

November 19, 1992

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Governors was held on Thursday, November 19, 1992, at 9:00 a.m. in the Board and Senate Room of the Old Administration Building.

Present: Mr. Kenneth M. Bagshaw, Chair
Dr. Leslie R. Peterson, Chancellor
Dr. David W. Strangway, President
Ms. Barbara Crompton
Ms. Shirley Chan
Mr. Jaret Clay
Mr. Ronald H. Granholm
Dr. Arthur S. Hara
Dr. Tong Louie
Mr. Derek Miller
Dr. Sidney Mindess
Mr. Doug Napier
Mr. Michael Partridge
Mr. Dennis J. Pavlich

A message of regret for absence was received from Mr. Thomas R. Berger.

In Attendance: Mrs. Nina Robinson, Secretary to the Board
Dr. Daniel R. Birch, Vice President Academic
& Provost
Mr. A. Bruce Gellatly, Vice President,
Administration & Finance
Dr. Robert C. Miller, Jr., Vice President, Research
Dr. Bernard S. Sheehan, Acting Vice President,
Student & Academic Services
Mr. Peter Ufford, Vice President,
External Affairs
Mr. Mark Betteridge, President, UBC
Real Estate Corporation
Mr. Tim Miner, Director, Campus Planning
& Development
Mr. Andrew Brown, University Planner
Mr. Steve Crombie, Media Relations Manager
Mr. Martin Ertl, President, AMS
Asian Research Institute
Dr. John Grace, Dean, Graduate Studies
Central Library - Phase I
Ms. Heather Keate

November 19, 1992

Nowell Best (Aitken Wreglesworth)
Kathleen Beaumont, CP&D
Marine Drive Parkade
Mr. John Smithman
St. Andrews Hall
Dr. Brian Fraser
Ms. Helen Piggott
Presentation
Dr. Olav Slaymaker, Associate Vice President,
Research
Dr. John Robinson, Director, SDRI
Dr. Peter Pearse, Forestry
Dr. Tom Hutton, Assoc. Director, Centre for
Human Settlements

OPEN SESSION

PRESENTATIONS

Regional Economic Development and Sustainability

A forty-five minute presentation on the topic "Regional Economic Development and Sustainability" was made by Dr. Olav Slaymaker, Associate Vice President, Research, Dr. John Robinson, Director, SDRI; Dr. Peter Pearse, Forestry, Dr. Tom Hutton, Assoc. Director, Centre for Human Settlements.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Michael Partridge asked if there was a plan or strategy to have a publicity program to let people know about the wonderful research that is being done on campus. Dr. Slaymaker replied that the University was currently working on inventories of research projects with a view to converting them into publicity items, but the range of material from the research of 900 faculty members was absolutely astronomical.

Dr. Daniel R. Birch gave an example of a method used a few years ago for popularizing research which was a series of two minute interviews called "UBC Perspectives with David Suzuki." This has gone out in cassette form and has received virtual saturation coverage on small-town radio throughout Canada. This was just one of many strategies, but one for a limited range of about two dozen research projects which received all kinds of response. The Chancellor felt that it would be a great mistake not to utilize Dr. Suzuki's time more fully in this area.

Mr. Peter Ufford felt that Dr. Birch's idea was a very good one and could be part of an overall plan in conjunction with other strategies being developed by Community Relations.

Student Facilities

Mr. Martin Ertl, President, Alma Mater Society, was present to speak to the issue of student facilities on campus. Mr. Ertl introduced the following students who were also in attendance i.e., Janice Doyle, member AMS Student Council; Marya McVicar, Coordinator, External Affairs, AMS; Orvin Lau, student representative on Senate; Carole Forsythe, Vice President, AMS; Bill Dobie, Director of Finance, AMS; and Careen Hanert, Director of Administration for the AMS.

Mr. Ertl circulated the following documentation to the Board for its information.

(a) Presentation to the Board of Governors by the Alma Mater Society November 19, 1992. (Response to the University's discussion paper dated November 18, 1992).

(b) Agreement dated July 5, 1966, between The University of British Columbia and the Alma Mater Society.

A copy of the University's Discussion Paper dated November 18, 1992, together with a letter dated November 16, 1992, from the President to Mr. Martin Ertl and a memorandum dated November 18, 1992, from the President to the Board had been circulated and were received for information.

