



# LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

## **Minutes of the special meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin: May 31, 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, May 31, 1963, 9:00 A.M.

President Friedrich presiding

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

ABSENT: Regent Pasch

President Friedrich announced that this special meeting had been called primarily to deal with a request from the Joint Committee on Finance of the Wisconsin Legislature. He stated that the President of the University had received a letter from the Joint Committee on Finance indicating that there probably would be no executive budget for 1963-64 passed before the end of the present fiscal year and requesting information as to the consequences of a possible cut of from 15% to 17% below the present year's appropriations. President Friedrich reported that Regents DeBardleben and Steiger had joined him in calling this special meeting.

President Friedrich stated that, although the principal business before the Regents was what he had mentioned, there was also one additional item of business relating to remodelling of the old Chemistry Building for the School of Pharmacy; and there being no objection, he requested Vice President Peterson to present this matter. Vice President Peterson distributed copies of the recommendations relating to the awarding of contracts and the approval of the schedule of costs for remodelling of space in the old Chemistry Building for the School of Pharmacy (EXHIBIT A attached). Vice President Peterson explained that the purpose of presenting these recommendations at this time was to permit the start of construction the following week. He noted that, although the funds available for this project were short \$70,000, there is sufficient money to award the contracts; and that the State Building Commission would be requested to provide the additional \$70,000 required.

Regent Steiger moved approval of the recommendations, (EXHIBIT A attached), the motion was seconded by Regent Gelatt, and it was voted.

President Friedrich announced that, in connection with the special purpose of this meeting, he understood that there would be a report from the President of the University to the Regents and that Regent Gelatt had a resolution to present. Regent Gelatt stated that he had a resolution for consideration by this Board, and read the resolution (EXHIBIT B attached). Regent Gelatt moved adoption of the resolution and the motion was seconded by Regent DeBardleben.

Regent Rothwell reported that he had received a call two days previously from the Bureau of Management indicating that there was no question but that there would be a reduction in appropriations of at least 17% below the current year's appropriations, if an executive budget is not adopted by the Legislature for 1963-64 prior to July 1, 1963. He also stated that he had been informed that, if the Department of Public Welfare receives the money it needs in order to keep its institutions running, the reductions for all other state agencies will be much greater than 17%.

Regent Gelatt stated that it seemed to him that the problem with the budget this year has to do with taxation, and that there are two divergent views, each having a certain amount of accuracy or truth to it. He noted that there was some truth to the statement that the sales tax may be more regressive than the income tax; and that there is also some truth in the statement that income taxes are higher in Wisconsin than in several other neighboring states and would have a direct effect on the future growth of industry in this state. He stated that there was no question in anyone's mind but that a reduction in, or even a failure to increase, the present University budget will be sure, certain, and sudden disaster. He stated that a budget (for 1963-64) could be adopted and there would still be time to determine which of the two theories of taxation is better or whether a combination of both would be better. He noted that the result of such kinds of taxation can be observed in a trend, but that a cutting off of the funds for the University would not be a trend but a disaster.

Regent Rothwell inquired how big a cut there would be in the executive budget, if the University budget was cut 15% to 17% below the current level. President Harrington indicated that the cut would be approximately 40% in the executive budget request for the University.

Regent DeBardleben stated that he was of the opinion that it was not a question of what the adjustments would be, if the budget was reduced as suggested. He stated that we can not do this and still have a University of Wisconsin. He noted that, under the constitution of the State of Wisconsin, there is to be maintained a University of Wisconsin to which the children of the State can go where their parents are confident that they will obtain good training. He stated that when the Regents are asked a question like this that, as Regents, they are asked to put their stamp of approval on ruining this University. If it were to happen, it certainly could not happen by the affirmative vote of the Regents of the University. He stated that this was a contrived crisis, to which

the Regents of this institution could not subscribe. Regent DeBardleben pointed out that there had been recognition by the Governor and by the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Joint Committee on Finance of the real need for substantial increases in the funds for the University. He noted that everybody on both sides of the fence agreed that the University needs this money. He stated that the question of how the University would operate on a 15% to 17% reduction could not be answered in the context of keeping the University of Wisconsin.

