



# LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

## **Minutes of the special meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin: August 2, 1963. 1963**

Madison, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of  
Wisconsin System, 1963

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/RQYWOYGVMZFOA86>

Copyright 2008 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Madison, Wisconsin

Held in the President's Office

Friday, August 2, 1963, 9:30 A.M.

President Friedrich presiding

PRESENT: Regents DeBardleben, Friedrich, Gelatt, Greenquist, Jensen, Rothwell, Steiger, and Werner.

ABSENT: Regents Pasch and Rohde.

President Friedrich stated that, since this was a special meeting called primarily for consideration of the 1963-64 budgets, the regular order of business would not be followed, but that the budget items and certain other special business items would be considered. There being no objection, he stated that several recommendations by the Vice President and Trust Officer would be taken up first, and the balance of the meeting would be devoted to consideration of the budgets.

-

Upon motion of Regent Werner, seconded by Regent Steiger, it was VOTED, That the Executive Committee be authorized to act for the Board in the award of contracts for the landscape development in connection with Married Student Apartments - Group 700 (Project No. 5529).

-

The following recommendation of the Vice President and Trust Officer was presented:

That the State Building Commission be requested to authorize the construction of a seventh floor to the Clinical Cancer Research Addition to University Hospitals at an estimated cost of \$125,000, chargeable to the item for University Hospitals remodelling in the proposed 1963-65 building program (\$3.17 million in Priority Group IV).

Vice President Peterson explained that the project funds were insufficient to finance the construction of the seventh floor to the Clinical Cancer Research Addition to University Hospitals; and that the Acting Dean of the Medical School and the President of the University had agreed that this floor should be constructed at this time and the cost charged to funds provided for the next biennium for hospital remodelling. He stated that this would provide a useable facility, but did not include equipment for this floor, which is anticipated will be provided by gift funds.

Regent Steiger moved approval of the above recommendation, the motion was seconded by Regent Rothwell, and it was voted.

The following recommendation of the Vice President and Trust Officer was presented:

That the State Building Commission be requested to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications and the award of contracts for a series of minor remodelling projects in University Hospitals, each estimated to cost not more than \$15,000, chargeable to the Hospitals revolving fund.

Vice President Peterson reported that the total cost of these projects was estimated to be somewhat over \$200,000, for which reserves were being set up in the hospital funds. He noted that these minor remodelling projects would be fitted in with the major remodelling projects, to be financed from State Building Commission funds, and were necessary because the hospital is about 40 years old and many areas need remodelling.

Regent Gelatt moved approval of the above recommendation, the motion was seconded by Regent DeBardleben, and it was voted.

The following recommendation of the Vice President and Trust Officer was presented:

That authority be granted to lease the following properties in Madison needed for University purposes:

- a. Approximately the west one-half of 2203 University Avenue -  
Betabak, Inc.  
Approximately 13,000 sq. ft. - \$760 per month  
August 16, 1963 to June 30, 1966  
Chargeable to the University Hospitals revolving fund budget.
- b. Second floor of 2546 University Avenue  
Elmer E. Kyecken  
Approximately 1,000 square feet \$212 per month  
1/2 August 1, 1963 to January 31, 1967  
1/2 September 1, 1963 to January 31, 1967  
Chargeable to the 1963-64 University operating budget.
- c. 3313 University Avenue -  
Lashs, Inc.  
Approximately 15,500 square feet - \$2,500 per month  
February 18, 1964 to June 30, 1969  
(Earlier possession if State vacates earlier)  
Chargeable to the 1963-64 University operating budget.

Vice President Peterson explained the location of each of the properties referred to in the above recommendation; and reported the University uses to be made of them.

Regent Jensen moved approval of the above recommendation, the motion was seconded by Regent DeBardleben, and it was voted.