Mr. Martin Ertl addressed the Board as follows:

"As some of you are aware, the University and the AMS are involved in a fairly serious dispute over the philosophical position adopted by the Administration regarding future contractual agreements between the AMS and the University. Prior to his departure on sabbatical, Dr. Srivastava, Vice-President of Student & Academic Services, expressed the Administration's view that the University will no longer enter into agreements with the AMS. The rationale given was that these agreements cause needless friction. Obviously, we strongly disagree with the position taken by the Administration, because without contractual agreements we would not be able to hold the University to its word. Dr. Strangway distributed a discussion paper on this issue and on related issues, and we have prepared a response to that discussion paper because in honesty we didn't feel it did justice to our view. In any case, the Administration's discussion paper did not clearly state whether its philosophical position with respect to contractual agreements with the AMS has been modified or not and we would like the Board to resolve that issue today.

I would like to address why contractual agreements are a concern to the AMS. The best example is that of the Student Union Building; the SUB for short. Without the lease agreements obtained on SUB in 1966 and 1968, the AMS would not be able to provide the number and variety of services that we offer to students. Quite simply, SUB has provided the facilities necessary for the AMS, for our undergraduate societies, for our

November 19, 1992

service organizations and for our 150 or so clubs to carry on their activities and organize student events. Ancillary to this, SUB has also provided the opportunity to develop some commercial ventures that have been very valuable to the funding of our services and programs. In the future, I would like to be able to obtain a lease on any extensions to the SUB, in particular the proposed north side expansion to the SUB.

One of the secondary issues to the primary philosophical issue is that of commercial operations. This is a particularly sore point with the Administration for reasons that I will elaborate on in a minute. First I want to explain why these commercial operations are actually of benefit to students: 1. The net revenue from these operations goes directly back to students in the form of services and programs such as the Ombudsoffice, the Speakeasy student counselling service, the *UBYSSEY* student newspaper, etc. 2. These operations employ nearly 400 students on a part-time basis, and last year we paid those students on a part-time basis over \$1.3 million in wages.

Now, today, the Administration is displeased with the fact that the University is required to pay for the cost of utilities, maintenance, and custodial services for those commercial operations and they contend that it is unfair, particularly because it takes money away from teaching, financial aid, the library, etc. Again, you should note that the net revenue from the commercial operations is directed back to students through funding for such things as the walk-home program, student bursaries, and our emergency student loan program.

I want to argue quite strongly that the arrangement is indeed fair. For one, the University has a legal obligation to provide those services under the legal agreements on SUB. We have a legal opinion that confirms this and should the University have a legal opinion to the contrary, we would be happy to exchange our opinions and have our legal counsel review their interpretation. The second reason that the arrangement is fair, is that the students paid for the capital costs of the SUB in the amount of about \$3.5 million. This was consideration for the provision by the University of utilities in future use. The third reason that the arrangement is fair is that the AMS agreed to vacate Brock Hall and Brock Hall Annex, both built and financed by students; therefore leaving these two facilities open for the use of the University. This was also consideration for future services. Perhaps the most compelling reason that the arrangement is fair is that the students have contributed immensely to the University in terms of time, effort, initiative and dedication throughout UBC's history. One other point that should be made is in relation to the claim sometimes made that the University did not contemplate that the AMS would have commercial operations when the agreements on SUB were entered into. I want to state very emphatically that this is not the case. The University was well aware of the AMS's intention to have commercial operations in the SUB. The Administration may well be unhappy about these clauses today, but they cannot claim ignorance of the future implications at the time the agreements were entered into.

I want to talk a little bit about the historical involvement of students at UBC. Right from the Great Trek in 1922 that led to UBC moving to the Point Grey Campus, the students