Regent Werner stated that he went along with everything that had been said by Regents DeBardleben and Gelatt; but he raised a question regarding the phrase "could not be party to," in the first sentence of the resolution presented by Regent Gelatt. He thought that the phrase assumed the Regents had something to say about the money to be provided to the University. He stated that the Regents do not have anything to say as to whether the money should be given to the University of Wisconsin, since that is a function of the Legislature. He noted that the Regents are responsible to the people of Wisconsin; and that the Regents had called the needs of the University to the attention of the Legislature in the most emphatic terms. Regent DeBardleben stated that he thought the Regents would be a party to it, if, on the basis of an inquiry, they acquiesced in anyway in furnishing the information requested. Regent Werner agreed that the Regents should not acquiesce, but noted that, if it happens, by no stretch of the imagination could the Regents be accused of being a party to it. He suggested some other appropriate words might be substituted for "can not be party to". Regent Gelatt, noting that he did not know where the legal responsibilities of the Regents begin or end, stated that he would feel derelict if he did not speak up or do anything in the way of offering his service or the services of the Regents or of the administration to achieve the funds needed by the University. He stated that he was not wedded to any particular language in the proposed resolution as long as it states clearly that there would not be a University of Wisconsin if the suggested reductions are effected. Regent DeBardleben noted the language of the resolution was appropriate, and believed that, if the Regents suggested by silence or otherwise that this University could stand any reduction, they would be a party to it. President Friedrich believed that the sense of the resolution was that the Regents cannot suggest to the Joint Committee on Finance how they can reduce the budget from 15% to 17%. If they do so, they would be a party to the proposed reduction. Regent Werner stated that he could approve the language of the resolution, if "cannot be party to" meant saying "No" to the request of the Legislature.

Regent Jensen pointed out that the reduction of 15% to 17% would be in the neighborhood of \$10,000,000; that the proper share of the cost due to growth of the student body that the state should assume would be about \$14,000,000; and that the total amount appeared to be \$24,000,000. Professor William Young agreed, pointing out that the reduction would be about 40% from the amount requested for 1963-64.

President Friedrich made the following statement:

"I think it is most unfortunate that we are requested to even consider a proposition of this kind at a time like this when our economy is in fair condition. If there was a very bad economic situation, one might be able to understand it. But we cannot understand it in the face of the present situation. What would we have to do if we had a worse economic situation? That is one thing.

"The second thing is that everybody today recognizes the fact that, if industry is to develop in this state and in the midwestern states, there is need for new products, new ways of doing things, all of which require a high quality educational system. And to say that we in Wisconsin cannot at this juncture afford quality education, is to place wrong emphasis on the value of things. We, here in Wisconsin, and in the nation as a whole, are proud of our rising standard of living, which is good. I come, of course, from the group of the working class of people that are employed by industry. But there has been an increase in the standard of living. We live better in material things, but here we are suggesting that, while we continue to improve our material standards, we cut back on our educational standards; and to me a standard of living must include not only material things, but also cultural things and educational values. If, in order to provide these educational and cultural values, some of us may have to cut back a little on our material things, I think it is a sacrifice worth making, because eventually it will result in greater values jointly in cultural and material things.

"So, it is most unfortunate that this comes at a time like this when the horizons of education are expanding and new knowledge is absolutely essential to the well being of this state and of this nation, essential to the status of this nation and the world. I go along whole-heartedly with this resolution that is here proposed. I think we will have the support of most of the people in the State of Wisconsin in saying that a cutback in our education at a time like this is absolutely unthinkable."

Regent Jensen noted the contrast between two countries, Venezuela and Denmark. Venezuela being very rich above and below ground in resources, but having one of the lowest standards of living in the world. Denmark, on the other hand, having very little in the way of resources, being in a sand belt, with poor soil, similar to central Wisconsin, but having one of the highest standards of living in the world. He stated that education was the answer to the difference in the standard of living in those two countries. He stated that the United States, being rich in resources both above and below ground, should have not only one of the highest standards of living, but also the highest or one of the highest educational systems in the world.

Regent Werner moved that, in any reply to the Legislature, the above remarks by President Friedrich be included verbatim. The motion was seconded by Regent Jensen. President Friedrich turned the chair over to Regent Jensen, who put the question on the immediately preceding motion, and it was voted.

President Friedrich resumed the chair and put the question on the adoption of the resolution (EXHIBIT B attached). A called vote was taken with Regents DeBardleben, Friedrich, Gelatt, Greenquist, Jensen, Rohde, Rothwell, Steiger, and Werner voting "Aye". There were no "Noes". The resolution was declared adopted unanimously.

President Friedrich noted the Regents also had a report from the President of the University on this matter. He explained that the State College Regents also had held a meeting on this subject this morning, and it would be considered by the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education in the afternoon. He stated that he understood that the resolution which the University Regents had just adopted, and the report to be made to the Regents by the President of the University, would be submitted to the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education.