- - -

President Friedrich recalled that, at the last meeting of the Regents, he had informed the Regents that some people in Kenosha were interested in representatives from the Regents and the University administration visiting Kenosha to permit them to show what was available there for a future campus of the University in Kenosha. He noted that, at the last meeting of the Regents, it had been decided to defer this matter until after the Legislature had completed work on the budget, in order to avoid meeting conflicts, since members of the Legislature would be involved. Several of the Regents indicated they could attend such a meeting during the week beginning August 11; and it was agreed to attempt to arrange a meeting on Wednesday, August 14. (Later in this meeting, after people in Kenosha had been contacted, President Friedrich announced that the meeting in Kenosha would be held on Wednesday, August 14, 1963, at 11:30 A.M., at the University Center in Kenosha.)

- - -

Regent Werner, as Chairman of the Special Regent Committee on Acquisition of Land in Milwaukee, reported that at the last meeting the Committee had been authorized to increase the offer of the University for the purchase of the Milwaukee University School property by \$100,000 from \$2,200,000 to \$2,300,000, provided that the four residential properties owned by Milwaukee University School would be included in that price. He stated that the offer was made on that basis and was accepted by Milwaukee University School. He presented the following recommendation:

That the President of the University be authorized to complete negotiations for the acquisition of the Milwaukee University School property located at 2033 East Hartford Avenue, Milwaukee, and the four residences located at 3264 North Cramer Street, 3283-5 North Maryland Avenue, 3273 North Maryland Avenue, and 3255-57 North Maryland Avenue, Milwaukee, for a consideration of not to exceed \$2,300,000, subject to the approval of the Governor, the State Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, and the State Building Commission.

Regent Werner moved approval of the above recommendation, and the motion was seconded by Regent Steiger.

Regent DeBardleben inquired why the words "not to exceed" were included in the recommendation, when the price was agreed to. Regent Werner agreed that those words should be deleted, and with Regent Steiger's concurrence, since he seconded the motion, the question was put on the recommendation, as amended, and it was

VOTED, That the President of the University be authorized to complete negotiations for the acquisition of the Milwaukee University School property located at 2033 East Hartford Avenue, Milwaukee, and the four residences located at 3264 North Cramer Street, 3283-5 North Maryland Avenue, 3273 North Maryland Avenue, and 3255-57 North Maryland Avenue, Milwaukee, for a consideration of \$2,300,000, subject to the approval of the Governor, the State Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, and the State Building Commission.

Regent Jensen expressed appreciation for the work of the Special Regent Committee on Acquisition of Land in Milwaukee in handling this acquisition. President Friedrich pointed out that most of the work had been done by Regent Werner, Chairman of the Committee.

- - -

President Friedrich read a letter dated July 12, 1963, from President John Kennedy, addressed to Regent Steiger (copy on file), requesting that efforts be made to extend equal educational opportunities, in view of civil rights problems facing this country. President Harrington noted that he had attended the meeting of educators at the White House, which was referred to in President Kennedy's letter. He stated that the questions of civil rights and equal educational opportunities were not questions that come to the University just at this time; and he explained the various conferences that had been held during the past several years

on this subject. He stated that the University was deeply conscious of this problem of civil rights; and that he would be pleased to report at the next meeting of the Regents on what has been done and what is planned to be done in this area at the University. He emphasized that in these areas the University of Wisconsin had a very good record, but felt that consideration should be given to whether or not more could be done. He noted that the problem related not only to Negroes in the South, but also to educational opportunities and civil rights in the North for Negroes and other minority groups. He noted that the University of Wisconsin has Negro and other non-whites, such as Orientals, at all levels of employment, including faculty tenure positions, both at Madison and Milwaukee. He stated that such persons were appointed to posts that they were eminently qualified to hold, but noted that the Negroes must not only stand for their own positions, but also for their race. He reported the University also employs a considerable number of Negroes in civil service categories, but the number was not known, because the University does not request information as to race. He noted that the University had a very good record, in this regard, in connection with University housing, although there were some problems in private housing in Madison. He stated that he would welcome suggestions from the Regents regarding a full discussion of this subject.

