



# LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

## **Minutes of the special meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System: September 21, 1972. 1972**

Madison, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 1972

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/SEEMH22OCELNK8A>

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.

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING  
of the  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Madison, Wisconsin

Held in Room 1820 Van Hise Hall  
Thursday, September 21, 1972, 3:05 P.M.

President Kopp presiding.

PRESENT: Regents Christianson, Day, Fish, Gelatt, Hales, Kopp, Lavine, Neshek, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, and Williams.

ABSENT: Regents Dixon, Kahl, McNamara, Murphy, Nellen, Solberg, Zancanaro, and Ziegler.

- - -

President Kopp announced that this special meeting of the Board was called for the purpose of acting on the recommendations of the Business and Finance Committee relating to the approval of the 1973-75 University of Wisconsin System Biennial Operating Budget Requests and such other matters as may properly come before the Board.

President Kopp reported that the report of the Business and Finance Committee was not yet in final form, so that the meeting would be recessed for about twenty minutes.

The meeting recessed at 3:07 P.M.

---

The meeting reconvened at 3:34 P.M.

✓

PRESENT: Regents Christianson, Day, Dixon, Fish, Gelatt, Hales, Kopp, Lavine, Neshek, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, Williams, and Ziegler.

ABSENT: Regents Kahl, McNamara, Murphy, Nellen, and Zancanaro.

- - -

President Kopp reported that he had received a written request from Professor Edward J. Muzik, President of the Association of University of Wisconsin Faculties, to appear before the full Board, although he had earlier addressed the meeting of the Business and Finance Committee.

Professor Muzik stated that he probably should have waited until after the Board took action on the report of the Business and Finance Committee, but, assuming that that would be affirmative, he stated that he wanted to express his thanks, and stated that he was very happy to have been here at what he considered a rather historic day, in terms of the action he hoped the Board was about to take in approving the budget. He stated that he wanted to express the appreciation of the faculty for the great work that the Central Administration did. He stated that the faculty were very impressed by this tremendous amount of work that went into the budget process. He noted that he had the pleasure of working with Gene Arnn for almost nine months on the faculty Advisory Committee on Compensation, and very much enjoyed that relationship. He stated that he wanted to express the thanks of the faculty to the Board for the enlightened action it was about to take in regard to the budget.

President Kopp expressed to Professor Muzik the appreciation of the Board for the letter of appreciation which he had sent in regard to the faculty retroactive pay case.

President Kopp recognized Professor Michael Besel, Chairman of the University of Wisconsin Faculty Council. Professor Besel stated that he just wanted to second Professor Muzik's statement, expressing appreciation for the Board taking this responsible action.

-

President Kopp stated that he wanted to take this opportunity to formally welcome Regent Day to this Board, and to tell him that the Regents were very happy to have him with them.

Regent Day expressed his appreciation for President Kopp's remarks, and stated that he very much appreciated the honor that the Governor had seen fit to bestow upon him, and that he hoped he would prove to be a worthy colleague of the Regents. He noted that he had come in at a time of baptism of fire, and that he was only a week old on the Board, and was certainly learning a great deal and looking forward to his associations on the Board.

-

Regent Fish noted that there was a meeting of the Physical Planning and Development Committee scheduled for 10:00 A.M. on the following day, which

all Board members were invited to attend. He suggested that, in order to provide additional time, if there was no objection, he would like to move that meeting up to 9:00 A.M. on the following day. There were no objections so he requested that the meeting of the Physical Planning and Development Committee be held at 9:00 A.M. on Friday, September 22. President Kopp stated that he thought it was important that all members of the Board stay over for the meeting of the Physical Planning and Development Committee on the following day, because it was another phase of finance, and would be an extremely important meeting.

President Kopp announced that it would be necessary to hold an Executive Session of the Board at the end of the meeting to meet with counsel and consider several matters on which legal advice was needed, after which there would probably be an announcement.

- . - -

#### REPORT OF THE BUSINESS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Regent Neshek presented the report of the Business and Finance Committee; and he made the following statement: "I want to commend those Regents who, over the summer months, were able to take a personal extra interest in the budget process and to participate with the Central Administration on a day-to-day and week-by-week basis as they built the very responsible budget requests for our consideration. I believe that we have been better prepared and better informed on this undertaking than on any in my recollection, and that we have shown a great restraint in assessing our budget needs for the next biennium. Certainly, it cannot go un-noticed that we are requesting a state fund increase, and a total fund increase, that is below the increase amount actually authorized by the Legislature for the current biennium. I would urge the full Board's unanimous support of this proposal, and their commitment to seek complete support for its content at all subsequent budget review levels.