have taken some responsibility for the building of the University. In the package that we sent to you, we listed some of the facilities that we built on campus. It turns out that the AMS has initiated and financed in whole or in part all but one of the athletic and recreational facilities on campus; the only exception being the Osborne Gym which is primarily an academic facility. In fact, until 1952 the AMS was solely responsible for the varsity athletic program and today we fund that program in an amount close to \$180,000 per year. Throughout UBC's history, students have voluntarily contributed immensely to the physical development of the campus. To this day, students take an active role in setting the direction of the University and in advising on its day-to-day operations. I may be biased, but I feel strongly that the education received from a meaningful involvement is equal to if not better than the education received in the classroom. By being so involved with the affairs of the University, you learn how to deal with and resolve real world problems. For myself, nowhere else at 22 years of age could I get the opportunity to lead an organization with over 30,000 members and with the resources to offer its members all the services and activities and chances to be involved that the AMS offers. The students want to continue the tradition of assuming some responsibility for the improvement of the University. As President Mackenzie said in 1954, "No university in the world I know of owes as much to its students as does the University of British Columbia." This applies not only to buildings, but to participation in the actual operation of the University on a variety of levels. This, I believe, is good for the University and good for you and the students, for it is in an exercise of that kind that you gain experience and maturity in becoming in a real sense actively interested in and supporters of the University."

Mr. Ertl thanked the Board for its time and answered questions from Board members.

Mr. Dennis Pavlich asked what commercial operations were being conducted by the AMS at the time these leases were entered into i.e., 1966 and 1968. Mr. Ertl replied that the AMS didn't run any commercial operations in Brock Hall because there wasn't room. He believed, however, that there were two sub-leases; a barber shop and one other which he could not recall. When the SUB opened in 1968, the games room was one of the first operations opened, as well as the candy counter. Mr. Ertl indicated further that the barber shop also moved into SUB when it opened as well as the deli that is there now.

The Board Chair noted that a considerable amount of material had been received by the Board from both the Administration and the AMS on this issue within the past twenty-four hours. He felt that it was difficult for the Board to grapple with this in a substantive way at this time. He stated that it was the Board's understanding that discussions would continue between the Administration and the AMS with the expectation that the issues would be worked through, in terms of specifics and in terms of more generic philosophical relationship questions, with a view to reporting back to the Board at its January 1993 meeting.

Mr. Ertl advised that there were absolutely no problems with having discussions on the SUB and Aquatic Centre continue. The only problem is that it is going to be very difficult, if not impossible, to come to a conclusion on those discussions because as it stands right now, Dr. K. D. Srivastava expressed the University's position that it was philosophically opposed to contractual agreements with the AMS. From the AMS view, it was very difficult to deal with the secondary issues without first addressing the primary philosophical issue.

President David W. Strangway pointed out that there were a number of principles in the University's discussion paper dated November 18, 1992, and that was not one of the principles enunciated.

Mr. Ertl asked if it could be taken that either is no longer, or was not the position of the University, and the President replied in the affirmative.

It was the view of the Board Chair that it is very important in these sorts of situations that the Administration and the AMS try to work these things out without the Board intervening. If these issues are extant in January, then they will have to be revisited. However, for the moment, the Chair indicated that the Board wanted to see the matter worked through within the internal processes of the institution. He was hopeful, with the statements put forward this morning, that we have the ground work for continuing discussions.

The following motion (which had been put forward by student Board members; Mr. Jaret Clay and Mr. Derek Miller) was **TABLED** to the January 1993 meeting of the Board.

WHEREAS, the members of the Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia were the moving force behind the Great Trek that brought the University of British Columbia to its present campus; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Alma Mater Society have participated in unique, valuable and significant ways in the establishment and/or in the administration of the Student Union Building, the War Memorial Gym, the Aquatic Centre, the Thunderbird Winter Sports Centre and a number of other capital projects; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Alma Mater Society recognize that their continued participation in the establishment and/or in the administration of capital projects is essential to the Alma Mater Society's ability to serve students and to ensure that the University of British Columbia thrives;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Governors:

- (1) recognize the crucial role that the members of the Alma Mater Society have played in the establishment and/or in the administration of future capital projects, services and activities for students of the University of British Columbia; and
- (2) recognize and support the right of the members of the Alma Mater Society to participate in the establishment and/or in the administration of future capital projects, services and activities for students of the University of British Columbia; and
- (3) affirm that the University intends to honour its existing contractual obligations to the AMS; and
- (4) support, in principle, future contractual agreements between the University of British Columbia and the Alma Mater Society.

THE ABOVE MOTION WAS TABLED.

Secretary's Note: The above motion was **WITHDRAWN** by the mover and seconder at the meeting of the Board held on January 21, 1993.

