

MINUTES - JOINT MEETING

Executive Committee and Business and Finance Committee

Board of Trustees

Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of Higher Education

Thursday, January 24, 1991

3:00 P.M., Feinstone Lounge, Sullivan Hall, Park and Berks Malls

Attendance:

Executive Committee Members - Richard J. Fox*, Board Chairman, presiding; Patricia J. Clifford, Paul A. Dandridge, Peter J. Liacouras*, R. Anderson Pew, Edward H. Rosen, Isadore A. Shrager, Clare L. Wofford
(* - member of both Committees)

being a quorum of the Committee;

Business & Finance Committee Members - Harry P. Begier, Jr., John J. Contoudis, Richard J. Fox*, Peter J. Liacouras*, William W. Rieger, Francis R. Strawbridge, James A. Williams

Invited Trustee Attending - Nicholas A. Cipriani

Non-Voting Members - William Duncan (Alumni); Kenneth Cundy (Faculty); Randy Gaboriault (Student)

Executive Committee Non-Voting Advisory Member - William Woodward (Faculty)

Business and Finance Committee Non-Voting Advisory Members - John Hagopian (Alumni); Carson Schneck (Faculty)

Administration and Staff - Jack E. Freeman, Steven R. Derby, Leon S. Malmud, Laurent J. Remillard, Robert J. Reinstein, Julia A. Ericksen, Arthur C. Papacostas, Valaida S. Walker, Paul H. Boehringer, David V. Randall, Robert Lux, William G. Sites, Kathy Gosliner, Stephen Zelnick, Jesse Milan, A. Kent Rayburn, C. Robert Harrington, Marvin Gerstein, Jay Falkenstein, Richard A. Chant, Beverly L. Breese, William C. Seyler

General Counsel - Peter Mattoon

University Counsel - George E. Moore

Executive Committee Members Absent - Louis J. Esposito, Clifford Scott Green, Lacy H. Hunt, Irving K. Kessler, Milton L. Rock, Anthony J. Scirica

Business and Finance Committee Members Absent - Peter D. DePaul, Chaka Fattah, Lacy H. Hunt, D. Donald Jamieson, Brian J. O'Neill

Executive Committee NVA Member Absent - Jay L. Rosen (Alumni)

Business and Finance Committee NVA Member Absent - James Cawley (Student)

JOINT COMMITTEE ACTIONS

1. Approval of Minutes of Joint Meeting of 11/27/90

Without objection, the captioned Minutes were approved as distributed.

2. Next Joint Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Joint Committees is scheduled for Thursday, February 28, 1991, at 3:00 P.M., in Sullivan Hall on the Main Campus.

3. Announcement that the Committee on Trustees Will Recommend to the Board of Trustees that a Non-Temple Faculty Member or a Former Temple Faculty Member Should Be Elected to Membership on the Board of Trustees

Board Chairman Fox announced that at a meeting of the Committee on Trustees held earlier this afternoon, that Committee agreed to recommend to the Board of Trustees that a non-Temple faculty member or a former Temple faculty member should be elected to membership on the Board of Trustees. This reflects long discussions between the Trustees and the officers and Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate.

4. Remarks by Dr. Arthur Hochner, President of Temple Association of University Professionals (TAUP)

Mr. Fox said that Dr. Hochner had asked for the opportunity to speak to the Joint Committees, and five minutes have been granted to him for that purpose.

Dr. Hochner thanked the Committees for granting his request to speak, especially on such short notice. The reason he asked to be here is to discuss the state of negotiations between Temple and TAUP. He wants to enhance communications because he believes that there are serious misunderstandings. Specifically, he wants to ask that you agree to a meeting of our negotiating teams to discuss the issues and to come to a settlement.

We all share a common purpose, to make Temple and the education it provides the best that we can. Of course, there are differences of opinion between the union and the administration; but that's what collective bargaining is all about.

Contrary to what you may have been told, the union didn't and doesn't want a strike. Though a number of administrators think that we don't want a settlement, that is not true. We are reasonable, deliberate, pragmatic people. We have no hidden agenda. Our aim is simply to get a negotiated contract--a fair contract for our members--one that they can live with.

The union has not been and is not attacking individuals. Our motive is not to attack the President. We have carefully refrained from

doing so. You can look at our publications and our public statements. The personal attacks have come from the news media, who have, in order to make a story, prompted individuals (both in and out of TAUP) to personalize the issues. In fact, when some members of the Faculty Senate told me that they wanted to have a poll on President Liacouras, I told them that the union and I would have nothing to do with it, that it was a bad idea, and that it would not help us get a contract, our real aim.

