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The Board of Regents of Murray State University met September 26, 1981, at 9:00 a.m. in the Board Room, Third Floor, Wells Hall, on the campus of the University. The following members were present: Mr. J. W. Carneal, Dr. Charles E. Howard, Mr. Mark McClure, Mr. Jere McCuiston, Mr. Bill Morgan, Mrs. Sara Page, Dr. Ed Settle, Mr. Steve West, Mr. Jerry Woodall, and Mr. Ron Christopher, Chairman, presiding.

None were absent.

Also present were Dr. Constantine W. Curris, President; Mrs. Patzy R. Dyer, Secretary of the Board; Mr. Don Chamberlain, Acting Treasurer of the Board; Vice-Presidents Richard Butwell, Marshall Gordon, Jim Hall, Frank Julian; University Attorney James O. Overby; Dr. Tom Posey, President of the Faculty Senate; members of the news media and visitors.

Chairman Christopher called the meeting to order and Dr. Butwell led in prayer.

The following agenda was presented for the meeting:

AGENDA
for
Meeting of the Board of Regents
Murray State University
Saturday, September 26, 1981
9:00 a.m.

1. Minutes of the Meeting held on May 9, 1981 (delayed)

2. Request from the Non-Academic Personnel Committee (Joe Dyer)

3. Update on University Tenure Committee’s action on Dr. Don Johnson’s request

4. Special Report
   A. Overview of the Budget Process (Jim Hall)

   (copies supplied to members on September 5)

6. Board of Regents Response to Governor John Y. Brown

7. Recognition for Appreciation

8. Nominations to the Board of Directors of the National Museum of the Boy Scouts of America

9. Executive Session
   A. Personnel Item: Report on discussion between Mr. Christopher, Mr. Carneal, and Dr. Curris

Mr. Christopher stated that it has been suggested that the agenda be rearranged and that the executive session be first.

Mr. McCuiston moved that the Board go into executive session for the purpose of discussing a personnel item concerning the report from Mr. Christopher, Mr. Carneal, and Dr. Curris. Dr. Settle seconded.

Mr. Christopher: All those in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

To visitors and members of the press, we will try to keep this as brief as we possibly can.
The executive session began at 9:15 a.m. and ended at 11:00 a.m. The meeting reconvened in public session at 11:05 a.m.

President Curris left the meeting to attend the meeting of the Murray State University Foundation of Trustees.

Mr. Christopher: The minutes of the meeting held on May 9, 1981, are in my custody. I reviewed about three-fourths of them, and I thought I'd be able to do it last night; however, everything appears to be in order, and she also has the rough transcripts of all other meetings.

Item 2, Request from the Non-Academic Personnel Committee. I think everyone received a copy of Joe Dyer's letter. Last week, Joe and several members of the Committee came to my office. I told them at that time that I thought the appropriate thing to do would be to put their request on the agenda for the next meeting, that this has been somewhat the procedure in the past. It is my understanding that Joe Dyer is chairman, and, Joe, would you come forward and explain your request, set out your reasons, and the Board may have questions.

Mr. Joe Dyer: First, Mr. Christopher, let me express the gratitude of the staff for allowing us to come before the Board. I would also like to recognize that several of the members of the staff and the Non-Academic Personnel Committee are in attendance.

With your permission, I have something I would like to hand out. We'll try not to take a great deal of your time recognizing that you're on a limited time schedule. I think that the letter that we sent to you, hopefully, is self-explanatory. Our purpose in being here, I suppose, is two-fold. We would like to assure you that our movement, the thing that we're trying to accomplish, is positive, that we have the interest of Murray State University foremost in our minds. We would also like for you to be aware of the steps that we have taken if you have questions, and the fact that we will be pursuing in the 1982 session of the Legislature, the passage—actually the amendment—of the existing law concerning governing boards of state universities to allow a voting staff member. I think what I have handed out to you is again self-explanatory in nature. There is a generalized statement on the first page of why we feel we need staff representation. There is a breakdown on the second page of the numbers of staff members that you have at Murray State University and faculty members. There is a copy of the KRS that we will be amending in the 1982 Legislature. There is a copy of a letter that we are preparing to send to Legislators. I would like to say that our mailing and our telephone calls and those things that we will be doing in conjunction with the passage of our bill will not be at University expense; we will handle it ourselves. I am open to questions. The people behind me will be happy to respond.

The second thing that we have asked for is an endorsement in fact by asking you gentlemen and Mrs. Page to allow us to have a non-voting member as part of this body. I'm open to questions.

Mr. Christopher: Anybody have any questions?

Mr. Morgan: What was your last comment?

Mr. Dyer: We would ask that this body permit us, Mr. Morgan, to have a non-voting staff member as part of this Board at this time.

Mr. Morgan: Until the amendment is either approved or rejected?

Mr. Dyer: Until it is approved, yes, sir.

Mr. Christopher: Joe, in the interest of time, let me suggest that I appoint an ad hoc committee to meet with your committee so that the Board would have a thorough understanding of what your request is and the ramifications of it, and so that you all may answer what concerns the Board might have.

Mr. Dyer: That certainly is satisfactory to the staff. We did not expect action from the Board today.
Mr. Christopher: I'm sure that if we really got into it there would be lots of questions that each person would have and let me just ask Dr. Settle and Dr. Howard—you're familiar with this—and Steve. Would you three make up an ad hoc committee to meet with them? Since Steve's on campus, I'll ask you to chair it or be responsible for making the contact with Joe so that the three of you and his committee could get together and perhaps you all could make some sort of report at the next meeting.

Mr. Dyer: That's fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. Christopher: Thank you and your committee members for being present also.

Update on University Tenure Committee's Action on Dr. Don Johnson's Request

Mr. Christopher: Did everyone receive a copy of Dr. Loberger's letter? And Ms. Dyer has a letter from Dr. Johnson: Is Dr. Johnson present?

Dr. Don Johnson: Yes.

Mr. Christopher: Give us a minute to review Dr. Johnson's letter to Mr. Overby. Has everybody had a chance to review the letter?

Mr. Carneal: We've got another letter here.