Before presenting his report on this matter, President Harrington explained that, while he was on his way back from Mexico, the letter had been received from Senator Walter G. Hollander and Assemblyman Glen Pommerening, Chairmen of the Joint Committee on Finance, and that Vice President Clodius and the other University Officials, during his absence, had done much of the basic work in connection with the preparation of this report, which was to serve as a basis for a reply to the request of the Joint Committee on Finance. President Harrington stated that he felt that everybody wants to break this log jam; that the Joint Committee on Finance is very much interested in helping the University get out of this difficulty; that the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Joint Committee on Finance has shown that the Joint Finance Committee wants to support the University; and he stated that he knew the Governor wants to support the University and has made a strong recommendation for the University budget. In the event a solution to this problem is not found, President Harrington stated that the University cannot take a cut below current expenditures. He stated that the University serves the State, is necessary for the State, and it must be contended that the University needs support to render this service. He stated that it was unthinkable to cut salaries, when they should be increased; to reduce staff, when it should be increased; to let fees skyrocket, when the nature of our University is to serve people of average wage families; to limit enrollment, when the student body is increasing so rapidly; or to drop some of our programs in instruction, in research, in extension, and on some of our other campuses. He pointed out that the answer to the Joint Committee on Finance is that the University cannot make these suggested reductions, because the University is necessary and must be maintained. He noted that it was in this spirit that the University administration had prepared this report, which he then read, (EXHIBIT C attached).

President Harrington stated that he wanted to repeat that, while he had read this statement and had worked on drawing it up, he wanted to emphasize that the basic work in framing it had been done by Vice President Clodius and the other administrative officials. He noted that it was a statement of position identical to that of the position of the Regents.

Regent Werner moved that the Board heartily approve the statement (EXHIBIT C attached), which had been prepared by the administrative officials and approved by President Harrington. The motion was seconded by Regent Greenquist. President Friedrich stated that the effect of the motion was to approve the report of the President of the University in reply to the request of the Joint Committee on Finance. A called vote was taken, with Regents DeBardeleben, Friedrich, Gelatt, Greenquist, Jensen, Rohde, Rothwell, Steiger and Werner voting "Aye", there were no "Noes". The motion was adopted unanimously.

Regent Rothwell called attention to the fact that, in the event the Legislature decides to do something for the University, but not until Fall, all

of the civil service employees would be denied scheduled salary increases, which in reality would become cuts, since the Legislature cannot make such salary increases effective retroactively. Noting the amount of money and the number of people involved, he pointed out that this would mean a substantial reduction unless something is done prior to July 1. President Harrington stated that that was one of the reasons for the need for action before the July 1 deadline.

Regent Gelatt inquired whether there was anything that the Regents could do as individuals or as a Board. President Friedrich suggested talking to members of the Legislature and to the Governor to see if any action can be taken. Regent Steiger noted that the problem was not a one way street and that it would be necessary to talk to both the Legislature and the Governor. President Harrington stated that the administration would be pleased to convey to members of the Legislature and to the Governor the willingness of the Regents to offer any services that might be useful at this stage. It was agreed that that suggestion be followed. President Friedrich suggested that, as far as the Legislature was concerned, the best approach was to approach the heads of the Democratic and Republican caucuses; and that it certainly would not hurt if the Regents would contact the Assemblymen and Senators in their own districts or others with whom they have relationships that could be effective in this present situation.

President Harrington thanked all of the Regents for coming to this meeting, stating that he realized that it was a substantial sacrifice to those who had interrupted business or vacation plans, and he expressed gratitude for those Regents who were staying over for the meeting of the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education. He stated that this meeting should show the people of the State the importance of this crisis.

Regent Werner announced that a meeting of the Special Regent Committee on Acquisition of Land in Milwaukee would be held immediately following this meeting.

President Harrington congratulated the University on the re-appointment of Regent Werner as a member of the Board of Regents.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 A.M.

Clarke Smith, Secretary

Pharmacy Building Remodelling

That, subject to the approval of the State Building Commission, the Governor, and the State Director of Engineering, contracts for remodelling of space in the old Chemistry Building for the School of Pharmacy, Madison campus (Project No. 6207-17) be awarded to the low bidder in each division of the work on the basis of the base bid and the alternate bids accepted; and that any Vice President or Assistant Vice President of the University be authorized to sign the contracts:

General Construction

J. H. Findorff & Son, Inc.  
Madison, Wisconsin

Base Bid No. 1	\$47,728	
Add Alt. 1D	4,900	
Alt. 1F was included in Base Bid	<u>N/C</u>	\$52,628

Plumbing & Sewer

Wm. F. Butler  
Madison, Wisconsin

Base Bid No. 2	\$37,884	
Add Alt. 2A	143	
Add Alt. 2B	181	
Add Alt. 2C	190	
Add Alt. 2D	261	
Add Alt. 2E	220	
Add Alt. 2F	<u>3,301</u>	\$42,180

Htg., Vent., Air Cond.