Regent Jensen stated that he had felt for many years that solid research in areas of attitudes was far from sufficient and felt that a University could make a vital contribution by such means to this problem, which is one of the largest problems of the Twentieth Century. He stated he would welcome the University taking the lead in solid research to buttress the present purely emotional approach. Regent DeBardleben noted that the question of equal opportunity in education was closely related to the question before the Regents today regarding substantial increases in fees and tuition. He noted the problem of providing equal opportunity in education to people who have poor economic status and poor educational background.

President Harrington agreed with the comments by Regents DeBardleben and Jensen and stated that the University had an opportunity for a large area of research, particularly basic research. He cited data regarding the few number of Negro students graduating from high school in Milwaukee, which has a large Negro attendance, who go on to colleges and universities. He noted that students from high schools in higher income areas go on to the University ten to twenty to thirty times as frequently. He noted that it was not only a question of poverty, but also poor educational background.

Upon motion of Regent DeBardleben, seconded by Regent Gelatt, it was VOTED, That the University administration, as President Harrington had suggested, be requested to examine the whole subject of civil rights and equal educational opportunities with a view to determining whether the University is doing everything that it can do in this area and what further can be done.

President Harrington stated that he would try to have a report for the Regents at the next meeting.

- - -

Regarding the presentation of the 1963-64 University budget, President Harrington suggested that he would make a presentation, with the assistance of others in the administration, to be followed by some general discussion with the Regents, after which the Regents might go into an Educational Committee meeting with all Regents present to discuss a few of the personnel aspects of the budget. He stated that, during a meeting of the Educational Committee, other administrative officers would be glad to talk to the press and answer particular questions about the budget. He suggested that, after the meeting of the Educational Committee, the final consideration of the budget could be taken up and perhaps another question regarding the position of the average student in the University.

President Harrington reported that since the biennial budget had just been approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor only the night before, the administration was not in a position to present an individual salary list. He hoped that the Regents could adopt an overall resolution, including total budget figures; and stated that a total report on individual salaries could be presented at the September meeting of the Regents.

President Harrington then presented the following recommendation, relating to the University Operating Budget for 1963-64, exclusive of University Hospitals:

That the University operating budget for the fiscal year July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1964 (excluding University Hospitals) in an amount estimated at \$33,638,589 from state tax funds and \$63,944,720 from receipts making a tentative total of \$97,583,309 and including the fund allocations, revised student fees (including 1964 Summer Sessions), promotions, and emeritus designations listed in the budget schedules be approved; and that the President of the University be authorized to complete the staff, salary, and other adjustments necessary to comply with the requirements of the final legislation.

President Harrington then read two other recommendations, to be considered by the Regents, relating to the 1963-64 University Hospitals budget, and the student wage rates, as follows:

That the University Hospitals operating budget for the fiscal year July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1964 in an amount estimated at \$3,402,646 from state and county funds and \$5,216,760 from direct receipts making a tentative total of \$8,619,406 be approved; and that the President of the University be authorized to complete the staff, salary, and other adjustments necessary to comply with the requirements of the final legislation.

That, effective September 1, 1963, the minimum hourly student wage be increased to \$1.05 and the maximum to \$1.25, with the usual provision that rates in excess of \$1.25 per hour may be paid for work involving special skills on approval of the University Personnel Office.

President Harrington stated that this budget was based on a tax budget bill which the Governor and the Legislators, of both political parties, have stated is not satisfactory to them. He stated that a substantial majority of

the Legislators and the Governor have stated that this is the best compromise that can be worked out, which would enable the services of the state to proceed with some improvements. He noted that, although it included tax revisions that are unbearable to individuals and groups on both sides of the political picture, agreement was necessary so that the work of the state could go on. President Harrington stated the attitude of the University toward the budget could be described in somewhat the same terms.