Mr. Christopher: Dr. Butwell, do you have any objection to my reading this letter that you've written to Mr. Overby?

Dr. Richard Butwell: Mr. Chairman, if it is your judgment, I have no objection to your reading it. I think references made to other persons in the letter, and my own preference that obviously can only be a preference of myself is that perhaps that point one in particular is better addressed in executive session, but if you wish to read it that would be your judgment. I find it somewhat sensitive.

Mr. Christopher: Okay. Let me go back again and try to take a stab at where I think we are, and I certainly stand to be corrected. Dr. Johnson, Dr. Loberger, Dr. Butwell, Dr. Posey or anyone else who might be involved or concerned, feel free to correct me. Dr. Johnson came to this Board. I use the word appeal. I think he recognizes that there is no provision in the Tenure Policy to appeal to the Board, but he has requested or appealed to the Board to reconsider his tenure position. As all of you know, the current Tenure Policy calls for the procedure under which this Board can only give tenure upon recommendation of the President. In other words, it's a positive action that the Board is involved in. The Board does not deny tenure, the Board only grants tenure and upon the recommendation of the President. The policy calls for one who was up for tenure and does not receive tenure to then redress his, not denial necessarily, but when the President fails to recommend, he may then go to the University Tenure Committee. He has the burden of proof to show them there was probable cause to indicate that his rights were violated in the overall process. Dr. Johnson has made a request to the University Tenure Committee. They have found that there is no probable cause to indicate that Dr. Johnson's rights were violated. Is that a fair statement, Dr. Loberger?

Dr. Gordon Loberger: Yes.

Mr. Christopher: Information has been given to me on the part of Dr. Butwell that indicates there's concern as to whether or not each member of the University Tenure Committee was impartial. The problem with trying to address such an allegation would be that this Board then, if it said that it was going to review what the University Tenure Committee did, would be adding new policy to the Tenure Policy. We would be expanding the tenure policy. My suggestion might be that this Board recommend that the President reevaluate his position, and the reason I suggest that is that only upon the action of the President can this Board act without expanding the Tenure Policy. Does everybody understand? That's trying to be very brief on a very complicated situation. It strikes me that the appropriate action for the Board at this time is to suggest to the President that he reevaluate his determination. Then, we could get this back before the Board without tampering with the Tenure Policy. Do you understand what I'm saying, Dr. Johnson?
Dr. Johnson: Yes. I'd like to make a comment, if possible.

Mr. Christopher: Sure.

Dr. Johnson: One conclusion that you made regarding the University Tenure Committee's deliberation was that my rights haven't been violated, and the way I read the letter, they didn't decide that. What they decided was that although my rights may have been violated, I hadn't proven the negative decision was a result of the violation of those rights which is quite different. The way I read the Tenure Policy, that's not what it means. If I could just read you a brief statement, maybe I can express this. The University Tenure Committee, in its letter of 22 of September 1981 provided, "an explanation of the exact manner in which the Committee arrived at its decision may be of value to the Board of Regents in reaching its own decision in this matter." Clearly the University Tenure Committee has recognized the Board's continuing role in assuring its policy is correctly interpreted and carried out. At the last Board meeting, Attorney Overby presented comments on the appeals section of the Tenure Policy and Regent West as one of the architects of the Policy, spoke to the intent concerning granting a hearing. I have discussed policy interpretation and intent with Faculty Senate President Posey and guiding principle of this Policy has been described as a presentation of facts that show probable cause and the intent was to deny hearings only in those cases determined to be clear cut or a hearing would be frivolous. The UTC finding that violations of procedure, academic freedom, as well as arbitrary and capricious action entitles the victim to a hearing only if he can demonstrate that those violations resulted in a negative recommendation for tenure does not appear to comply with the Board policy since the tenure candidate is not entitled to review the factors that went into that decision nor to call witnesses or in any other way defend against false allegations prior to a hearing. It is impossible to gain a hearing under this interpretation of the policy. The UTC decision appears to be the creation of new policy. I believe they've gone beyond present policy. The UTC in the first paragraph of its explanation uses the final statement of paragraph 2 from Board policy on appeal to modify paragraph 1 of that policy. The appeal section of the Tenure Policy consists of four paragraphs. The first deals with obtaining a hearing. The second and third describes the nature of the hearing and the fourth presents how the resulting report is to be handled. Clearly a concluding sentence in the second paragraph should not be interpreted as if it were a concluding sentence of the first paragraph. The UTC explanation of the exact manner in which it arrived at its decision includes the statement that "If, in fact, a decision by an agency not to recommend tenure for an applicant is reached prior to the formal tenure recommendation proceedings, the appellant could not logically prove the negative decision resulted from any possible violations of proceedings." The adopted and amended Board policy describes both the basis for awarding tenure and the tenure process. There is no suggestion that the decision made on other bases or one made prior to the formal proceedings would be in compliance with Board policy. The UTC has presented the possibility that it has expected its authorized limitations or viewed the tenure policy an erroneous prospective and if so, has pledged itself to attempt to rectify the matter upon instruction and authorization from the Board of Regents, to provide an open and speedy hearing to determine if I have met the criteria established by the Board. For the award of tenure would provide a just resolution of the matter for all concerned. And my concern is that it's my understanding that the University Tenure Committee has found what they call irregularities to which I interpret as violations of my rights. There have been allegations made in which a tenure decision has been based. There has been no necessity to substantiate those allegations, and I haven't been able to address the allegations. I'd like to have some recourse. I'd like to have someone review them. Perhaps, if the President reviewed the allegations again, and if he could substantiate them and support them, and discuss them with me, that would be satisfactory from my point of view. If he can't substantiate them or support them, then I think that we should have a recommendation for tenure.