We are concerned about the state of the University's finances and always have been. We are well aware of the financial circumstances facing us all, most immediately the Governor's mid-year budget cuts. I can but imagine the tremendous concern you bear in dealing with this situation.

Contract negotiations are most publicly identified with wages and benefits, but they are not just a matter of dollars and cents. These negotiations involve the educational and scholarly missions of Temple, the role of faculty and staff, their relationship to the administration, and the overall relationship of our union and Temple.

Nevertheless, in making our proposals, TAUP has brought nothing to the bargaining table that could not be settled there. Our proposals are fair ones, which represent the needs and interests of the members of our bargaining unit dues-payers, but we regularly and pointedly seek the views of all we represent. We desire to reach a reasonable settlement, one both the University and our members can live with and build our mutual relationship on.

However, there is a perception on the administration's part that we have not been fair, reasonable or flexible. This perception stems from misunderstandings of our position. For example, on the issue of co-pay of health insurance, the \$260 is not and has not been the issue. The issue is the cost of health insurance coverage. We are well aware that the costs are rising and putting an escalating burden on employers and individuals. But we want to be part of a long-term solution here at Temple. We have been doing extensive research into the issue and are seriously concerned that Temple overpays for inferior coverage. Before we "solve" the problem with \$260 in co-pay, we want to examine our coverage and make sure we're getting our money's worth. In order to be responsible and to understand the issue in greater depth, one year ago we requested from the administration detailed information about health insurance costs, but never received the relevant information. That lack of cooperation makes it difficult to do anything but question the rationale for co-pay.

As to salaries, the administration's position has been that Temple's offer is equal to or better than what is being granted to faculty at other universities, such as Penn State, Pitt, or Rutgers. That would make our proposals for more appear to be unreasonable. Perhaps equal rate increases would be acceptable to our members if we were not already so far behind those schools and other comparable ones, as the table of comparisons I have given you makes clear. Moreover, the gap between our salaries and those of comparable institutions has grown, not shrunk, over time. From this perspective, our across-the-board and salary compression proposals are quite moderate.

We certainly appreciate the serious financial constraints the

University is facing, and are willing to take them into account, particularly for the current year. Still, despite administration statements that our current proposals cost outrageous sums, the cost of a settlement would be far less than the cost of continued conflict. And there are other issues, costing little or no money, that still need to be discussed, not to mention the second, third and fourth years.

TAUP has been flexible in our bargaining position from the beginning. Contrary to the charge of intractability, we are not very far apart in our positions at the bargaining table. I have given you a chart of comparisons to illustrate that. There is a great deal of common ground on many issues, even on the publicly conspicuous issue of co-pay of health insurance premiums. Nevertheless, there are some sticking points beside the most often cited one of across-the-board salary increases. We believe insufficient attention has been paid to less visible issues, such as the treatment of librarians and academic professionals, small groups in our bargaining unit, whose needs cost very little to satisfy.

We have continued to emphasize our willingness to be flexible with regard to the proposals we currently have on the table. However, we have a responsibility to represent the wishes of our members, who, in a secret ballot vote overwhelmingly rejected the tentative agreement reached on October 23. Neither the TAUP Executive Committee nor I have authority to take back to the members a proposal that they have overwhelmingly rejected in a secret ballot. Yet, that tentative agreement, I believe, forms the basis for serious talks.

The public is disgusted with both sides in this conflict. Right now negotiations are our last chance before we continue to do further damage. What we want is to sit down together, discuss the issues, and bridge the gaps. Are you willing to set up such a meeting of our respective negotiating teams? I would like to sit down with Mr. Harrington to come up with a few dates when I finish my presentation.

At this time, it behooves us all to work out a relationship that both sides can live with. We all have to be more concerned than we have been with damage control for the present and stability and peace for the future. We have to work with one another. For the future, the faculty will still be here, the union will still be here, and the administration will still be here. So together let's strive to build a better relationship--one that works.

Thank you for listening. Will you agree to the meeting we are asking for?

(The two charts referred to by Dr. Hochner are attached to these Minutes as SUPPLEMENT I.)

Mr. Fox said that we are not here to have a public bargaining session. The question of a meeting with the union will be discussed by the Employee Relations Committee of the Board, and a report will be given to Dr. Hochner.