Home Heating Company, Inc.  
Madison, Wisconsin

Base Bid No. 3	\$39,300	
Add Alt. 3A	21,400	
Add Alt. 3B	2,800	
Add Alt. 3C	3,090	
Add Alt. 3D	600	
Add Alt. 3E	600	
Add Alt. 3F	<u>395</u>	\$68,185

Electrical

R. D. Schnurbusch, Inc.  
Madison, Wisconsin

Base Bid No. 4	\$30,980	
Add Alt. 4A	780	
Add Alt. 4B	104	
Add Alt. 4C	115	
Add Alt. 4D	73	
Add Alt. 4E	73	
Deduct Alt. 4F	<u>-300</u>	\$31,825

Laboratory Equipment

Kewaunee Technical Furniture  
Co., Statesville, No. Carolina

Base Bid No. 5	\$69,050	
Add Alt. 5A	<u>11,000</u>	\$80,050.



Pharmacy Building Remodelling

That the following schedule of costs be approved for remodelling of space in the old Chemistry Building for the School of Pharmacy:

	<u>Preliminary Schedule</u>	<u>Additional* 7/1/63</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total Construction Contracts, including Fixed Equipment	\$274,868		\$274,868
Design & Supervision			
Architect's Fee	\$24,000		
Bur. of Engineering	<u>6,000</u>		
	30,000		30,000
Contingent	4,280	\$22,500	26,780
Movable Equipment		47,000	47,000
Other (Landscaping)		<u>500</u>	<u>500</u>
	<u>\$309,148</u>	<u>\$ 70,000</u>	<u>\$379,148</u>
Source of Funds:			
National Institutes of Health	\$137,074		\$137,074
Graduate School Research Gifts	137,074		137,074
State Building Commission	<u>35,000</u>	<u>\$70,000</u>	<u>105,000</u>
	<u>\$309,148</u>	<u>\$70,000</u>	<u>\$379,148</u>

\*/ Subject to allotment of funds by the State Building Commission.

## A RESOLUTION

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, responsible to the citizens of Wisconsin for the operation and progress of their University, cannot be party to the disaster which a 15 to 17 per cent reduction below the University's current operating level would bring.

It would be catastrophic in its effect upon the University, would undermine the economic progress of the State, and would ruthlessly deny to future generations educational opportunities which the people of Wisconsin have worked for more than a hundred years to provide. It would lay waste to one of the world's great faculties, destroy this State's major source of brainpower--the best resource it has for bettering the lives of its people.

We therefore call upon the Governor and the Legislature to recognize the scope and the permanence of such a disaster, and implore them to act immediately to meet the University's financial needs before the fiscal year begins, July 1, 1963.

We call upon the University administration to make clear to the Joint Committee on Finance the full dimensions of the tragic consequences which would follow failure to provide adequate financial support for the University.

The Secretary of this Board will communicate this Resolution to the Governor, and to the Legislature, and to the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education.

May 31, 1963 EXHIBIT B

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY  
TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

May 31, 1963

We have been asked by the Legislature's Joint Committee on Finance to state the consequences of attempting to operate the University in 1963-65 on a State appropriation 15 to 17 per cent below the current year's appropriation.

We have given the question serious, detailed study.

We have found that the only answer is that such a reduction would be disastrous to the University and to the State, and to all the people of Wisconsin.

The young people of Wisconsin would be cheated out of the educational opportunities they need and deserve; the economic progress of our State would be halted; the University, as we know it, would not survive.

To cut 15 per cent below the present level would mean a reduction of \$14,728,732 below the request for 1963-64 recommended by the University administration and approved by the Board of Regents and the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education; \$14,198,802 below the Governor's recommendation; \$8,873,374 below the budget recommended by the Legislative Joint Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Higher Education; and \$4,679,939 below the current year's \$31,199,590 State appropriation.

Since more than 82 per cent of the University's educational budget is used to pay civil service and faculty, a cut of the magnitude suggested could be accomplished only by dropping a total of 700 staff members--more than ten per cent of our present faculty and civil service employes--with a consequent reduction in program and course offerings.