Mr. Christopher: Dr. Johnson, let me explain in a little more detail. All ten members of this Board may be totally and in complete sympathy with you, but if the Board does what you're asking it to do, it expands the Tenure Policy. The Faculty Senate and all those that had input into drafting the tenure policy, then are going to say, why'd you ask us to draft this document; you're going to do what you want to anyway. To give some continuity to it, it appears that, regardless at how you look at it, the only way under the policy
the tenure question gets to this Board is on the affirmative action of the President. So, the only move that this Board can make without expanding the policy is to recommend to him that there are serious allegations that we think he needs to look into, and we think he needs to give you the opportunity to discuss with him the questions you have about it and that he talk with whoever he deems necessary whether it be the members of the tenure committee or Dr. Butwell or your departmental chairman or whoever, and then reevaluate his recommendation and get back to the Board on that. Will that be fair?

Dr. Johnson: That's fine. I do believe that if anybody is going to change Board policy on tenure, that it should be the Board. I think that the way the policy is now being interpreted isn't the way it's written, and I'm concerned that a negative decision will be made in my case not based on what it says in the Tenure Policy but based on how the Tenure Policy is being interpreted. The letter that you got from the University Tenure Committee starts out the explanation by saying, "we take the last sentence in the second paragraph and use it to explain the first paragraph." I don't think that makes any sense, and I think that's new policy.

Mr. Christopher: What I'm saying to you is everybody on this Board might agree with you, but if we start reviewing what the University Tenure Committee does, then we're expanding the policy. You're right in thinking the Board has the power to do it, but also you get into a broader picture in terms of offering to the University some continuity or stability with the policy that the faculty itself has said, this is the policy we like. The only way to get it back into the mechanism that has been set up is to put it back in the President.

Dr. Johnson: I appreciate your time and your consideration, and I'm sure you appreciate that to me it's more than an arrangement of words in four paragraphs. To me it's my professional career and it's rather important, so I guess I get a little emotionally involved with it. Thank you.

Mr. Christopher: Thank you, sir.

Mr. West: I would just briefly comment that I think your solution is a good one, and I think it is within the spirit of the policy. Were the matter to go back to the tenure committee it would then go back to the President after their evaluation. In addition, I think it's important to point out here that tenure is a recommending process involving several agencies including departmental faculty, chairman, deans, and Dr. Butwell. Correct me if I'm wrong, Tom, but some universities do not have the president in the chain. However, at Murray State we do, and that in many cases has been viewed as a buffer against faculty decisions in favor of colleagues. Perhaps this is a case where the President will have to evaluate Dr. Johnson's accomplishments compared to the evaluation of the faculty so I think if it can be a buffer one way, and it can be a buffer another. So I think your suggestion is well made.

Mr. McCuiston: Do we have to make a recommendation?

Mr. Christopher: Yes. The Board's going to have to take some sort of official action if we're going to address the issue. It can either take action or no action.

Mr. McCuiston: In other words, the action that we need to take is refer it back to the President and let him make a recommendation?

Mr. Christopher: Personally, I see no other alternative. Does anybody have any suggestions?

Mr. West: I move that the matter involving Dr. Johnson be referred to President Curris to permit Dr. Johnson an opportunity to discuss with him concerns, for Dr. Curris to talk to Dr., Butwell about his concerns, and to give Dr. Loberger an opportunity to express their position or give a clarification of what the committee did, and for the President to reevaluate his recommendation on Dr. Donald Johnson.

Mr. McCuiston: I second.

Mr. Christopher: Is there any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. There being no nays, the motion passes.
Overview of the Budget Process, Postponed

Mr. Christopher: About two meetings ago we asked Jim Hall to present an overview of the budget process. Do you want to get into this or put it off to another time?

Mr. Hall: Just one comment, Chairman Christopher. I really think that it is a subject that deserves a considerable amount of time when we take it up. I'm prepared to do it today. I'm prepared to do it any time at your convenience.

Mr. Christopher: We'll put it off until the next meeting, Jim. I'm sorry that it's been put off so many times.


Mr. Christopher: Do you want to make any comments about the financial report, Mr. Hall or Mr. Chamberlain? It's never been officially received.

Mr. Don Chamberlain: The conversation that Dr. Curris, Jim, and I had this week was that the financial statement would be taken up in the same context with the report. I think it would be more meaningful.

Mr. Christopher: We'll put both of those items off until the next meeting.

Board of Regents' Response to Governor John Y. Brown, Discussed

Mr. Christopher: As all of you know, in June, Governor Brown called all the chairmen of state institutions to Frankfort with the purpose in mind of asking the Boards to respond to him by November of this year on what programs could be consolidated or what other means or steps that the various universities might be willing to take to cut down on costs. His threat, I suppose you could put it, was that if you all don't do it, then you're going to force me to do it as far as making a recommendation to the Legislature. I think we're all aware of the fact that Dr. Curris and Dr. Zacharias will get together on Wednesday, the 30th for the purpose of discussing what programs might be approached between these two institutions. The primary concern that I have is that at least this Board respond to the Governor. It puts us in a bad light if we just ignore it. Does anybody have any thoughts?

Mr. West: First of all, I would like for our report to, at least in some way, acknowledge the Prichard report, the report of the Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future which I gave to all of you at the last meeting. The recommendations in that document, I think, are very good. When he was talking about cutting programs, was he speaking of academic programs specifically?

Mr. Christopher: I think what Governor Brown is requesting is that each institution establish its priorities and in doing that, examine what programs could be eliminated or consolidated.

Mr. West: I guess to get to the bottom line of it, in anticipation of this question, I did make a list of money and anywhere from $1,300,000 to $2,600,000 depending on what you want to cut out of where or what figures you use, I guess, are at our disposal to report on and none of those involve any academic programs so I have a lot of reservation about cutting academic programs or combining them or whatever until we look at some of those things.

Mr. Christopher: Does anybody have any feeling that there's duplication of services at this institution as compared to what's being offered at any other institution?

Mrs. Page: Well, there are several programs that we've already discussed that apparently somebody feels we'd be better to cut them and strengthen other programs. I'm not in any condition to evaluate except that apparently there is some feeling about the library program and geography and others we discussed.

Mr. West: I guess that's why I keep going back to that Prichard document. What it may come down to is the definition of what a university is. Dr. Doran made some good points yesterday about the fact that we don't need to give up being a university. Everyone teaches English. Is that duplication? Everyone has a history department. I'd like to see this Board take a strong position in favor of our being a university that will serve the needs of this region. I don't
see that many courses here which aren't meeting those needs and when you couple that with the fact that we really don't have to make those cuts, that's the way I view the issue.