Mr. Fox said we are now confronted with a new set of issues:
(1) the Governor's reduction in Temple's appropriation of \$6.3 million;
(2) the failure of the State to make its July monthly payment to Temple has cost the University about \$1 million in lost interest. The State is

asking Temple University to become the banker for the State. The question of a settlement has to be put in the context of a total financial picture, and it relates to the economic environment--one in which the Governor and the State have raised issues of significance regarding funding. Until the University understands the full impact of our own total financial picture, it is very difficult to come to grips with the impact of even what is on the table.

Dr. Hochner said he is very much aware of the current economic environment, and Mr. Fox indicated that the whole question we are dealing with raises significant financial issues beyond the TAUP negotiations and will have to be put in that context.

It is more than unsatisfactory that we find ourselves in January 1991 without a settlement. This Board and the Administration believe that we have put on the table very generous proposals that go beyond those settlements with any number of other universities that are comparable to Temple University. There are still open options. The goal of this Board and the Administration is to find a settlement which is equitable and which is fair to the faculty of Temple University.

Mr. Fox thanked Dr. Hochner for his presentation. Dr. Hochner's representation of the Board's policies would not be Mr. Fox's; there are differences of opinion. We believe that we have acted in a fair, above the table, and generous manner, and we believe we are still acting in that way. We have met the union more than half way and will continue to do so. It is important and helpful to have Dr. Hochner here. We hope we can solve these problems. We have been in a confrontational mode; we would like to get out of that mode.

Mr. Fox said that at the last meeting of this Board we agreed we will make efforts to keep separate those issues that are non-confrontational. There are a lot of issues that have nothing to do with wages and money oriented issues. We have all learned a great deal. It is our goal to make sure that we find a solution to this present problem and put in place basic institutional structures. We have to change a lose-lose situation into a win-win situation.

5. Report of the President

The President asked the Secretary to distribute materials which Dr. Arthur Hochner, President of the Temple Association of University Professionals, had referred to during his earlier remarks to the Joint Committees today.

(1) Recognition of Dr. William Duncan, President of the General Alumni Association

The President recognized Dr. Duncan who referred to the Summer Issue of Temple Review in which General Thomas Kelly was featured. The Washington D.C. Temple Alumni Club has asked Dr. Duncan to present the GAA's Order of the Owl to General Kelly at its meeting tomorrow evening, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to his country. With the permission of the Board, Dr. Duncan will be presenting the Order of the Owl to General Kelly on behalf of the Trustees and on behalf of the General Alumni Association. General Kelly is a fine representative of Temple University, having received his undergraduate degree in Journalism from Temple.

(2) Spring Enrollment

The President said that the end of semester headcounts for Fall Semester of 1990 vs. Fall of 1989 were down 3,427, or 10.5%. We constructed a Revised Budget in November 1990, approved by the Board, recouping 60% of that decline of 3,427, although not necessarily the same students who withdrew. This meant that we needed to gain 2,056 of the 3,427 to meet our projections. In mid-December, through the efforts of staff and students themselves, the President reported that we had recouped 1,500 of that 2,056 but that we had to work even harder since we were about 500 below budget. We launched our Bill Cosby "Conversations about Temple University": Temple as a great educational value; the differences of viewpoints at Temple; and Temple's rich diversity.

Simultaneously, there was an even more heroic effort by the Provost's Office, Admissions, Registration, the Help Center, particularly Mike Goetz, Bill Nathan, Ira Shapiro, Rose Katz, Deans' Offices, students, faculty, and a special effort was made by the Admissions Office with leadership from Valaida Walker, Julia Ericksen, Jack Freeman, Stephen Zelnick and Kathy Gosliner.

The result of these efforts is that we have not only recouped the targeted 2,056 (or 60%) but have increased the returnees by 2065 (or 67%).

Our enrollment for this Spring Semester, which began on Monday, January 21, is projected, conservatively, to be less than 4% below that of last spring's enrollment. We had originally projected in July a 1.5% decline. We believe this record represents the very best and hardest indication that students and their families recognize the great value of Temple University, and it shows confidence in our institution. It shows the resiliency of students, faculty and staff. It demonstrates an appreciation of the unique quality of education offered by Temple University and the bad news is that we are still behind the enrollment of last year.