He recalled that the proposed biennial budget requests, that the administration had presented to the Regents, were presented as a minimum required budget. He noted that some Regents had criticized the presentation as being too conservative, while others said it was proper and others considered it perhaps even generous. He noted that the Regents unanimously approved the budget requested by the University administration; and that the budget requests had been approved by the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education and the Governor, with some changes. He recalled that the Coordinating Committee, after studying the scholarship situation, felt more scholarships were needed and recommended more funds for scholarships than were asked for in the budget request approved by the Regents. He reported that further reductions were made in the budget in the Joint Committee on Finance and in the Legislature. He reviewed some of the major losses as between the approved budget and the original requests of the University. One was in the student fee and tuition area, where there was a very substantial increase. He noted that the Legislature does not require the University to charge particular fees or tuition, but, by estimating income, the establishment of fees and tuition at certain levels is necessary. He pointed out that the recommended increase in resident student fees was from \$236 to \$300 a year and for nonresident students from \$750 to \$1,000 per year. He noted this increase was regrettable, because the University wants to hold down the cost of education for the students.

He reported another loss between the original budget requests and the approved budget as being in the faculty salaries category, where the University had requested a little more than 20% for increases for the biennium for faculty salaries as being necessary. He explained that the Governor had cut the requested increase in faculty salaries to 20%, which was later cut to 18% by the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Finance and which was finally cut by the Legislature to a 13% increase for the biennium, 6% for the first year and 7% for the second year. He reported that it would be possible to give raises to somewhat more than two-thirds of our faculty, and that the raises would be on a merit basis as the Regents had requested. He noted that the Legislature had also provided funds for civil service increases.

He reported other budget losses as being a reduction in the state funds available for research, which was regrettable because state funds for research were much more flexible than federal money, which is usually tied to particular projects. Other losses he mentioned were in the areas of improvements and in maintenance. He noted that basically the reductions were in the area of improvements, but in a form which would mean postponing starting the improvements until the second year of the biennium. President Harrington stated that both the Governor and the Legislature were very understanding and helpful and conscious of the needs for higher education and wanted to do the best they could and were thus able to work out the reductions in the budget on a basis which would merely postpone improvements until the second year. He noted a number of such improvement programs that were involved.



President Harrington pointed out that, on the other hand, some good things resulted from considerations of this budget, such as knowledge that people in the state administration and the Legislature did not want to destroy the University, the general feeling that higher education is a necessity and a value to the state, a budget which does have increases in pay for faculty and civil service, for the increased load of students, and for some improvements, particularly in significant improvements in Milwaukee. He stated that we have reached the point where Milwaukee is no longer a two-year extension of the University, plus a teachers college with some liberal arts work, but that Milwaukee is now a University, which will be a very strong University as time goes on. He noted that this necessitates having specialties and much more advanced work, although classes will be smaller. He indicated it will be possible to move into a better program in Milwaukee in the second year of the biennium. The budget also included, he explained, additional substantial sums for the University Centers, both to cover additional numbers of students and improvement programs. The final budget, he explained, also included a restoration of some of the previous cut in funds for improvement in the libraries, some restoration of the cut for funds for research improvements on the Madison campus and for a number of other improvements on the Madison campus. President Harrington suggested that the Regents may desire to have further discussion of the budget at this time or following the meeting of the Educational Committee.

Regent Gelatt noted that citizens in his area of the state seemed to be split, since they talk about the need for education, they are proud of the University and pleased to send their sons and daughters here, and then, at the same time, they see no excuse for higher taxes. He felt that, if the citizens in his area were typical of the state, the University had the active support of the Legislature, but the active support of their constituents was concentrated in the area of not spending any more money. For that reason, he felt that there was no question in his mind but that the Legislators and the Governor had faced an exceedingly difficult task. Noting that they had a tough job, he stated that apparently it was going to be even tougher next time, since there would have to be a lot more money for the University and the State Colleges. Regent DeBardleben inquired of Regent Gelatt whether the expression by part of the citizens that they don't want more taxes is generated by themselves or whether it is generated by irresponsible statements by political people during a campaign. He felt that the people recognized the need for education and the need for spending the money. Regent Jensen stated that he had the same impression of the general reaction of people to these matters as Mr Gelatt had. He commented on the fact that our state appropriates over 300 million dollars on the average per year, while the federal government takes out of the State of Wisconsin over 700 million dollars a year; and that the State Legislature gives more consideration to the over 300 million dollars than the people of Washington do to the over 700 million dollars. He felt that, if the people are sincere regarding a reduction of taxes, they ought to be concerned where most of the money is being spent.