Mr. McClure: I don't see any merit in going to this specialization plan that Governor Brown seems to have. I certainly don't think the students would be in favor of it. I think it's ridiculous, quite frankly. In any institution, however, you may come along in a situation where you find a program could be eliminated simply due to lack of need, and that may happen at this University. As far as duplication of programs across the State, I agree with everything Steve said. It's ludicrous.

Mrs. Page: I know we don't have much time, but I would like to see us strengthen programs possibly instead of talking about cutting back, strengthening what we have. For instance, the teacher education programs, the committee had very strong recommendations along that line and this is one of my pet projects. I would like to see us raise our standards above the minimum State standards and require a foreign language, require a broad background in liberal arts, require an entrance exam and a comprehensive exam over subject matter before the degree is awarded. Demand excellence instead of just accepting the minimum standards set by the state, and I see us as having the best teacher training program in the state, or the region, or the United States if we would concentrate and demand excellence.

Mr. McClure: Last week I talked to the Student Government Association at Western, and the feeling was the same there. As a matter of fact on October 5th or 6th, there's going to be a huge rally there, that was held last year against this attack, if you will, on higher education, and I think last year they got a response of several thousand people, and they expect the same this year. They're going all out on this, and I think it's wonderful. I think it's very healthy. I hate to see higher education at the front of this attack, and I would call it an attack.

Mrs. Page: As Steve says, we may have to reallocate our resources.

Mr. West: This was the point I wanted to make. I agree with your statement about demanding excellence if at the same time we recognize when you demand the excellence, you've got to commit the resources.

Mrs. Page: Well, there are possibly other places where we could cut back some of our resources, where they will show results. After all, these teachers we're training are going to influence the nation for generations to come, and I just think that's an important place for us to put our resources.

Mr. Christopher: Permit me and perhaps this will put this in context. We can decide what action we think is appropriate. I quote from the Paducah Sun Democrat on the meeting that was held, and it's very accurate. It's an AP story written by Herbert Sparrow. It says: "Brown said he told—talking about meeting with the chairmen—then to challenge the cost effectiveness of the operations of their institutions. Brown said he also called on the chairmen to cooperate in eliminating duplication at the schools. We are living in economic times where we have to be team players. We can't protect turf just for the sake of protecting turf. I want to concentrate on our priorities and strengths. Brown said he asked the chairmen to have their Boards establish priorities and determine the course each institution will play in Kentucky's Higher Education system. Brown said he felt the Trustees might be in a better position to attack the problem of duplication than the university presidents. I mean no disrespect for the college presidents, but I have not heard the first president want to consolidate a program, he said. The Board has that responsibility. If it feels a neighboring institution has a better program, it should be willing to give it up. I don't do it because I have any suspicions of the college presidents, but I think they are more likely to be defensive than independent boards, Brown said. The Governor said he asked the Trustees to report back to him by mid-November. Brown said the reports combined with reports from other groups will be used in determining his budget priorities for higher education for the next biennium. Brown said that the governing Boards of the public universities have never been called upon to take the responsibility that is theirs to oversee the operations of their schools. I don't think the trustees have ever taken the responsibility to challenge the system, Brown said. I don't think they have ever been asked to challenge the administration in programs. We've got to eliminate as much waste and unnecessary duplication as we can in the operation of the colleges."
Dr. Settle: I feel like state universities are probably going through the first impulsive reaction to this thing right now, and I think this is sort of what we would expect, but when we address the long-term issue of education, what we now have is the foundation was set up on deficit spending, and I think Brown needs to challenge not only cost effectiveness and management, but cost effectiveness of academic programs, too. I see no reason why when you get down to balance spending dollars, we're going to have to address this issue, maybe one decade, two decades, three decades down the road because there's not going to be enough money to have every institution in this State being everything to everybody. I see no reason why we can't start strengthening what we do well, like Ms. Page has pointed out. If we're strong in art and music and weak in some other area, why can't we be the Western Kentucky Regional Art and Music Center. One of the main purposes for establishing Murray State and Western, the way I understand it, was because of travel and difficulties in communication between one region and another. Well, that no longer exists. We have a very progressive road system in this State. I think when you get down to balanced budget spending, these issues are going to have to be faced. What we now have is based on deficit budget spending, and I think the impulsive reaction that we have initially is sort of the Gestalt-type reaction that we'd expect, but after this initial wave is over, we're going to have to talk bottom-line figures.

Mr. Christopher: Anybody else have any thoughts on it?

Mr. West: I just keep going back to the report. The only areas of duplication they really picked on were law schools and some other professional schools, and they talked a little bit about agriculture. The rest of the document is committed to the proposition that at the undergraduate level that all the universities need to have their programs strengthened and that there is such a thing as a program dying from a lack of resources. The recommendation they made on the last page is that, and they went so far to recommend, taxes be increased in order to strengthen and get more monies into the universities, and they made some other recommendations in here about priorities. Some which we probably would not appreciate on this Board, the athletic recommendation being one, but they do come from the point of view that we can have universities.

Dr. Settle: I think you have to go beyond, Steve, duplication. I think if you go beyond duplication, you're talking about justifying money expended in academic subject matter that justified the amount of academic or financial endeavor. In other words, we've got to do the most for the most people with tax dollars, and if we're investing a large sum of money for a small program that doesn't touch a lot of people, then I feel like there may be some problems with that. We may not be duplicating any other service in the region, but we've got to be cost effective as far as touching broad numbers of people with tax dollars, do the most for the most people. I think that when you talk about core undergraduate strengthening programs that's what you're talking about and not getting off on tangents that small universities can't deal with. The universities across the country are already doing this. You know, the University of Kentucky's strength may be in tobacco research, so UT, Indiana or whatever recognize that, and they don't try to duplicate that academic and financial obligation. You're going to get into institutions that traditionally across this country sort of layed away from areas where other people excel, and people who are interested in tobacco research migrate to Kentucky. People who are interested in genetic transfer migrate to MIT or somewhere else. I think this is what's going to happen on a smaller scale across the land.