Ms. Shirley Chan indicated that she had voted against tabling the motion simply because she wanted an opportunity to discuss what process will be set in place if the motion were tabled. Hence, she would like to see that we do record any process that we would establish leading up to the January decision and if, in fact, we are obliged to make a decision in January. She felt that a firm procedure should be established for dealing with the issue.

Ms. Barbara Crompton felt it was the role of the Board to look at the care of the university on a long-term basis, and that it was a question of not just a process but a step-by-step philosophical approach of how the students and administration interact over the next ten years. It was her view that the question was much bigger than this one issue, and that she would like the administration to provide a strategic planning process or a statement as to what they would like to do long term with the students in the AMS.

In that context, the Board Chair indicated that what we would like to see back in January is a resolution of the specific issue, and a framework for development of the ongoing relationship.

REMARKS

Chair

Board Appointments, Elections, Resignations, etc.

The Board Chair recorded the Board's sincere appreciation of the distinguished contributions to the University of Dr. Asa Johal and Mr. Richard Nelson during their terms of office as members of the Board.

Mr. Bagshaw welcomed Mr. Thomas Berger and Ms. Shirley Chan as new members of the Board, and expressed the hope that they would find their time on the Board rewarding and enjoyable.

Mr. Bagshaw congratulated Mr. Dennis Pavlich on his re-election for a second term of office and noted that Dr. William R. Cullen had been elected as a member of faculty on the Board to replace Dr. Sidney Mindess.

Mr. Bagshaw reported that Mr. Robert H. Lee had been elected as the University's new Chancellor, and that he would take office on June 25, 1993.

President

The President stated that, at the present time, the provincial government is working on legislation with respect to freedom of information. Obviously the University is in support of the Freedom of Information Act. There are, however, a lot of details that have to be looked at and the three universities are working with government to try to make sure that it is workable. The President warned the Board that, if the legislation is proclaimed as it is presently written, the costs of operating that to the institution will be enormous. According to the present legislation, every document in the institution will have to be listed, catalogued and available.

FINANCE

Financial Statements

Cedar Lodge

LIST

Peter Wall Charitable Foundation

TRIUMF

UBC Research Enterprises

The above-referenced financial statements had been circulated and were received for information.

Campaign Plans and Events

World of Opportunity Campaign

Key Events Leading to Campaign Finale

Donations Report--Quarter Ended September 30, 1992

Five-Year Summary for Quarter ended September 30, 1992

UBC Major Campaign Studies Report

Current Campaign Projects (Centre for Islamic Studies, School of Journalism, St. John's College)

Post Campaign Fund Raising Model

The President's Allocations Fund - Annual Report on Disbursements

The above-referenced reports had been circulated and were received for information.

Purchasing Policy

The proposed purchasing policy was deferred to the January 1993 Board meeting.

PROPERTY (Dr. Tong Louie)

Major Projects Status Report

The major projects status report dated November 2, 1992, had been circulated and was received for information.

Main Campus Plan - Proposed Public Process

Amendment #2 - Proposed Public Process to the Main Campus Plan had been circulated to the Board and was received for information. It was noted that this would be brought forward for approval at the meeting of the Board scheduled for January 21, 1993. The proposed process follows:

"The University recognizes the complex and multifaceted nature of both the campus community and the larger community. The University further recognizes the ongoing need to appreciate the extensive issues and concerns relating to the growth and development of the campus. The planning objectives described in the Campus Plan are a sincere attempt to balance constituent and communal needs, institutional goals and regional citizenship. Despite the absence of formal obligation to a voting population, the University will build and maintain a dialogue with the campus community and larger community in the interest of meaningful growth and development.

The University will, therefore, implement a regularly scheduled two level process, one level enabling a dialogue with the general public, the other dealing with the formal representatives of agencies having practical interfaces with the physical operation of the campus. Meetings will be scheduled monthly with the General Public meeting alternating with the Agency Representatives meeting. It is anticipated that there will be a substantial overlap of information between the two levels of the process.

Wherever possible, the University will present an overview of proposed significant changes to the campus and its operation. Signage describing proposed developments will be erected on selected development sites. Notices and agendas for the General Public meetings will be posted in UBC Reports. Extraordinary public meetings may be scheduled in order to provide information to groups and/or individuals directly affected by specific projects.

Meetings will be chaired by a senior member of the Campus Planning and Development department, who will report the proceedings directly to the President and Vice Presidents. Regular summaries will be included in UBC Reports and minutes will be available on request via the Campus Planning and Development office.