The meeting recessed at 10:33 A.M., for a meeting of the  
Educational Committee.

---

The meeting reconvened at 12:00 Noon, Friday, August 2, 1963, in the President's Office in Bascom Hall, with President Friedrich presiding

**PRESENT:** Regents DeBardleben, Friedrich, Gelatt, Greenquist, Jensen, Rothwell, Steiger and Werner.

**ABSENT:** Regents Pasch and Rohde.

Further consideration was given to the 1963-64 budgets. Regent DeBardleben stated he would prefer to discuss the matter of student costs before voting on the recommendation for the operating budget.

President Harrington expressed great concern over the mounting costs to students, noting that the students pay a very high percentage of the budget increase. He pointed out that about one-half of the 17 million dollar increase was from federal sources, about two and one-half million dollars from legislative appropriations, and about four million dollars from the students. He explained that this distribution would not be true in the second year, since there will be no additional raise in tuition for the second year and the Legislature will be supplying a larger percentage of the increase. He pointed out that all items of cost to the students seemed to be rising, and referred to the increase in University dormitory rates two years previously by \$50.00 per student. Although additional funds from federal and state appropriations have been made available for student loans, the loan program is a matter of some concern, since many students have to borrow extensively, with the result that they have a substantial debt when they graduate. He did not agree with the report that University of Wisconsin students from high income families are receiving substantial loans under the student loan program, and stated that a study of this matter shows that our students come from families of moderate income. He explained that it would not be

necessary to raise University dormitory rates this year, although a raise will be necessary in another year. Although this budget includes additional funds for scholarships, President Harrington stated that further attention would have to be given to student employment and dormitory rates. He suggested that the Regents might want the administration to work on the question of student costs, perhaps to look into the question of cheaper dormitory construction, obtaining gift funds for part of the cost for financing dormitories, and increasing scholarships.

There was considerable discussion of the increased tuition for the coming year. It was noted that the tuition increase was about 27% per student, whereas the proposed increase in student wages was only from \$1.00 to \$1.05 (minimum rate). President Harrington reported that a large increase in the student wage rate would result in increased costs for many students because of the necessity of increasing the price of meals at the Memorial Union.

Regent DeBardleben agreed that the matter of student costs should be looked into; and, in this connection, he made reference to the budget schedules relating to auxiliary enterprises. He inquired whether the \$460,737 of excess revenue shown on the Residence Halls statement for 1962-63 (page 46 of the budget schedules) was carried into the revenue item on page 45 for the 1963-64 year. He was advised that it was not. He referred to the various amounts of excess revenue, after debt requirements, in the schedules for Residence Halls, Memorial Union, and Intercollegiate Athletics. He suggested that a careful look be taken to see whether some of these amounts could be appropriated to reduce the costs to the students, or whether the costs of services provided in Residence Halls could be reduced so that unwarranted accumulation of profits would be eliminated.

President Harrington noted that the budget estimates for auxiliary enterprises had just been made available and the administration had not had much time to review them. He stated that the administration would be willing to have the budget approved, subject to Regent direction that there be a careful study of auxiliary enterprises. He thought a report on that could be made at the September meeting. He stated that the administration was concerned about the proper use of the surpluses for the benefit of students, but was also concerned about the financial responsibility which requires us to have certain surpluses for reserve to permit borrowing for dormitory construction.

Regent DeBardleben inquired whether the University was making maximum possible use of student help, particularly in the academic and caretaking functions of the University, and whether there were activities where students might earn more than the minimum of \$1.05 an hour. Vice President Clodius indicated that many students are paid more and will be able to earn up to \$1.25 per hour. He also reported that the deans and directors have been advised of the administration's interest in expanding student help, and that they have been requested, in preparing their budgets, to use student help to the maximum. Vice President Cafferty pointed out that the student payroll for the month of May averaged \$1.16 per hour for 3,633 students.