Mr. Christopher: What I would like to do though today is get some feeling from the Board as to how we want to respond. At this particular meeting, one thing I pointed out to the Governor was that we're farther from the State House than any other state institution. Murray is harder to get to than any other community that has a state institution. I think anybody who lives in the Purchase area and who has been involved in acquiring anything from Frankfort feels that we have to claw and scrape and fight for every dollar that we get, and that it may be interpreted as protecting the turf, but our spirit is one that we didn't come by it easily, and we're not going to give it up easily. Now, that's my personal opinion, and I throw that out only to ask do others feel that way or is there another side of it?
Dr. Howard: I don't think we should leave the impression that we're not going to try to cooperate with State Government in tight budget times. Certainly we want to do the best we can. I agree with what you've said, but it's difficult for us as a Board to evaluate, for example, what the strengths of a program at Western Kentucky University are. I don't know, and I doubt if anyone else here does. Maybe the meetings between Dr. Curris and Dr. Zacharias will bring some of those things out. It would be much easier for us to evaluate that situation did we know that. What I don't think we should do is this Board leave the impression that we're not going to cooperate with State Government, but agreeing with what you've said is a starter, is my feeling.

Mr. McClure: This University is like a spoked wheel and in the center of that spoked wheel is an axis, and I call that core curriculum. You can go however far out on that spoked wheel you want, whatever distance on the radius of that wheel you want. If you start talking about tobacco research, naturally, we're not going to be heavy in tobacco research at the same time Western Kentucky University is. But within the normal balance of a university, what we call a university, the theory of a university, not a college but a university, within a reasonable radius you include most of the majors on this campus. In our meetings with Western Kentucky University, we may come up with one or two very isolated curriculum--structural items that could be consolidated, but I think the Governor needs to realize, and I don't think he does, that within our educational system in this State most of the universities are within their reasonable bounds on that wheel. I don't think the Governor understands that, and I think this Board needs to make an effort to make him understand that you just can't come in and cut half the curriculum out of a university, and that's my point.

Mr. Christopher: I don't know that he said that.

Mr. McClure: But that's the impression I get out of the newspapers. I hear we ought to have one medical school, one law school. That may be the point; but when we get into one school that specializes in physics and one school that specializes in art, that's ridiculous, and that's what I see in the papers. That's everything I've seen come across my desk, every recommendation except out of the Prichard committee.

Mr. West: If I could just build on that a little bit. Again, Dr. Doran's speech yesterday. He was talking about, and I think Frank Julian's surveys will bear this out. The number one reason that students come to Murray State is because of its location. Is that right?

Mr. McClure: I'm sure.

Mr. West: I think we have an obligation to expose those students to as many possibilities for their future as possible. If we limit the scope of our university unreasonably, then their opportunity to grow and become all that they can become is limited. When I meet freshmen for the first time, very few of them know what they want to major in. They want me to tell them. That's where general education comes in. They've got two years to take a mixture of everything and try to find out what they like. Hopefully by the end of that two years, they then know; but if we don't have the program here and if we don't have a good mix of general education programs, we're doing a disservice to the students, and that goes along with your wheel concept.

Mr. Christopher: Anybody else? Does anybody have any objection to my taking what I heard you say today, getting with Dr. Curris, and considering what his task force has come up with and perhaps if you all in your committee--Bill and Sara--and who else was on that committee that looked at some of the programs that we talked about being eliminated?

Mrs. Page: Bill's the chairman.

Mr. Christopher: You were the chairman of that committee. Were you all ever going to make a report as such, in terms of a written report?

Mr. Morgan: I think the understanding and agreement was we as a Board would not pursue that further until the committee now evaluating the academic governance council would do the evaluation of the various areas of discussion. Of course, we can all continue to look at them. I believe we agreed to delay that until this academic governance committee had either been adopted or not. Isn't that right, Sara?
Mr. Christopher: Does anybody have any objection to my getting with Dr. Curris and drafting a response, assuring all of you that whatever input that each of you might want to add, correspond with either me or Dr. Curris, and that will be done then by mid-November. Does anybody have any problem with that?

Recognition of Appreciation

Mr. Christopher: As all of you are aware, we are losing the services of Mr. M. C. Garrott, and I thought it would be very appropriate for this Board to recognize in some way our appreciation of these people who have made significant contributions to this University over the years. There were two other people that came to mind also, and has everybody had an opportunity to look at the proposed resolutions? There's one concerning M. C. Garrott, one for Dr. Charles Hamra, and one for Dr. Richard Gray.

Mr. Carneal moved that the following resolutions be adopted:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, M. C. Garrott has announced his intention to retire from his position as Director of Information and Public Services at Murray State University on October 31 after more than thirteen (13) years as a member of the staff, and

WHEREAS, he has served during his tenure with enthusiasm and capability that reflect great credit upon his Murray State University alma mater and has been extremely effective in his role as a communicator with the news media, and

WHEREAS, he and his staff have initiated several major events and services, among them an annual News Media Appreciation Day, the Homecoming Golf Tournament, a biennial Kentucky Press Association Golf Tournament, a speakers bureau, a daily telephone information service, a monthly calendar of events, a hospitality room at the First Region basketball tournaments and periodic visits to area news media, and

WHEREAS, he has demonstrated in the course of carrying out his responsibilities the characteristics of dependability, competence, perseverance, cooperation, loyalty, consideration for others and an unfailing sense of humor, and

WHEREAS, his off-campus activities have earned him a great measure of visibility that he consistently has used to promote and to proclaim the benefits and the accomplishments of the University and the constituencies thereof,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Regents of Murray State University expresses its deep and heartfelt appreciation to M. C. Garrott for all of his contributions and for the example he has set for others by his devotion to the University, and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting of the Board of Regents and that a copy of this resolution be presented to M. C. Garrott on behalf of the members of the Board.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Dr. Charles A. Hamra served thirteen (13) years as chairman of the Department of Psychology before he relinquished that position in July to return to the classroom as a teacher on a full-time basis, and