"I would also like to take this opportunity to read a letter that I received from Mr. Carley, our Regent, who has resigned. (Regent Neshek read the letter from Mr. Carley, which is attached as EXHIBIT A.) I thought it was important to read that letter, since Mr. Carley had, along with the other members of the Business and Finance Committee, and the other Regents, taken the opportunity to work step by step in this budget process."

Regent Neshek stated that the Business and Finance Committee, after more meetings and more personal involvement than he thought possible during the past few months, and after the meeting just concluded, had approved recommendations relating to the 1973-75 Operating Budget Requests, which he read (copy attached as EXHIBIT B.) Regent Neshek reported that Vice President Percy had prepared a proposed single summary resolution, EXHIBIT C attached, relating to the 1973-75 Operating Budget Requests, also for consideration by the Board. He asked Vice President Percy to review the proposed summary resolution. Vice President Percy explained that the figures in the proposed summary resolution had been corrected to show the changes proposed in the aforementioned recommendations of the Business and Finance Committee. He also explained the four paragraphs following the tabulation in the proposed summary resolution.

Regent Neshek moved adoption of the following resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regent Solberg:

Resolution 298: That the resolutions of the Business and Finance Committee (EXHIBIT B attached) and the proposed summary resolution (EXHIBIT C attached), relating to the 1973-75 University of Wisconsin System Biennial Operating Budget Requests, be adopted.

Regent Day announced that, due to his general lack of familiarity with the budget requests, because he had only very recently been appointed to the Board, just a week ago, he would abstain from voting on the above resolution.

President Kopp ordered that the record would show that Regent Day was abstaining from voting on the Biennial Operating Budget Requests; and he stated that there would be a roll call vote on the above resolution.

Regent Ziegler stated that he had prepared a brief statement that he would like to make at this time before the roll was called. He read the following statement:

"Although I was unable to participate in the budget review proceedings on Monday of this week and today, I have studied the many documents, schedules, and supportive appendix distributed to the Regents these past five months. The 'Percy approach' never ceases to amaze me! He and his staff have performed the impossible in pulling together a cost analysis and proposed biennial budget for these 27 campuses.

"The questions I would have had were answered, I am sure, in your committee deliberations. The methodology and policy decisions generally meet my approval, and, of course, I did participate in many of the conclusions.

"However, today we are voting for the first time on a biennial budget for the merged University of Wisconsin System. The 1972-73 Annual budget was pretty much the tag end of Chapter 36 and Chapter 37 last separate biennial budgets. I personally opposed the merger of the two systems of higher education in Wisconsin. The reasons for my opposition were numerous, but the basic hang up I had was a strong belief that the merged system would cost those who financially support higher education in this state more money without any improvement in the quality or availability.

"It has been my policy to endorse proposals of Central Administration unless their proposals are contrary to what I deem is good for the taxpayers of Wisconsin. This biennial budget is probably the best documented request for funds Wisconsin has ever seen, but I find it necessary to vote against it because of my firm belief that merger of Chapters 36 and 37 is not in the best interest of higher education or the citizens I represent by serving on this Board."

President Kopp stated that the record would show the statement by Regent Ziegler.

Regent Fish stated that he too had prepared a statement, and that he would also vote "No" on the operating budget requests. He read the following statement:

"The vote on the University of Wisconsin System operating budget is the most difficult one I have had to cast as a Regent. On the one hand is the really Herculean job that Central Administration has done under most difficult circumstances. The efficiency thrust by President Weaver has accomplished much, the genius of Vice President Percy has put the best face on a troubled situation. The other side of the coin, however, is that a vote for this budget would acknowledge that despite every conceivable efficiency we are doomed to a system that grows at a faster rate than inflation, a faster rate than enrollment and a faster rate than we can absorb.

"Several things disturb me and I'll detail them. It should be apparent to even the most ardent supporter of merger that it has, as predicted, cost an almost unbelievable amount of money. To vote for the budget would be saying to the legislators and to the populace that indeed it's the best we can do. I've never been an ardent supporter of the efficiency and economy of scale, that size brings savings. Indeed, the reverse is usually true. I am distressed that we often read that 'in spite of merger' the budget is up. The truth is that it is up because of merger. And without that great thrust by President Weaver I wonder how high it would have gone. The only demonstrated economy is the elimination of the CCHE \$800,000 budget and it is as fallacious to call that a savings as it is to overlook the fact that with that \$800,000 CCHE biennially effected budget cuts of many times that amount--a considerable number of millions of dollars--close to 100 million dollars in the last four biennia.