Referring to Regent DeBardleben's comments regarding auxiliary enterprises, Vice President Peterson explained that the auxiliary enterprises have to be self-supporting, and that profits from one activity cannot be transferred to another. He noted that the estimated excess revenue of \$92,000 for Residence Halls

was less than 2% on a five million dollar operation. In answer to Regent DeBardleben's question as to whether the Regents had authority to appropriate funds from auxiliary enterprises, Vice President Peterson explained that the Statutes provided that the revenues from a particular activity could be used only for that activity, except for capital improvements. Regent DeBardleben suggested the possibility of having the legislation revised.

Regent DeBardleben made the following motion:

*Students*

That the administration be requested to study the question of student costs and the possibility of reducing them in all of the areas President Harrington mentioned, taking a look at the entire construction program of dormitories as to the possibility of less expensive cooperative dormitories; expenses in Residence Halls; fund raising for dormitory construction; obtaining increased scholarships and grants; increased employment opportunities; question of adequacy of wages; and the possibility of surpluses mentioned; and that the administration be requested to examine these subjects and all subjects that might bear on this question and report to the Regents as soon as possible.

President Harrington thought the administration could report on the auxiliary enterprises part of the study at the September meeting.

The above motion was seconded by Regent Jensen, and it was voted.

Regent Werner then moved approval of the recommendation (above) relating to the 1963-64 University Operating Budget (exclusive of University Hospitals), and the motion was seconded by Regent Steiger. Regent Gelatt suggested that a roll call vote be taken on the budget recommendation, since some of the Regents probably had some reservations regarding parts of the budget. A called vote was taken, with Regents DeBardleben, Friedrich, Gelatt, Greenquist, Jensen, Rothwell, Steiger and Werner voting "Aye"; no "Noes". The motion was declared carried. During the above roll call vote, Regent DeBardleben stated that he voted "Aye" with the feeling that he would like to vote "No" if he could, insofar as tuition increases are concerned; and that he voted "Aye" with a feeling of great disappointment that our budget was not approved as recommended by this Board. He stated he recognized that the University had to operate this way. Regent Gelatt stated that he also wanted to express disapproval of the extent of increase in student fees and the departure of the past practice of the student paying not more than 20% of the instructional costs. Regent Greenquist stated that he voted "Aye" because he saw no alternative. Regent Jensen stated that he voted "Aye" realizing that the Regents will have a study that may enable them to help the student costs somewhat. Regent Rothwell stated that he voted "Aye" with a feeling of dissatisfaction that student fees must be raised.

President Harrington, referring to the recommendation relating to the 1963-64 budget for University Hospitals, stated that that was largely a routine matter of standard type operation. He noted that the hospital budget this year is different in one respect, in that there is a specific state appropriation to permit giving a little more money to the interns and residents. He reported there would be no raise in hospital rates.

Regent Gelatt moved approval of the recommendation relating to the 1963-64 University Hospitals budget, and the motion was seconded by Regent DeBardleben. A called vote was taken, with Regents DeBardleben, Friedrich, Gelatt, Greenquist, Jensen, Rothwell, Steiger and Werner, voting "Aye"; there were no "Noes". The motion was declared carried.

President Harrington presented the recommendation regarding student wage rates, and added that the resolution already passed by the Regents at this meeting calls on the administration to make an overall study of the situation.

Regent Greenquist moved approval of the student wage rate recommendation, the motion was seconded by Regent Rothwell, and it was voted.

Regent Steiger stated that, in spite of the reservations made by some of the members of the Board (relating to the University budget), he would like to express to the Legislature and the Governor our thanks (and he stated he was not making this as a motion) and our appreciation for providing the funds, while they might not be all the funds needed, nonetheless, they did provide the funds to keep all the institutions in the state operating, particularly the University and the State Colleges.

Regent Gelatt stated that they (the Governor and the Legislature) certainly have had a difficult problem, one which he did not envy them; and that he was appreciative that they got the budget through.

The meeting adjourned at 12:32 P.M.

Clarke Smith, Secretary