WHEREAS, he has been a member of the faculty for eighteen (18) years -- from 1961 to 1963 and again since 1966 -- and has demonstrated the excellence both as teacher and as administrator to advance in rank from instructor to full professor, and

WHEREAS, he is recognized as a student-oriented teacher and administrator who has also remained closely identified with the faculty while serving as a departmental chairman, and
WHEREAS, he has involved himself in a number of University-wide assignments, including an active role in the Faculty Senate, chairman of the Committee on Student Evaluation and Accountability, co-chairman of the Task Force on University Growth and member of several other campus committees, and

WHEREAS, he has been active as a psychological consultant of the Murray-Calloway County Mental Health Center and has served as an effective ambassador of the University while away from the campus.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Board of Regents of Murray State University expresses its deep and heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Charles A. Homra for his longtime service as a chairman and for the loyalty and devotion he has demonstrated through the years, and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting of the Board of Regents and that a copy of the resolution be presented to Dr. Charles A. Homra on behalf of members of this Board.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Dr. Richard C. Gray served almost four (4) years as Vice President for Administrative Services before he resigned July 31 to become Technical Director of Research and Engineering with Wyle Laboratories, Huntsville, Alabama, and

WHEREAS, he proved to be an effective member of the University management team who demonstrated diligence, meticulous attention to detail and the ability to handle difficult situations with stability and self-assurance, and

WHEREAS, he was a member of the Kentucky Energy Conservation Task Force and spearheaded an energy conservation program on the campus that resulted in substantial savings to the University, and

WHEREAS, he made notable contributions by conducting a series of workshops to train supervisory personnel, by overseeing an effort to improve the appearance of the campus, by teaching courses both on and off campus on an adjunct basis, and by serving on several key campus committees, and

WHEREAS, he served during most of his tenure as treasurer of the Board of Regents,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Board of Regents of Murray State University expresses its deep and heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Richard C. Gray for his leadership and for his contributions to the betterment of the University, and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting of the Board of Regents and that a copy of this resolution be presented to Dr. Richard C. Gray on behalf of members of this Board.

Mr. Morgan seconded, and upon call for the questions, all voted aye, Motion passed.

Nominations to the Board of Directors of the National Museum of the Boy Scouts of America

Mr. Christopher: I discussed this with Dr. Curris, and we were in agreement that we would like for this to be handled in executive session, but upon review of the open meetings law, I cannot find a way that we can go into executive session on this. The reason I say that is this presents a situation where we could mention people's name and perhaps embarrass them because they were not elected.

Mr. McCuiston: Would it be best to form a committee and let them read four names before the whole board?
Mrs. Page: Can't we have a nominating committee of the Board?

Mr. Christopher: That might do better. Everybody agree? Charlie, would it be convenient for you? I'll be glad to serve with you, and we can go through these names. Anybody else want to serve in that capacity?

Is there a time factor?

Dr. Curris: Not necessarily. As soon as possible. This is what the Boy Scouts have indicated.

Dr. Howard: I'll be happy to serve on the committee if you want me to.

Mr. Christopher: Okay. We will report at the next meeting. Anything further?

Let's entertain a motion to go back into executive session for the same purpose as the prior executive session.

Mr. McCuiston: I move we go into executive session for the personnel item concerning Dr. Curris and the discussion we had earlier.

Mr. Woodall: I second.

Mr. Christopher: All those in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

The executive session began at 12:05 p.m. and ended at 12:40 p.m., at which time the meeting convened in public session.

Mr. Christopher: I'd like to say on behalf of the Board that in our executive session the Board was able to come up with a proposal that was acceptable to the Board and that has now been conveyed to Dr. Curris. He has asked for some time to think about it, and we've agreed to meet with him in this room on Saturday, October 10, at 9:30 a.m.

Is there a motion that we adjourn?

Mrs. Page: I have a motion I want to make before we adjourn. May I?

Mr. Christopher: Go ahead.

Mrs. Page: I make a motion that all the members of the Board of Regents except the Student Regent pay for any athletic tickets they use.

Dr. Settle: I second the motion.

Mr. Christopher: Well, I'm going to rule it out of order at this time. Why don't we...

Mrs. Page: Because I think we ought to pay for them.

Mr. Christopher: I understand. Everybody might want to talk about it, you know.

Mrs. Page: We can talk.

Mr. Christopher: We don't have the time, Sara. I'm just going to say it's out of order and be glad to take it up on the morning of the 18th, and if you want to send everybody a letter explaining your position, and if somebody wants to take a contrary position, fine.

Mr. McClure: Quite frankly, I don't see why the motion is out of order. I don't understand your ruling.

Mr. Christopher: I heard a motion to adjourn. We're just not going to get into it. Is there a second to the motion to adjourn?

Mr. Carneal moved to adjourn and Mr. McCuiston seconded. Upon call for the vote, the chair declared motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 12:43 p.m.
Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Murray State University Alumni Association Executive Council, the Murray State University Board of Regents, and the Murray State University Foundation Board of Trustees, Saturday, September 26, 1981.

A joint meeting of the Murray State University Alumni Association Executive Council, Murray State University Board of Regents, and Murray State University Foundation Board of Trustees was held at 2:00 p.m., September 26, 1981, in the Commonwealth Room of the University Center, on the campus of the University. Attending the meeting from each organization were:

Alumni Association Executive Council

Mrs. Donna Herndon, Director, Alumni Affairs and Executive Secretary, Alumni Association
Dr. Ben Humphreys, President
Mr. James E. Hurley, President-elect
Mr. Bill Cunningham
Mrs. Jill P. Hughes
Mr. Dan Shipley
Mr. Charles Walston
Miss Martha Boles
Mrs. Bettye R. Farris
Dr. Hal Houston
Mr. Rex Thompson
Mr. Charles Magness
Dr. Jimmy Ellis
Mrs. Mavis McCamish
Dr. Robert McGaughey

Board of Regents

Mr. Ron Christopher, Chairman
Mr. Bill Carneal, Vice Chairman
Dr. Charles Howard
Mr. Mark McClure
Mr. Jere McCuiston
Mr. Bill Morgan, also Alumni Association Executive Council
Mrs. Sara Page
Dr. Ed Settle
Mr. Steve West
Mr. Jerry Woodall

Foundation Board of Trustees

Dr. Thomas B. Hogancamp, Executive Director
Dr. Constantine W. Curris, President
Mr. Harry Lee Waterfield, Vice President
Mr. James A. Davis
Dr. Adron Doran
Miss Clara Eagle
Dr. Marshall Gordon
Mrs. Anne W. Hoke
Mr. Roy McDonald
Mr. Ed Norris
Mr. LoRoy Offerman
Dr. William G. Read
Mr. Leon T. Smith
Mr. William H. Thompson
Mr. Dalton Woodall

Dr. Constantine W. Curris, President of Murray State University, presided and called the meeting to order. Dr. Adron Doran gave the invocation.