As to the Fall 1991 enrollment (leaving aside graduate and professional students), and focusing only on undergraduate matriculated students: our applications were 50% off as of December 15. Today, they are 24% down. That is substantial progress, but it leaves a very hard challenge. We need much cooperation. The President thinks Temple should be increasing enrollment despite demographic declines. As recession spreads more broadly and deeply, Temple will be an even more attractive alternative for the middle class for the reasons Mr. Cosby spells out in his "Conversations about Temple": we have the best value with our diversity, the quality of our education and the relative bargain of our tuition. We think we will do very well if we get our act together--and the President was encouraged by Dr. Hochner's earlier remarks to the Joint Committees.

The President said that our Transfer applications are off 4%. Freshmen applications are down 27%. We are making progress but we are still behind last year.

The Professional School's enrollments are about where they should be. He is not quite sure about the Graduate School Enrollment. Dr. Papacostas said it is still early to have accurate estimates, most decisions are made in February and March. The President said that we will have an update on graduate applications at the March meeting.

Mrs. Wofford asked for a clarification of the enrollment figures, and the President said that our Revised Budget in November assumed that we could recoup 60% of our enrollment losses. We succeeded and then some. Perhaps it is simpler to look at the figures year by year. Apparently, there is about a 7% decline Fall to Spring semesters. That continues this year. The President said that as to Spring to Spring: we had a drop of about 3.6% compared to last year at this time.

(3) University's Budget

The President said that the University has suffered a \$4.8 million cut in Appropriations; a \$1.520 million reduction in the Tuition Challenge Grant; and we have lost \$1.0 million from interest we will not earn on \$11.5 million representing the first of 12 monthly payments beginning in July 1990. The State has delayed by a month these "equal" payments. The total loss from all of the above is \$7.3 million (\$4.8, \$1.520, and \$1.0 million).

With regard to this "lost interest money of \$1 million," Mr. Rosen asked if we have any legal recourse against the State; is this a contractual obligation of the State to the University.

The President said we will fully cooperate with the State because the Governor and the General Assembly do have a serious financial problem. They aren't just singling out Temple University. We have tried over the past three weeks to adjust the remainder of this year's budget to accommodate to a \$7.3 million loss in revenue. We cannot do so without either laying off full-time employees or refraining from academic and necessary institutional repairs which it will cost us two or three times to do later on, as well as possibly endangering the health and safety of persons at Temple. Rather than having to make these \$7.3 million cuts (without laying off people, maintaining academic quality and student support, consistent with the budget approved by the Board on 11/27/90), we will await the Governor's Budget Message of 2/6/91 and have further discussions with the State persons responsible for these matters.

The President had asked for a legal opinion on this matter. We do not want to operate in a confrontational mode. We want to work out our problems with the State which has been very cooperative, and we will explain our special challenges. On the legal questions:

(1) As to the 3.5% cut in the Appropriations--if all Non-Preferreds received the same 3.5% abatement, we believe it is probably legal.

(2) As to the Tuition Challenge Grant: we think this was really a contractual relationship between the State and the State-related Universities. This "abatement" is a unilateral change in this contractual arrangement. House Education Chairman Ronald Cowell's letter of January 16, 1991 (copies of which were distributed to committee members today) to the Governor makes this same point in a "fairness" (rather than legal) sense.

(3) As to the interest income we are losing because the July payment was not made: our Counsel believes that the payments must be made on schedule. This isn't a confrontational mode.

It is important to emphasize that we will try to work out an adjustment, consistent with our needs and fairness. The President thinks we have some time to do this between now and the Governor's Budget Message of 2/6/91.

Actually, we are implementing certain additional reductions in the 11/27/90 Budget; but we won't be able to absorb all of these cuts without major implications for personnel and for programs. When the Governor's Budget Message is given on 2/6/91, we will have to look at all programs and all personnel. We will work very hard to deal with each of our units in a fair way, but everyone should understand that we are faced with an enormous problem.

We have these basic options:

(1) We can increase student enrollments; (2) we can increase tuition; or (3) we can receive an increased State appropriation. Sixteen years ago the original percentage of appropriations to tuition was two-thirds to one-third. Today, the division is 55% provided by the student and 45% by the State appropriation. This major change is not due to the present Governor; in fact, he has actually done better. There is a long standing tradition in Pennsylvania: our State is ranked #3 in terms of support for private higher education and 48th in support for public higher education. We have been doing more with less at Temple University as a public institution.

