey field now available to the Women's Physical Education Department and will cause them to cancel or severely limit that part of their program. This problem has arisen because the new Physical Education play fields will not be ready for use, for certain, until the Fall semester, 1974. It was anticipated that with ideal growing conditions the seeding would be ready for use this Fall, but less than ideal conditions prevailed.

The entire Plaza should be reconsidered and reduced in size to fit the new site limitations. The cost of redesigning this area will not exceed \$1000.

MOTION:

Mr. Bailey moved the Board approve extra compensation to Thorson, Brom, Broshar, Snyder, Architects, for the above project. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

IOWA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

The following business pertaining to the Iowa School for the Deaf was transacted on Friday, October 20, 1972.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions reported in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of September, 1972, were approved.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. The Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the month of September, 1972, contained no items.

BIDDING DATE ON GIRLS' DORMITORY ADDITION. It was reported that bids are to be received on the Girl's Dormitory Addition on November 2, 1972. Recommendations on award of contracts will be made at the November meeting.

Plans and specifications have been drawn in such a manner as to permit continuous construction through the two phases to completion if second phase funding is received from the 1973 General Assembly.

Approximately \$255,000 is available to begin construction.

Plans have been drawn, however, so that if funding is not received to continue the project, the institution will have a usable structure with 12 dormitory rooms. The total project includes 36 dormitory rooms, a meeting room, and lounges.

REPORT BY SUPERINTENDENT. Superintendent Giangreco reported that the 1972 fall enrollment is 392 students. This enrollment is down approximately 4% from last year's enrollment. He stated that this was due primarily to transfers out-of-state by parents.

He further added that the West Dormitory Remodeling, Main Building, is just about completed, and that the parents have been very enthusiastic about the improvement.

Superintendent Giangreco reported that he is working with Iowa Western and the

Iowa School for the Deaf
October 19-20, 1972

Board Office on a proposal relative to Federal Vocational education funds.

IOWA BRAILLE AND SIGHT SAVING SCHOOL

The following business pertaining to the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School was transacted on Friday, October 20, 1972.

REGISTER OF PERSONNEL CHANGES. The actions in the Register of Personnel Changes for the month of September, 1972, were approved.

REGISTER OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. The Register of Capital Improvements Business Transactions for the month of September 1972 contained no items.

APPROVAL OF EXTENDED USE OF SWIMMING POOL FACILITIES. The Board was requested to approve the use of the swimming pool facilities at IBSSS by the Vinton Aquatic Club.

The Vinton Aquatic Club has requested the use of the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School swimming pool and locker room area from the hours of 5:45 to 9:00 p.m. each Thursday from November 9, 1972, through April 19, 1973, with the exception of November 23; plus two Saturday afternoons to be selected later for competitive meets.

The Vinton Aquatic Club will pay a fee of \$300.00 for the Thursday use and \$15.00 per meet for the Saturday use.

The Vinton Aquatic Club shall purchase an insurance policy covering the limits as required by the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School.

MOTION:

Mr. Perrin moved the Board approve the request of the Vinton Aquatic Club to use the IBSSS swimming pool facilities from November 9, 1972, through April 19, 1973. Mr. McCartney seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

KITCHEN-FAMILY ROOM PROJECT, SUPERINTENDENT'S RESIDENCE. The Board was requested to authorize the employment of Brown Healey Bock, architects, for the renovation of Kitchen-Family Room and Interior Design Consultation for Superintendent's Residence.

Scope of Services

Discuss in detail the requirements and any preferences for the above entitled project.

Check the plans and existing structure to determine the ramifications of removing certain portions of partitions.

Prepare preliminary drawings and an estimate for approval. Prepare limited working drawings for the carpenter to follow in executing the work, consult with the carpenter and be prepared to visit the site once or twice during the construction period. Make enough drawings so that the carpenter can proceed with the work but not complete plans and specifications that would normally be required for bidding purposes.

Visit the house and provide the necessary consultation and recommendations for improving the decor.

Suggest the kind of treatment and furniture layout that is felt would be successful in the new family room.

Cost of Services

Above services can be accomplished with a \$500.00 top limit. Charges are based on the regular hourly rate plus travel and out-of-pocket expenses. Hourly rate for the interior designer is \$10.00. Architect's and draftsmen's rates range from \$10.00 to \$25.00 per hour.

MOTION:

Mr. McCartney moved the Board approve the authorization to employ Brown, Healey Bock, architects, for the above described project. Mr. Baldrige seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT. There being no further business, President Redaker declared the public meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m., Friday, October 20, 1972.

Following the meeting, Board Members toured the West Dormitory Remodeling project.


R. Wayne Richay, Executive Secretary 267