The following tentative agenda was presented for the meeting:

1. Opening Remarks from the President
2. Discussion of the roles of each organization
3. Rapport on Private Giving
   A. Alumni Association
   B. Athletic Program
   C. Foundation
   D. Presidents' Club
   E. Other Fund Raising Efforts

4. Report on Money Management
   A. Investments Committee (BOR-MSUF)
   B. Alumni Association

5. Discussion of Coordination Efforts
   A. Annual Giving Solicitation
   B. Deferred Giving Solicitation
   C. Business Corporate Solicitation
   D. Centralized Records
   E. Recognition of Donors

6. Discussion of Administration
   A. Role of a Director of Development
   B. Role of a Development Council

Opening Remarks

President Curris stated this is the first joint meeting of the three organizations and thanked the attendees for coming. He stated that the State has responsibility for providing educational opportunities, but that private giving makes excellence possible, that because of common efforts, purpose and desire to work together, this meeting has been called, and that he hoped from the discussions good things would follow.

Role of Each Organization

President Curris introduced Mrs. Donna Herndon, Director of Alumni Affairs and Executive Secretary of the Alumni Association.

Mrs. Herndon stated the role of the Alumni Association is critical because it is the prime source of giving, that the responsibility of the Association was to preserve the relationship between alumni and the University and that the Alumni Association needs to develop young alumni and long-range support for the University. Mrs. Herndon challenged the group to preserve this opportunity of working together, and stated, "We need to focus on a common goal; the best interest of Murray State and its students."

President Curris introduced Dr. Thomas B. Hogancamp, Executive Director of the Murray State University Foundation.

Dr. Hogancamp stated that the Foundation is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Kentucky and its sole reason for existence is to assist Murray State University achieve its educational objectives. He further stated that all but three of the 15 member governing board are graduates of Murray State University and that the President of the University is, by virtue of his office, a member of the Board of Trustees and President of the corporation.

The Foundation solicits, records, acknowledges, administers, and invests both restricted and unrestricted gifts made in behalf of the University. Contributions may be cash, securities, gifts-in-kind, life insurance policies, and real estate. Most of the endowments and current funds received are restricted by donors as to use. Where funds are restricted, although the Foundation has legal title to these funds, it can act only in a fiduciary capacity, expending money as required by the terms of the gift. The contributions received by the Foundation are intended to supplement, not replace, State support of the University. Unrestricted funds and investment earnings from those funds are used by the Foundation for direct aid to the University.

The goal of the Foundation is to generate funds from private gifts and wise investments such that it may provide for Murray State the financial support needed for the achievement of a "margin of excellence."
A few of the ways the Foundation has or is contributing to the University are:

1. Funding real estate appraisals for property being considered for acquisition by the University.

2. Purchasing and holding real estate desired by the University.

3. Stimulating faculty research by providing more than $30,000 as seed money and travel funds.

4. Advancing funds for the construction of two horse barns on the University Farm in support of the Horsemanship Program.

5. Purchasing a boat, motor, and trailer for the use of the Biological Station.

6. Advancing payroll and supply funds to the federally financed grant programs of Apollo, Upward Bound, the National Rural Project, and the Kentucky Institute for European Studies.

7. Mailing miniature billfold-size diplomas to each graduate of MSU.

8. Administering and investing $738,007 in Foundation scholarship and loan funds, exclusive of funds invested for the Alumni Association. In the current year, 125 scholarships totaling $31,413 have been awarded. In addition, 151 scholarships from outside sources totaling $92,815, were channeled to the Foundation for distribution to named student scholarship recipients.

9. Providing fiscal and accounting services for research grants and contracts made to the Foundation and to the University. Such services have been provided since 1957. In addition, accounting services are provided groups, consortiums, and cooperatives such as the West Kentucky Education Cooperative, made up of 18 school systems in West Kentucky.

Dr. Hogancamp stated that lastly, it is anticipated that if the sun continues to shine and the creeks don't rise, a beautiful 18-hole golf course will be ready for use by students, faculty, staff, board members, alumni, and guests of Murray State University in June 1983. He closed by saying that as one who has devoted 33 years of professional life in both teaching and major administrative posts at this University, he was proud of the work of the Foundation and felt that the coordinated and cooperative efforts of all entities of the University can result only in further heights of greatness for this institution.

Mrs. Herndon provided the following data on Alumni Association scholarships:

1. 93 scholarships were awarded this year, Century Club (38) and named-scholarships (55).

2. $470,000 plus in perpetual scholarship funds.

3. 41 Century Club scholarships were awarded last year.

She added that the Alumni Association would like to establish a permanent fund as the Century Club scholarships are funded on a year-by-year basis and that the Association needs to generate good will which makes people want to donate.

President Curris introduced Dr. Marshall Gordon, Vice President for University Services, and asked him to address fund-raising efforts in support of the athletic program.

Dr. Gordon presented the following information:

Presidents' Club Contributions 1975 through September 17, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$68,585.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>128,073.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>87,323.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>20,547.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>237,962.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>110,199.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-to 9/17/81</td>
<td>135,123.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$787,815.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Gordon added that the Presidents' Club is made up of individuals and companies donating $1,000 plus on an annual basis and that any portion of the donation can be earmarked for any group or activity on campus.

