

Exon slashes budget request

by JIM PEDERSEN
Staff Writer

The University of Nebraska ordered a full meal, but it received only skim milk Thursday when Gov. J. J. Exon presented his budget message to the Nebraska Legislature.

Exon's proposal for the University for 1971-72 calls for a \$1.5 million reduction in state aid from what the University is receiving during the current fiscal year. For the 1971-73 biennium, Exon proposed a \$400,000 increase over the current biennium.

The Regents had requested an allocation of \$123.8 million in state funds for 1971-73.

Exon's recommended state fund appropriations for all NU operations for 1971-73 is \$80.9 million, as against \$80.5 appropriated two years ago. For the Lincoln campus and outstate activities, the total appropriation—including general cash, federal and revolving funds—would be cut from \$97.2 to \$96.6 million.

In a speech before the legislature, Exon said it is time "for higher education to streamline, to break through worn precepts. Students are becoming bored with humdrum approaches in education."

"I'm challenging the Board of Regents, the Administration, the faculty and students to review their goals; to look at educational output not just input; to realize that educational costs will become prohibitive unless educators and officials look for educational reform to get more out existing dollars; to create a top-flight university by channeling thought to concentrate on present appropriations rather than to seek unreasonable spending goals."

Exon added, "The University is a great university by any reasonable standard and we have programmed a budget that we are convinced will keep it in the forefront."

The reaction from Chancellor D. B. Varner and Regents' President Robert Raun was an emphatic "dissatisfied."

"The budget proposals are definitely not capable of keeping the University of Nebraska in the forefront of higher education," Raun said at his home in Minden.

Hardest hit were the two Lincoln campuses, where figures show there will be only \$100,000 more for expenses next year over this year. Administrative Services director Gus Lieske told newsmen earlier in the morning no allotment had been made for increased enrollment.

"The budget was prepared on the assumption the Lincoln enrollment

will hold at 20,000 students," Lieske said. "If more students are admitted, the increase will have to be absorbed in teaching loads not appropriations."

Lieske added that the budget was planned on a teaching load of 15 hours and class size of 27 for professors teaching freshmen and sophomores, 12 hours and class size of 25 for juniors and seniors, nine hours and 15 students at the masters of arts level and six hours and 12 students at the doctoral level.

In short, the budget proposal assumes more teaching, less research and no increase in enrollment in the next two years.

This means the University may limit enrollment, a move Varner had hinted at several times, not to increase educational quality but out of economic necessity.

"We may have no alternative but to limit the enrollment at the Lincoln campus to 20,000 and impose general enrollment restrictions at the other institutions," Raun said. "I don't know how we would do that."

Ironically, the Regents had included in their budget request an across-the-board tuition hike for all students. The rationale, at the time, was that students should pay a fair proportion of the vastly increased budget proposal then submitted.

In preparing his budget proposal for the legislature, however, Exon retained the tuition hike while cutting tax funding.

"The Regents may now want to review the tuition hike," Varner said.

The question now however, is whether the sparse budget may force the Regents to retain the hike.

"I would not have been in favor of a tuition like for this level of spending," Raun said. "It is not fair to the students to raise their percentage of payment, but I can't say if the increase will be retained. The Governor's budget certainly makes it undesirable."

Only three of the Regents' top ten priority capital construction projects were funded—land acquisition at UN-O, the home economics building at East Campus and part of the requested library funds for the Lincoln City campus. The total fund proposal for capital construction was about one-fourth of the requested funds.

The proposed allocations for the addition to Love Library was \$1.5 million to be added to the \$2 million appropriated by the last session of the legislature. The original request was for \$6 million over two years ago.

"We can't build a \$6 million library with \$3.5 million," Varner said. "We

Turn to Page 2



Regents to examine modified PACE plan

by DAVE BRINK
Staff Writer

The PACE controversy may finally be laid to rest at Saturday's meeting of the Board of Regents.

The PACE committee, led by ASUN Senator Steve Fowler, will be there with a modified idea. It calls for a mandatory collection of \$3.50 per each semester (\$1.75 per summer session) but would allow students to collect a refund after the fee is paid.

Sophomore Douglas Voegler will also appear before the Board. He will encourage adoption of his own plan which, like PACE, is a low-income scholarship program. Voegler's plan has one important difference, however.

Instead of PACE's refund procedure, Voegler calls for each student to indicate whether or not he will contribute at the time of registration.

Fowler predicted the Regents might table action on both proposals because of the heavy work load they must face at Saturday's meeting.

Fowler's committee did extensive research in designing their proposal. They also made a promotional effort including a petition drive which collected 4,892 signatures. Fowler said time did not allow checking the petitions for duplicate signatures but he still feels they are significant.

The petition proposal called for a mandatory fee without possibility of refund. "Several thousand", according to Fowler, didn't sign because of the mandatory fee so the new refund proposal represents the opinion of a "substantial majority of the students."

In Voegler's opinion, the petitions show support for the "concept" of low-income scholarships but not necessarily for the specific PACE program. He said his plan would be more economical to implement and would raise money without "any legal

questions and without raising any charges of coercion or intimidation."

"It worries me that some people's idea of what's voluntary affect everyone and makes some return for a refund."

Director of Business and Finance Miles Tommeraasen said there is little question that the refund system would cost more than the Voegler plan. He added that legal questions might also appear but the cost could be lowered if the refunds were in cash. Tommeraasen emphasized that his office was ready and willing to develop a refund system if the Regents choose the PACE proposal.

Tom Cardwell, who led the short-lived STOPACE movement petition drive, said Voegler's proposal was "a simple way to implement this thing". STOPACE collected about 200 signatures but, as Cardwell points out, they only had about four workers.

According to Cardwell, the purpose of STOPACE was not to oppose low-income scholarships but to protest the involuntary nature of PACE. He called the refund system "highly inefficient" and a great inconvenience.

ASUN President Steve Tiwald, taking the opposite view, called PACE a "test case for the system".

PACE workers, according to Tiwald, "did their homework", carefully researched the plan, talked to administrators, local citizens, faculty, and students, and went through the channels to come up with a program.

He noted that many students opposed the mandatory fee so the PACE committee changed to the refund which "retains the individual's freedom."

If PACE fails Tiwald said it would be a "very serious setback to any student-initiated reform efforts at the University of Nebraska."

The money situation

... at a glance

CAMPUS	1969-71 Biennium Appropriations	NU Request for 1971-73	Exon Proposal for 1971-73
Lincoln (and outstate activities)	97.3 million	122.7 million	96.6 million
Omaha	20.2 million	29.1 million	24.7 million
Medical	32.7 million	42.8 million	34.7 million
TOTAL FOR University system	150.2 million	199.7 million	156.1 million

(figures rounded to nearest hundred thousand)