The President would like to delay any further action on the Budget by the Board until we hear what the Governor recommends on 2/6/91. If we move earlier, this will force us to take actions that may not be appropriate. After 2/6/91, we will have to look at the whole enterprise and make whatever recommendations are appropriate, including all issues, all programs, all personnel. The Board has the ultimate financial and legal responsibility for this process. If we face greater short-falls--and we have already pared down the budget, keeping tuition low--then we must make further cuts that will be more than painful. The President would like to hold off until sometime after the Governor's Budget Message of 2/6/91.

(4) Temple University Hospital

The President noted that the Final Hospital Budget for 1990-91 was delayed when, at the 12/11/90 Board meeting, it was reported that there was a projected deficit of \$8.9 million and no funding source to close the gap. This deficit now stands at a projected figure of \$8.4 million. The Hospital leadership is working very diligently in keeping down expenses and trying to increase revenues. The source of our problem is the State's under-reimbursement for our Hospital's Medicaid costs and the free care the Hospital provides for indigent patients. We are having continued discussions with the Department of Public Welfare on Judge Fullam's decision. There is a great desire on the part of the State, Temple University and the industry to settle this case as promptly as possible. We continue to maintain that we must be paid for our costs of serving the community. At this point in these delicate discussions, the President does not want to say anymore.

As to the Business Planning process: there has been underway since early last year, a Business Planning process at the Hospital to improve the long term financial structure of the Hospital.

This plan is being developed with the assistance of Peat Marwick and should be completed within the next two weeks. The plan will present the strategies needed to increase revenues through developing a greater percentage of fully paying patients. There would also be certain administrative and management improvements.

The President said that on 1/17/91, the University retained Goldman/Sachs as a financial advisor to the Hospital in terms of these phases: (1) increasing the options on restructuring the Hospital as a separate entity; (2) evaluating options to restructure the Hospital's debt; and (3) exploring potential joint ventures and other approaches. Goldman/Sachs has been authorized to proceed with the first phase only. We are scheduling a planning session next week with Goldman/Sachs.

(5) Hostilities in the Persian Gulf

The President said that there are certain laws that apply to students and employees who are called up for service in the Persian Gulf Conflict. We are complying fully with those laws. In addition, the President read two new Presidential Policy Statements dealing with "Temple University Employees Who Serve on Active Military Duty During the Persian Gulf Crisis" and "Temple University Tuition Scholarships for Persian Gulf Crisis Veterans and Dependents of War Casualties." (Both of these Policies are attached to this Presidential Report as SUPPLEMENT II.)

During the discussion of these Presidential Policies, Judge Dandridge urged that the dependents of those who are 100% disabled should be added to those groups who receive benefits. There was agreement that this addition to the Policy should be made, and the President said that it would be added.

(6) Woodhaven Center

The President said that the State has a problem and we want to help. As you know, Temple University has given notice to the State that it is withdrawing from Woodhaven on April 3, having given the State nine months notice. The State needed this time to receive bids from other institutions to operate Woodhaven. They have been unsuccessful in getting responsible bids, and they have asked Temple to stay until June 30, 1991. We have agreed to that request. Furthermore, we are engaged in discussions on the issue of Temple's staying there and withdrawing the notice of termination. We will keep the Committees well informed on those discussions.

We would, in exchange, need help in the area of University Budget reductions and Medicaid under-reimbursement. Temple University, to serve its mission as a great university with a research mission and a well compensated faculty, and with students who have curricular and extra-curricular activities they need as part of their experience, requires more not less State Aid. Temple University, because it is a State-related University fulfilling its mission at least as well as anyone else in this region, we would like to cooperate with the State on Woodhaven and on all other issues.

This completed the President's Report and he welcomed any questions the Trustees may have.

Judge Dandridge referred to the retention of Goldman/Sachs as a financial adviser for the Hospital, noting his understanding that they will address long-term concerns of the Hospital, as opposed to short-term concerns. He feels that a key short-term concern is the \$8+ million deficit of the Hospital, and he wanted to know when the Trustees will hear something on this important matter. The President replied some time after the Governor's Budget Message, or as soon as we have a settlement of the litigation with the State. We were apparently very close to a settlement before the Budget reductions of three weeks ago. The President understands we are back on track and are looking forward to a prompt and fair settlement. We have had some indications that a satisfactory settlement is quite possible, and if this occurs, we will be back here in early or mid-February with a much different kind of approach.