Racer Club Contributions 1975 through September 17, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$39,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>37,963.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>60,285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>88,556.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>87,693.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>97,116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 - to 9/17/81</td>
<td>79,962.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$491,057.47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He added that of the $79,969.47, $71,277.50 has been received since July 1, 1981, that the estimate for the year is $100,000, and that these funds are used by coaches primarily for recruiting expenses.

Dr. Gordon further stated that all need to work together so that everyone knows what is happening as far as the University is concerned in fund-raising efforts.

President Curris called attention to the following Summary of Private Gifts to the University for the 1980-81 Fiscal Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Association (excludes $14,500 in dues payments)</td>
<td>$17,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Giving Century Club Scholarship Dues</td>
<td>$31,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Giving to Perpetual Scholarships</td>
<td>1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>$49,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletic Program</strong></td>
<td>$106,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Giving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU Foundation</td>
<td>$82,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Giving to Scholarships, etc.</td>
<td>43,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Giving to Perpetual Scholarships &amp; Programs</td>
<td>43,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Gifts</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WKMS Radio Station</strong></td>
<td>$210,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Giving</td>
<td>$25,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$391,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several small gifts given to individual departments and programs that are not reflected in these figures. These gifts could well total $10,000 - $15,000.

Discussion

It was pointed out that the Board of Regents and the Foundation have a joint investments committee, and Mr. Jim Davis stated that this committee was established in 1974, under the philosophy of the prudent-man rule, that the people have done an excellent job with investments inasmuch as our return has exceeded the return of most trust departments of large banks.

In response to Miss Eagle's suggestion that all scholarships be pooled on a single application form for recruitment advantages, Dr. Humphreys stated that this has been done for the last 2-3 years and that all applications are channeled into the School Relations Office.

Dr. Houston asked, "If someone calls and says he wants to donate $50,000 for scholarships, what is the next step?" Dr. Curris responded that the most important thing is to follow up with the wishes of the donor so as not to lose the money, that if the person has no preference and the scholarship in question
has no geographic or interest-area limitations, they are referred to the Alumni Association, and that if there are limitations where it would be more appropriate that the recipient be chosen by the faculty in a department, it is generally directed to the Foundation.

Mr. Offerman suggested serious consideration be given to hiring a Director of Development, and Mr. Jerry Woodall agreed.

Dr. Curris explained that there is no one person in the University with responsibility for fund raising; everyone goes out soliciting funds. He stated that the present budget has a position of Director of Development, but that it is frozen at this time.

Mr. Walston asked if there was a job description.

Dr. Curris responded, no, and that suggestions from all three groups are needed on how this should work before a job description is written.

Mr. Hurley expressed concern that a Director of Development might duplicate efforts of others.

Mr. J. Woodall stated that the person should be skilled in public relations, salesmanship, and marketing. He further stated the time has come to look beyond fund raising for scholarships and look to total needs of the University.

Mrs. Herndon expressed hope that if such a position were funded that the Alumni Association would be an integral part of the efforts, that duplication would be avoided, and that it is important that all work together.

Dr. Curris cited the coordination of fund raising efforts at Western Kentucky University.

It was pointed out that a Director of Development could not be an expert in all areas, that he/she must know the background and language and when to call in the tax accountant and/or lawyer.

Mr. Morris stated he favored the concept of a Director of Development, that private colleges have done a much superior job to public institutions, and that if we are going to survive, it will have to come from fund-raising efforts. He cited procedures at Yale and Vanderbilt Universities. He stressed we must unite our efforts under one umbrella, utilize our resources, get our house in order and present a united front.

Dr. Humphreys stated that he was leaning toward the concept of forming a council or committee from the three groups to look at the issue of where we are, where we want to go, and what our short-term and long-term needs are.

Miss Eagle recommended that the position be unfrozen and that the University hire a Director of Development after the job description has been determined.

Governor Waterfield stated that problems need to be brought out at this meeting or a competent committee should be named to determine what the problems are, that he would like to see it resolved, and that he is concerned about the image of the University. He stated that he felt the University is being made a whipping boy and that Murray State and Kentucky State University may be being used for the purpose of bringing about a state-wide university system. He further stated that he felt the problem is with the people out in the State not understanding what is going on here, and recommended that we look at issues. He further recommended that a committee with representatives from the three groups be named to come up with a plan that can be presented to the Alumni Association, the Board of Regents, and the Foundation Trustees.

Dr. Curris asked if there was sentiment that it would be beneficial to have representatives of the three groups look at the issue of coordination of development.

Mr. Christopher stated that it would be beneficial for the Board of Regents if such a committee were established.
Mr. Carneal stated he endorsed this concept and suggested each organization select one or two people to serve on this committee. He further suggested inasmuch as athletics are being attacked in the State that a representative from athletics be named to the Committee.

Dr. Houston stated that the Regents would have to unfreeze the position, and Mr. Christopher stated that everyone on the Board is in agreement that the position needs to be filled.

It was determined that each organization would name two members of the Committee, and Dr. Curris named Dr. Marshall Gordon to represent athletics.

Mr. Norris recommended that President Curris appoint the committee chairman.

Mr. Christopher stated the Board of Regents would like to have the Committee's recommendations as soon as possible.

Governor Waterfield stated that we ought to hire a professional to make a study and make recommendations to us based on the size of this institution and how to proceed. He further stated that the Committee should meet at the earliest possible time and identify problems.

Dr. Curris stated that the CASE (Council for the Advancement and Support of Education) organization would be probably a good source for a consultant, and Mrs. Herndon agreed. Governor Waterfield indicated that if we could get a consultant, he would see that the person was paid.

Mrs. Herndon asked what impact this will have on investment of funds, and Dr. Curris responded that they may be coordinated rather than unified.

It was determined that the Committee would report to this total group and then the total group should make recommendations to the Board of Regents. The meeting recessed in order that the three organizations could caucus to name the representatives. The members of the Joint Committee are:

representing the Alumni Association: Ben Humphreys
                                      Rex Thompson

representing the Board of Regents: Sara Page
                                       Jere McCuiston

representing the Foundation Trustees: Ed Norris
                                               Harry Lee Waterfield

representing Athletics: Marshall Gordon

Governor Waterfield was designated Chairman of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.