It is anticipated that this process and schedule will continue in harmony with the extent of growth and change taking place on the campus. The University will review the process on an annual basis in order to ensure optimal effectiveness."

A discussion took place regarding the proposed process, and suggestions for modifications were made as follows:

1. Formal advertisements in local newspapers and the Ubyyssey, in addition to UBC Reports, regarding matters that impact on the outside community.
2. Letters regarding proposed projects should be sent to affected individuals both on and off campus.
3. Meetings should involve more than the Campus Planning and Development Department; perhaps a member of the Board and the Chair of the Property Committee (or nominee), and a representative of Senate.
4. Embody into the process an identification of the stage at which the meetings in a given project are going to be slotted.

Institute of Asian Research - Building Facilities Program Brief

It was RESOLVED,

That the Facilities Program Brief dated October 1992, prepared by Kathleen Beaumont, Campus Planning and Development is hereby approved as a basis for further planning for the Institute of Asian Research Building.

CARRIED.

Central Library - Phase I

It was RESOLVED,

That the Central Library - Phase One predesign Report Volumes 1 and 2 dated October 1992 prepared by the collaborative of Aitken Wreglesworth Associates and Arthur Erickson are hereby approved as the basis for further planning and detailed design of the project.

CARRIED.

Marine Drive Parkade

It was RESOLVED,

That the Administration is hereby authorized to apply to the Minister of Advanced Education, Training & Technology and the Minister of Finance as required under Section 55 (1) of the University Act to borrow up to \$15,600,000 for construction of the Marine Drive Parkade, and further, that the University of British Columbia borrow these funds from the Province of British Columbia through the off-lending program or from other sources as may be necessary.

That Campus Planning & Development is hereby authorized to proceed with preparation of documents and tendering of the Marine Drive Parkade project based upon approximately 1,000 stalls and a maximum project cost of \$15,600,000.

CARRIED.

Facilities Inventory Report 1991-92 - Analysis of Space Inventory and Space Calculation

The above-referenced report, which is an annual report requested by the Ministry of Advanced Education, Training & technology, had been circulated and was received for information.

It was noted that the 1991-92 calculation (Table 2B) indicates that the University is at 88% of its formula space requirement with a net shortfall of 49,288 NASM. This figure would be further reduced to 70% if the University were able to demolish all substandard space.

The President drew attention to the proposed construction and demolition schedule for 1991-92 - 1995-96, noting that The Armories would be demolished in December 1992 to make way for the construction of the Creative Arts Centre.

Instructional Space

A report dated November 5, 1992, from Dr. Daniel R. Birch regarding instructional space which had been prepared in response to questions raised at the September 1992 meeting of the Board was received for information. The following documents were attached to the report.

- (a) Memorandum dated October 31, 1992, from Dr. Spencer to Vice President Birch.
- (b) Summary report dated October 31, 1992 entitled "Utilization of Instructional Space."
- (c) Instructional Space Utilization Report, Winter Session 1991-92 - first 11 pages.

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

Reports and Recommendations from Senate

It was RESOLVED,

That the following recommendations from Senate be approved, subject, where applicable, to the proviso that none of the programs be implemented without formal reference to the President; and that the Deans and Heads concerned with new programs be asked to indicate the space requirements, if any, of such new programs.

Senate Meeting held October 21, 1992

That, as recommended by Senate, the new awards listed be approved and that letters of thanks be sent to the donors. (Approved as required under the University Act, Section 36 (i) and 37).

Senate Meeting held November 18, 1992

That, as recommended by Senate, the new awards listed be approved and that letters of thanks be sent to the donors. (Approved as required under the University Act, Section 36 (i) and 37).

That, as recommended by Senate, curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Law be approved. (Approved as required under the University Act, Section 36 (f)(o) and 37).

That, as recommended by Senate, the proposal that the name of the School of Rehabilitation Medicine be changed to the School of Rehabilitation Sciences, be approved. (Approved as required under the University Act, Section 36 (o) and 37).

That, as recommended by Senate, a proposal that the name of the Chair in Fisheries Oceanography be changed to the Chair in the Ocean Environment and its Living Resources be approved. (Approved as required under the University Act, Section 36 (o) and 37).