"This was to have saved us on competition for programs--yet we note that over 75 new courses and degrees were requested by the campuses. Merger was to eliminate log rolling and yet the capital budget request by some strange coincidence includes at least one structure for each of the 13 four-year degree granting campuses. The prestige factors were to fill the campuses of the Chapter 37 schools and yet we find a net decrease in their enrollment and a net increase in each of the four Chapter 36 institutions. Chapter 36 went from 61,329 to 66,527 and Chapter 37 from 62,642 to 59,963.

"To say that we, as Regents, should not let it happen does not square with reality. You achieve equality and equity always on the high side--a bigger budget was absolutely preordained with merger legislation. If we accept this now, we are building in cost increases we simply cannot control. Don't blame the officers of this institution, they did everything they could.

"Enrollment in total is almost exactly the same as it was two years ago, a grand total in all the campuses of 149 more students. Despite this the budget request is up 14.8%--and more importantly, the State funded portion of it is up a whopping 25.1%. I might add that was without the \$300,000 that was added to it this morning. I cannot accept that \$21,000,000 was withdrawn to conform to guidelines when most of it was put back under a different name. The public realizes that whether you call it a pie or pastry, it still is a lot of dough.

"I have diligently waded through all the books, all the tables, all the arguments. I am not trying to make a retroactive evaluation, but I think it is time we reflect on our basic problem. No one has worked any harder to see what could be done in putting this together. It is time we reflect on our basic problem and I don't care how much rhetoric we get, the fact remains that the budget is up almost 15% with no enrollment increase. This amounts to an increase of \$37 for every man, woman and child in this state for higher education.

"I must vote no on the operating budget."

President Kopp ordered that the record show Regent Fish's statement.

Regent Lavine made the following statement:

"Certainly, I have respect for Regent Ziegler's and Regent Fish's remarks, and I don't intend to debate merger here, I think that's past, but I would just point out an observation that I came to in the process which merely is, I think realistically the people of Wisconsin, who have two systems like all university systems in this nation, have now reached the time when enrollments are leveling off, and more simply put, it is more expensive to educate students because education is more complex, and because this institution, like every other in our society, is more costly to run, from the price of paper clips to faculty salaries, to the fact that teaching physics is not just a test tube, you need a lot of things to go with it now.

"I just want to commend the Central Administration as I vote 'Yes' for the budget, because I think we will never be able to tell in concrete terms, if we could have gone back and had a system that wasn't merged, or one that was, you can't run the two side by side. I think Central has done a perfectly magnificent job of chopping requests down below the level the Legislature even gave us in the past, and they are stopping unnecessary competition where a buck could be passed and buried between two Boards of Regents and the CCHE. They stopped it, I hear the screams of pain in schools across the system.

"I think the total package is a wonderful job, and has put a lid on where we are going--not just in the new things, but in the old things we are doing. I think that will become apparent in the next few years, when we do the program reviews of what we are doing right now. I am very impressed, and I don't like voting for more tax dollars, I don't think anyone does, but I think this is a job right down to the core, and we can go to anyone and defend it, and have concrete reasons for what we are doing. I want to thank, frankly, as a Regent, President Weaver, Don Percy, and the rest of his staff."

President Kopp ordered that the record would show the statement by Regent Lavine.

Regent Dixon made the following statement:

"I will state at the beginning that I will support the resolution, but I would also like to say that I support in principle the remarks by Regents Ziegler and Fish. I think we are dealing with a very sensitive problem here, and I do not believe that a case has been made as yet for merger. I think this is going to be a continuing matter for discussion and study for the next biennium. Meanwhile, I do believe, in the interests of good education and good teaching, the show must go on, and, therefore, we have to work with the tools at hand which our administration has done so capably in preparing the budget figures, so I will vote for it, but I still believe that we have many bridges to cross before we can say, and I do not believe that we say, in voting for the budget, that we are supporting wholeheartedly the philosophy of merger."

President Kopp ordered that the record would show the statement by Regent Dixon.