Mr. Fox said that Judge Dandridge's question is a valid one. Rather than bring a Budget in with a major unknown, the decision was made that we wait until the Governor's Budget Message of 2/6/91. He thinks we will need a Special Meeting of the Board some time after that Budget message, and after we have had a chance to look at our total Budget situation.

Judge Dandridge said this Hospital Budget has been hanging for some time. Mr. Fox noted that there is a federal judge who has ordered changes, and we are trying to get that matter squared away.

Mr. Fox further noted that the State of Pennsylvania is ranked 48th out of 50 States in terms of its support for public higher education, while it is ranked third in support of private higher education. We have to ask ourselves why this is permitted to exist. This is not aimed at the present Governor because the present Governor has been supportive. This has been going on for 15 or 16 years. Essentially, the Temple University mission is being eroded by our inability to provide a tuition level and funding to provide high quality education, which the State expects us to do so.

6. Human Resource Information System

The President pointed out that this Human Resource Information System and the five following items are all being recommended by the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee which met on 1/14/91. Each of these six items has been in the pipe-line for some time and each has a source of funding, as indicated in each recommendation before the Committees.

Mr. Begier and Judge Dandridge emphasized that the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee went over each of these projects in great detail and these recommendations come to the Joint Committees following an exhaustive discussion of them at the 1/14/91 session.

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting on behalf of the Board, voted to approve the recommendation of the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee (1/14/91) that the officers be authorized to expend \$275,000 for the product implementation phase of the Human Resource Information System (HRIS), with funding from the Human Resource Information System Project Budget.

7. Expansion of Main Campus Underground Chilled Water Distribution System

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting on behalf of the Board, voted to approve the recommendation of the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee (1/14/91) that the officers be authorized to enter into a contract with Willard, Inc., to install extensions of the Main Campus underground chilled water system at a cost not to exceed \$3,317,710, with interim funding from the Plant Development Fund (\$1,875,000 previously committed to the project, will be expended in FY 90-91, and the balance of \$1,442,710 will be expended in FY 91-92). If market conditions permit, this expenditure will be permanently financed by proceeds from a University tax-exempt bond issue.

8. Student Housing Design Services Phase III - Design Development/Construction Documentation/Contract Administration

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting on behalf of the Board, voted to approve the recommendation of the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee (1/14/91) that the officers be authorized to enter into a contract with the Hillier Group for architectural/engineering service for design development, construction documentation, and contract administration for the proposed new student housing facility at a cost not to exceed \$500,000, with funding to come from the Plant Development Fund, with the understanding that when a final source of funding for the project is identified these costs will be reassigned to that source. If market conditions permit, this expenditure will be permanently financed by proceeds from a University tax-exempt bond issue.

9. Community Development Plan - Armory Site

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting on behalf of the Board, voted to approve the recommendation of the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee (1/14/91) that the officers be authorized to contribute up to \$200,000 in cash and \$100,000 in in-kind services in furtherance of the implementation of a community development plan for the area immediately adjacent to the proposed new student residence facility, with the funding source of insurance proceeds. If market conditions permit, this expenditure will be permanently financed by proceeds from a University tax-exempt bond issue.

10. Johnson/Hardwick Dining Hall Renovation Design Services

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting on behalf of the Board, voted to approve the recommendation of the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee (1/14/91) that the officers be authorized to enter into a contract with Thomas Ricca Associates and Wallace Roberts & Todd for completion of preliminary design services for the renovation/expansion of the Johnson/Hardwick Dining Hall consisting of a feasibility study, identification of a preliminary construction budget, and complete schematic design documentation at a cost not to exceed \$85,370, with funding from the Plant Development Fund, and with the understanding that when a final funding source for the project is identified these costs

will be reassigned to that source. If market conditions permit, this expenditure will be permanently financed by proceeds from a University tax-exempt bond issue.

11. Capital Budget and Program Request for Commonwealth Fund Support for 1991-92 through 1995-96

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting on behalf of the Board, voted to approve the recommendation of the Campus Planning and Plant Management Committee (1/14/91) that the Capital Budget requests previously submitted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and a total line year capital program request for the period 1992-93 through 1995-96, be confirmed and approved, as shown in SUPPLEMENT III.

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

12. Summary Status of the Plant Development Fund Projects

Mr. Fox called attention to the captioned Report (which was distributed as Agenda Reference 9 for today's meeting), and indicated that if there were questions about this Report, they should be raised at the next meeting of the Joint Committees.

The meeting of the Joint Committees was adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

W.C.S.