That, as recommended by Senate a proposal that the name of the Department of Biochemistry be changed to the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; and that the name of the Department of Anaesthesiology be changed to the Department of Anaesthesia be approved. (Approved as required under the University Act, Section 36 (o) and 37).

That, as recommended by Senate, a proposal that the name of the Department of Harvesting and Wood Science be changed to the Department of Wood Science be approved. (Approved as required under the University Act, Section 36 (o) and 37).

CARRIED.

Student Aid Fund Report

A report dated November 5, 1992, prepared by Dr. Bernard S. Sheehan, Acting Vice President, Student and Academic Services on the Student Aid Fund (1991-92 Term End Report) had been circulated and was received for information. The Student Aid Fund originated as a part of the tuition fee policy approved by the board in January 1991. In the fiscal year 1991-92, a total of \$450,000 was designated as being allocated to the fund. The fund is used to supplement existing financial need-based funding for both graduate

November 19, 1992

and undergraduate students. At the January 1992 meeting the Board received a progress report on Term 1 expenditures from this fund. A final report on 1991-92 and a project for 1992-93 were attached to Dr. Sheehan's report.

Report on Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund

The Board received for information a report dated November 19, 1992, from Dr. Daniel R. Birch, Vice President Academic & Provost, on the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund for 1993-94. The call for proposals for funding in 1993-94 was attached to Dr. Birch's report.

UBC Continuing Studies - Organizational Change

Dr. Daniel R. Birch in a report dated November 5, 1992, provided information with respect to organizational changes in UBC Continuing Studies for members of the Board.

The following documentation was attached to Dr. Birch's report.

- (1) UBC Continuing Studies: Organizational Change
- (2) President David W. Strangway's memorandum dated May 9, 1990, to Senate regarding Continuing Education, Extra-Sessional Studies, Guided Independent Study

UBC Degree Programs Offered in Collaboration with University College of the Cariboo and Okanagan University College

A report dated November 5, 1992, on the status of UBC degree programs with the University Colleges had been circulated and was received for information.

UBC/Ritsumeikan Budget

A report dated November 12, 1992, and proposed budget for the UBC/Ritsumeikan Academic Exchange Program had been circulated. It was noted that the UBC/Ritsumeikan Academic Exchange Program was approved on the understanding that there would be no net cost to UBC. In order to keep student tuition fees close to \$5,000, Ritsumeikan University had agreed to make a direct contribution to program costs.

IT WAS RESOLVED,

That the 1992-93 Operating Budget for the UBC/Ritsumeikan Academic Exchange Program is hereby approved.

CARRIED.

CORRESPONDENCE

Letter dated September 25, 1992, to Mr. Kenneth M. Bagshaw from the Minister of Advanced Education, Training and Technology re violence against women and response dated October 19, 1992, from President David W. Strangway

Letter dated September 30, 1992, from Mr. Martin Ertl, President, AMS to Dr. K. D. Srivastava re Student Facilities

The above-referenced correspondence had been circulated and was received for information.

OTHER BUSINESS

Reminder re Fall Congregation - November 26, 1992

The Board was reminded of Fall Congregation which would be held on November 26, 1992.

Tuition Fees

A delegation of students requested that two of their number be allowed to address the Board regarding tuition fees. Mr. Martin Ertl, President, AMS and Mr. Michael Hughes, Graduate Student representative to the AMS, spoke on behalf of the students.

Mr. Hughes advised the Board that students cannot afford an 18% increase in tuition fees stating that \$330.00 represents a months' rent. He felt that by increasing tuition by 18% the Board was cutting off accessibility to UBC. Mr. Hughes stated that the students present really care about this issue and their position was that they can't afford an increase above the inflation rate and that is what they would like to see.

Mr. Ertl stated that the fact that this many students came out on a Thursday afternoon to a Board meeting shows that students do care about what is going

November 19, 1992

on. He advised the Board that the students were not only addressing the Board on this issue but were approaching government as well because clearly the funding problem does not lie with the Board itself but with government sources as well.

Mr. Kenneth M. Bagshaw thanked the students for their presentation. He advised that the Board has some very difficult decisions to make at times and often they are decisions we don't like to make, not just with regard to students, but in a lot of areas. He indicated that the Board respected the students' point of view and the manner in which they made their presentation.