Regent Renk made the following statement:

"I too opposed merger, but I am going to vote for the budget. I think it has been a foregone conclusion for quite some time that merger would not save money. I state that the budget that has been presented here today, with the tremendous effort put on by the administration, Don Percy, and the President, is bare bones. Sure there has been some increase. We have had some statutory increases. We are trying to take care of our faculty, to make them competitive, and I will therefore support it."

President Kopp ordered that the record show the statement by Regent Renk.

Regent Williams made the following statement:

"I think it is entirely inappropriate to discuss at this time the philosophy of merger or non-merger. I don't think it had anything to do with the discussion in the Business and Finance Committee



today, which the rest of us attended, and didn't hear the reasons for and against various things. That, I think, belongs in another place. There is a Merger Implementation Study Committee, which is discussing this, and any references that these gentlemen wish to make can be put in that particular place, and that committee can decide on it.

"It seems to me that our obligation as a Board, in looking at the expenses and needs of the students for the next biennium, our obligation is to be as responsible as we possibly can to the students, to the people who are doing the teaching, to the administrations of the various parts of this university system, and to the citizens of the state. That is the way I look at this obligation. I was not going to look at it from the standpoint of whether merger is or is not going to save money. If we were separated and were submitting separate budgets, I think we would find that they had gone up in each system, planning to do the kinds of things that are needed in the future, so I think it is entirely inappropriate. We don't know what would have happened if we had still been separated, and I really object to this being raised at this time."

President Kopp ordered that the record would show the statement by Regent Williams.

Regent Christianson made the following statement:

"I have an observation. I will vote for the budget. Incidentally, however, I have vague reservations, and I have expressed them individually about what I would call snap judgment readjustments of figures that were submitted to us. I was impressed and very heartily in favor of the decisions arrived at by Central Administration. However, again, I have great reservations about the items that revised those figures, and I am specifically referring to the \$300,000 which might be justifiable, but I think we did this very much on the spur of the moment, and I have that doubt. The item of cost-of-living adjustment, I think too is rather open end, for which I have the same doubt. I will vote for the budget, with these things that bother me."

President Kopp ordered that the record would show the statement by Regent Christianson.

A roll call vote was taken on the adoption of Resolution 298, relating to the adoption of resolutions on the 1973-75 University of Wisconsin System Biennial Operating Budget Requests, with Regents Christianson, Dixon, Gelatt, Hales, Kopp, Lavine, Neshek, Pelisek, Renk, Sandin, Solberg, and Williams voting "Aye", with Regents Fish and Ziegler voting "No", and with Regent Day abstaining from voting. The resolution was declared adopted.

Regent Neshek stated that he believed it was fitting that he make some comment on the efforts and time of the members of the Business and Finance Committee, who spent many endless hours attending briefings and meetings and taking

the necessary time to do what he considered an expert job on this budget. He stated that he personally wanted to thank these gentlemen for their help and cooperation.

- - -

Regent Solberg suggested that it would be appropriate for the new Chancellor at UW-Stout to be introduced. Chancellor Robert Swanson was introduced to the Board; and President Kopp stated the Regents were happy to have him join the chancellors of the System.

- - -

The meeting recessed at 4:08 P.M. for an Executive Session.

---

The Regents went into Executive Session at 4:13 P.M., and arose from Executive Session at 4:43 P.M.

---

The meeting reconvened at 4:43 P.M., with President Kopp presiding.

President Kopp read the following resolution, which he reported had been unanimously adopted by the Regents in Executive Session:

Resolution 299: Whereas, Dr. Ralph G. Iverson served as Acting Chancellor at UW-Stout from November 22, 1971 to September 3, 1972, and

Whereas, in this role he skillfully and without hesitation carried out the duties assigned to that office, and

Whereas, he was able to engender widespread faculty support in what could have been a difficult period for the University,

Be It Resolved, that the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System commend him for his contributions as Acting Chancellor and reappoint him Assistant Chancellor for Student Services at an annual salary of \$30,500.

-

President Kopp read the following resolution, which had also been unanimously adopted by the Regents in Executive Session:

Resolution 300: Whereas, the United States of America has refused to accept the deed dated April 7, 1972 conveying 60.91 acres in LaCrosse County which included reversionary language if the Laboratory was not constructed within a period of 5 years; and

Whereas, the United States of America has appropriated to date \$1,067,000 to the Department of Interior for the Laboratory project; and

Whereas, the U.S. Attorney General has required that the reversion language be removed from the deed before construction contracts can be signed;

Now, therefore, the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System acknowledges that the United States of America is prepared to proceed with the project by virtue of the appropriations noted above and authorizes the President or Vice President and Secretary or Assistant Secretary to execute a new deed without the reversion language, for the 60.91 acre parcel conveyed pursuant to Resolution 99, adopted on February 11, 1972, subject, however, to the approval of the Attorney General of Wisconsin and, if required, the Building Commission.