In terms of current State fund appropriations, such a reduction would be equal to, for example::

1. Closing the instructional program of the College of Letters and Science in Madison with its 46 departments ranging from Art History to Zoology; or
2. Closing the instructional program in Madison of the Colleges of Agriculture and Engineering and the Schools of Education, Law, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy; or
3. Closing all instructional programs of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and the College of Agriculture in Madison, and the eight University Centers in the Fox Valley, at Green Bay, Kenosha, Manitowoc, Marathon County, Marinette, Racine, and Sheboygan, and failing to open the new Center at Marshfield and other projected Centers; or
4. Dropping all State-supported research in all the schools and colleges of the University and all General Extension programs.

EXHIBIT C

Any of these alternatives, or a combination of them, would require the violation of tenure commitments to the faculty and would disgrace the University and the State of Wisconsin in the world of higher education.'

In the current year's budget, almost two-thirds of the State appropriation supports instruction; there is no way the cut could be made without drastically and permanently affecting University instruction. It would be legally impossible and morally indefensible to make up the deficit in instructional funds by diverting gift and grant funds earmarked by the donors for research, special programs, or student aid.

It would be equally impossible and improper to curtail enrollments to meet such a fund limitation at this late date. We already have hired the faculty and committed the University to providing Summer Sessions instruction for some 12,000 students on the 1963-64 budget. Registrations for the fall semester at Madison, Milwaukee, and the Centers have been committed to some 36,000 students, ten per cent above the current budgeted enrollment. Colleges today are so crowded that if any of these students were turned away at this late date, they could not find a college to accept them next fall. We cannot be responsible for such widespread, personal tragedy. And if savings were to be realized by denying education to these young people or by cheating on the quality or the scope of their educational opportunities, such savings would have to come from layoffs of faculty and staff. Such layoffs would start a chain reaction which would encourage 25 to 35 per cent of our faculty to accept employment opportunities elsewhere. Recruitment of qualified replacements would be impossible. If this were to happen, the University and the State would never recover from the loss.

State "seed money" for faculty research has attracted many millions of dollars to Wisconsin from non-state sources. Without matching State funds federal agricultural research support would not be available. Loss of faculty through lack of research support would most likely doom such potential federal programs as the \$125,000,000 Atomic Energy Commission Midwest Accelerator at Stoughton and countless other enterprises on which this State's industrial progress heavily depends. In an era when a state's supply of brainpower has become the source of its economic progress, loss of our University faculty and research would cut off Wisconsin's main brainpower supply.

If the Legislature were to ask the Regents to levy and use additional student fees to replace a 15 per cent reduction in State appropriations and to raise our operations to the level agreed upon as necessary by the Regents and the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, such an action would almost triple fees for Wisconsin residents and require non-resident fees higher than those at any private or public university in the country. Such action is out of the question since increases of this order would deny higher education to young people from the average family in Wisconsin, and force some students already enrolled to cancel their plans for completing their education.

We call attention to the detailed study made by the Joint Finance Committee's own Subcommittee on Higher Education which found that the University will require \$8,371,791 additional next year just to teach added students, to meet inevitable fixed cost increases, and for such sorely needed improvements as faculty salary

increases, an extended summer term, strengthening the University Center curricula, and the expansion of commerce and engineering offerings at Milwaukee. None of these needs could be met if the present appropriation level were continued.

Reducing the budget 15 to 17 per cent below the present appropriation level would bring about an intolerable cost in human values--the students who would be cheated of the variety and quality of courses, curricula, and teachers they deserve--parents whose aspirations for higher education for their children would be denied--the loyal and dedicated teachers and staff who would be discharged--the adults on farms and in cities who would not continue to develop their knowledge, training, and interests.

And who can say what the State might lose if the quality of the University were washed away--the farm boy from McFarland who may discover the cure for a dreaded nutritional disease, the dedicated researcher whose drug may cure cancer, the hybridizer who may develop a superior crop variety?

Who is the loser if the potential Steenbock, or Elvehjem, or Witte or Heidelberger never gets a University education, or if he manages to attend, is not inspired by a gifted teacher?

Who is the loser if the quality of the courses for and the knowledge of our young graduating doctors is not up to par, or the teachers of our children or our pharmacists, or lawyers, or nurses, or any graduate of the class of 1964 and beyond?

Finally, let there be no misunderstanding about the urgency for prompt solution of the problem of an adequate budget for the University. It is the height of folly and the courting of disaster to gamble with the future of the University. To try to rebuild the losses of programs, of quality, of teachers, of research at some future time--even if only a few months in the future--would cost incredibly more than to maintain and develop what already exists. And the tampering, for a few months or years, with the hopes, the aspirations, the jobs, and the futures of the hundreds of thousands of persons who benefit in one way or another from the University--to the boundaries of the State--would be a cost that could never be recovered.