- - -

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 P.M.

Clarke Smith, Secretary

INLAND STEEL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

315 West Gorham Street  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
(608) 257-5675

David Carley  
President

September 13, 1972

Mr. Milton E. Neshek, Regent  
University of Wisconsin  
Godfrey Building  
Elkhorn, Wisconsin 53121

Dear Milt:

After spending some considerable time on the University System budget with you and other members of the Business and Finance Committee, together with Don Percy and his staff, it seems incomplete that I end my official interest without a comment.

As you know, Don had prepared for me a complete set of working analysis of one of our major campuses so that I could study and test firsthand the budget criteria and standards we were requiring of the members of the System.

The rigorous demands you and the Central Staff have placed on the 1973-75 budget requests, particularly the use of the excellent Base Review process, will stand you in good stead, I can assure you, as you commence the budget action on the legislative terrain. I am convinced, Milt, that you will enter that process with the very best of credentials because you and the System will be prepared to a better extent than ever before.

My continuing best wishes.

Sincerely,

/s/  
David Carley

cc: Mr. Donald E. Percy

EXHIBIT A

As AmendedRegent Business and Finance Committee

## 1973-75 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST RESOLUTIONS

1. That the Faculty Compensation Program (attached Summary Item 3.b. \$42,770,200), amended to provide for income continuation coverage beginning in 1973-74 at an additional cost of \$800,000, be approved for inclusion in the 1973-75 Biennial Operating Budget Request of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, and that the Department of Administration, the Governor and the Legislature be asked to include the Academic Staff of the U.W. System in the annual cost of living adjustment payment provided other State employees.
2. That the Productivity Base Cuts (attached Summary Item 2., \$-21,558,700) and necessary Reinvestments to sustain Productivity Gains (attached Summary Item 3.a, \$9,186,400) be approved for inclusion in the 1973-75 Biennial Operating Budget Request of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.
3. That the New or Changed Services proposals (attached Summary Item 5.a-g, \$15,431,800) be approved for inclusion in the 1973-75 Biennial Operating Budget Request of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.
4. That the Workload Changes (attached Summary Item 4.a-f, \$34,918,800)  
Debt Service Costs (attached Summary Item 6., \$12,506,500)  
Costs to Continue (attached Summary Item 3.c-e, \$18,020,400)  
Annual Difference (attached Summary Item 1.e, \$40,434,120), and  
Fee/Tuition Income Offset (attached Summary Item 7, Zero Net)  
be approved for inclusion in the 1973-75 Biennial Operating Budget Request of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.

EXHIBIT B

Revised  
Sept. 21, 1972

SUMMARY OF U.W. SYSTEM 1973-75 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST

	<u>State Funds</u>	<u>Other Funds</u>	<u>Total Funds</u>
<b>1. <u>Current Operating Level</u></b>			
a. 1971-72 Budget Level (Actual)	\$ 232,263,562	\$ 261,762,818	\$ 494,026,380
b. 1972-73 Budget Level (Adjusted)	269,248,700	265,211,800	534,460,500
c. (Sub-Total)	(501,512,262)	(526,974,618)	(1,028,486,880)
d. <u>Annual Difference</u>	<u>36,985,138</u>	<u>3,448,982</u>	<u>40,434,120</u>
e. 1972-73 Level Doubled	538,497,400	530,423,600	1,068,921,000
<b>2. <u>Base Budget Cut for Productivity</u></b>	-21,558,700		-21,558,700
<b>3. <u>Add'l Costs to Continue Pres. Programs</u></b>			
a. Productivity Reinvestments	9,186,400		9,186,400
b. Faculty Compensation Program	42,005,200	1,565,000	43,570,200
c. Classified Merit Program	4,083,900	5,986,900	10,070,800
d. Price Increases	4,036,100		4,036,100
e. Other Costs to Continue	3,913,500		3,913,500
	(\$ 63,225,100)	( 7,551,900)	(\$ 70,777,000)
<b>4. <u>Workload Changes</u></b>			
a. Enrollment Funding	345,500	166,100	511,600
b. Physical Plant	8,167,600		8,167,600
c. Staff, Equip + Operate New Bldgs.	824,900		824,900
d. Auxiliary Enterprises + Hospitals		2,424,100	2,424,100
e. Other Workload Changes	1,795,800	-405,200	1,390,600
f. Est. Growth in Federal Funds		21,600,000	21,600,000
	(11,133,800)	(23,785,000)	(34,918,800)
<b>5. <u>New or Changed Services</u></b>			
a. Health-Related Programs	1,926,500		1,926,500
b. Teaching Hospitals	2,400,000		2,400,000
c. Revitalize Wisconsin Idea	3,223,000		3,223,000
d. Minority/Disadv. Programs	3,765,900		3,765,900
e. New Acad. Programs + Improvements	1,871,100		1,871,100
f. Research, Sea Grant, Marine Sci.	978,800		978,800
g. Other Program Improvements	1,266,500		1,266,500
	(15,431,800)		(15,431,800)
<b>6. <u>Add'l Debt Service Costs (Est.)</u></b>	12,506,500		12,506,500
<b>7. <u>Less Fee/Tuition Income (Est.)</u></b>	-13,690,000	+13,690,000	
<b>8. TOTAL PROPOSED OPERATING LEVEL</b>	<u>\$605,545,900</u>	<u>\$575,450,500</u>	<u>\$1,180,996,400</u>
<b>9. a. <u>Increase Over 1972-73 Level</u></b> (Line 8 less Line 1. e)	(67,048,500)	(45,026,900)	(112,075,400)
b. <u>Biennium-to-Biennium Increase</u> (Line 8 less Line 1. c)	(104,033,638)	(48,475,882)	(152,509,520)

(MORE)

10. SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR BIEN. INCREASE

a. State: (1) Amount Covered by Existing Tax Base \$ 36,985,138

↘ (2) Add'l Amount Required 67,048,500 ↙

b. Other: (1) Amount Covered by			
Exist. Income Level		3,448,982	
(2) Fee + Tuition		13,690,000	
(3) Federal		21,600,000	
(4) Other Program Rev.		9,736,900	
	<u>(104,033,638</u>	<u>(48,475,882)</u>	<u>(152,509,520)</u>

Proposed Summary Resolution

That the proposed 1973-75 Biennial Operating Budget for the University of Wisconsin System shown below be approved for forwarding to the Governor and that the Central Administration be authorized to make any budget adjustments necessary to reflect final salary and fringe benefit computations, final receipt estimates and Department of Administration format changes:

	<u>State Funds</u>	<u>Other Funds</u>	<u>Total Funds</u>
A. <u>Current Biennial Budget</u>	\$501,512,262	\$526,974,618	\$1,028,486,880
B. <u>Funding of Annual Differences</u>	36,985,138	3,448,982	40,434,120
C. <u>Budget Changes (1973-75)</u>			
1. 1973-74 Increases (Net)	24,512,800	18,501,200	43,014,000
Continued in 1974-75	24,512,800	18,501,200	43,014,000
2. 1974-75 Increases (Net)	<u>18,022,900</u>	<u>8,024,500</u>	<u>26,047,400</u>
3. Incr. over 1972-73 Level	(67,048,500)	(45,026,900)	(112,075,400)
4. Biennium to Biennium (Change (B+C))	(104,033,638)	(48,475,882)	(152,509,520)
D. <u>Proposed 1973-75 Budget</u> (A+B+C)	605,545,900	575,450,500	1,180,996,400

That the Joint Survey Committee on Retirement Systems and the Retirement Research Committee be asked to assist in analyzing the retirement needs of the System's academic staff and in preparing legislation providing for improved benefits, in addition to those proposed in this budget, to assure an adequate level of basic retirement income and range of options, including early retirement;

*Joe* That the Department of Administration in its biennial budget consideration of employee benefit plans be asked to consider extending state group health insurance coverage with employer cost sharing to academic staff not now eligible, particularly visiting faculty and graduate assistants;

That, independent of the University System's budget request, the biennial budget proposals of the State Laboratory of Hygiene and the State Soil and Water Conservation Board be conveyed directly to the Department of Administration for review and consideration as requested by the advisory board representatives of those two agencies; and

That the Department of Administration be asked to include revised statutory language in the budget bill more clearly providing for the payment of sewage charges as well as water utility costs from the sum sufficient appropriation for utilities and heating.